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Abstract

In 1911 Theodore Dreiser published his novel *Jennie Gerhardt*. Prior to publication, the editors at Harper and Brothers cut around 16,000 words from the text. In 1992 James L. West III, Distinguished Professor of English and Fellow for the Arts and Humanities Studies at Pennsylvania State University, published a restored "Pennsylvania" edition. Scholars are now unsure of which text better represents Dreiser's original artistic vision for the novel. This dissertation closely examines the changes made to the original manuscript and concludes that these changes alter Dreiser's original artistic vision dramatically. Therefore, the 1911 edition is substantially inferior to the Pennsylvania edition.

The restored material shows that Dreiser used a variety of genres to describe the different ways man can respond to life and the consequences of those responses. The 1911 edition is, however, flatter and more sentimental. In the restored text, Jennie Gerhardt is a figure from the romance who is consistently loving and sacrificial. Lester Kane, Jennie's love interest, is a mechanistic determinist. In the 1911 text, Jennie's romantic tendencies are muted considerably. As a result, she loses her place as the central character of the novel. In the Pennsylvania edition, Jennie and Lester's relationship is complex and dynamic. In the 1911 edition, cuts made to their relationship make it stereotypically sentimental.

The Harper editors also destroyed the sharp distinctions between the Gerhardt family and the Kane family. In the Pennsylvania edition, the Gerhardt's actions are consistent with their ethnic background and their poverty-stricken existence. Cuts made by the Harper editors, however, obscure their ethnicity and the extent of their poverty.
Mrs. Gerhardt becomes an accomplice in Jennie's downfall and Mr. Gerhardt becomes a religious fanatic. The Kanes were also rewritten. In the Pennsylvania edition, they are so obsessed with wealth, power, and place that they ignore, even exploit, any one who stands in their way. Together with Letty Gerald, they represent all that Dreiser saw wrong with capitalism. In the Harper text, the Kanes' wealth and their obsession with power are toned down considerably. As a result, the Gerhardts become less sympathetic and the Kanes more sympathetic.
In his poem "Theodore Dreiser," Edgar Lee Masters compares Dreiser to a jack-o-lantern because his mouth droops and his eyes are "fixed" and "scarcely sparkling." Underneath his unassuming facade, however, was a mind that could understand deeply and see clearly, a mind that contemplated life as it was and wrote stories so profoundly true that it was as if the reader were sitting "before the sphinx" (37). Although there have always been those like Masters who have appreciated Dreiser's genius, his recognition by the literary community has not always been solid. He enjoyed tremendous success with *Sister Carrie* and *American Tragedy*, but he had dropped into relative obscurity by his death in 1945. In the last thirty years, however, scholars have reexamined his work, acknowledged his literary accomplishments, and have assured his place in the pantheon of great American writers. Dreiser presents his characters' lives so vividly that it becomes impossible not to be moved by them. In much of his fiction, his characters are so overwhelmed by material forces that they end up miserable or dead, and through them we come to understand the terrible loneliness inherent in the human condition: "Every line hurts," states Alfred Kazin, "It hurts because it is all too much like reality to be 'art'" (5).

Critics, however, have generally considered *Jennie Gerhardt* to be his least satisfactory work. The probable reason for this assessment is that the original manuscript, begun by Dreiser in 1901, was heavily edited by Harper and Brothers to make it more palatable to its readers. The novel Harper published in 1911 was substantially different from Dreiser's original version. The characters became stereotypical, flat, and static, and the story predictable, sentimental, and morally
conventional. The result is that critics have seen Jennie Gerhardt as a strange anomaly in the Dreiser canon. The 1992 edition of the novel, however, edited by James L. West III and published by the University of Pennsylvania Press, restores Dreiser's manuscript essentially unchanged. The restored novel compares quite favorably with Sister Carrie (1900) and An American Tragedy (1925). It also proves to be quite unlike any other Dreiser novel because it has strong romantic as well as realistic elements. In the end we are not left hurting, as much as we are left pondering the capacity of goodness and love to exist in even the most tragic circumstances.

Dreiser's status as a writer has been erratic at best. From the republication of Sister Carrie in May of 1907 until the late 1930s, his work was heavily discussed, even though critical opinions of his work differed considerably. When An American Tragedy was published, "[f]ifty thousand people bought copies in the first few years, many more read the book, and still more read of attempts in Boston to have the book banned" (Gogol Beyond vii). During these early years, many believed that Dreiser's bold thematic concerns would set the pace for the future of American novels, but others argued that his choppy and verbose rhetorical style would keep him from ever being considered a great novelist (Pizer, Dowell, Rusch 92). For instance, John W. Crawford writes in his review of An American Tragedy that although Dreiser can be recognized as a "pioneer" in the field of realism, "he writes as badly as ever . . . . There are the same slipshod sentences, the bulky paragraphs, the all but unleavened chapters" (454). Stuart Sherman adds: "I will not quarrel with any one who contends that 'An American Tragedy' is the worst written great novel in the world" (440).
The controversy over Dreiser's place in the American literary canon continued into the 1940s, when the topic of critical conversation turned from Dreiser's style and subject matter to his personal politics. His blatant association with the communist party during the 30s and 40s labeled his work as anti-American. During this period of nationalistic fury, Dreiser's work could not be made to fit into the paradigm prescribed by nationalist patterns. Because his fiction did not seem to represent accepted American ideals and values, it was seen as inferior and not worthy of reading. H.L. Mencken wrote that what offended the critics of this later generation most was "not actually Dreiser's shortcomings as an artist, but Dreiser's shortcomings as a Christian and an American" ("Bugaboo" 86). Probably the most damaging criticism of Dreiser's work during this period, however, was Lionel Trilling's influential essay, "Reality in America," first published in The Partisan Review in 1940 and later republished in his book The Liberal Imagination (1950). Trilling accuses Dreiser of being "awkward and dull," and states that unlike Thoreau and Emerson, whose works are "specifically American," Dreiser "lacks [a] sense of colloquial diction" (16). He wonders "how [Dreiser's] moral preoccupations are going to be useful in confronting the disasters that threaten us" (12), and criticizes him for "thinking" amorally:

He thinks . . . [that] religion and morality are nonsense, 'religionists' and moralists are fakes, [and that] tradition is a fraud . . . Dreiser's religious avowal is not a failure of nerve--it is a failure of mind and heart. We have only to set his book beside any work in which mind and heart are made to serve religion to know this at once. (17, 20)

Compounding the problem that Dreiser's work did not fit nationalistic critical attitudes, the emphasis on scientific or philological methodology promoted during the 1940s and 50s as a way of legitimizing the study of American literature in the universities also
made it difficult for Dreiser's work, with its stark realism and prosaic verbosity, to be accepted as worthy of study (Pizer, Dowell, Rusch 92). As a result, Dreiser's novels were not only attacked for their inappropriate political and social views, but also for their complete disregard of "form and structure" (92). In 1951, Saul Bellow wrote that "Dreiser is not very popular now, unfortunately . . ." (147). In 1954, John Berryman added that although Dreiser had been one of the pivotal figures in American literature "his immense frame [has] so deteriorated, especially after his death in 1945, that when a detailed biography was produced by Robert Elias in 1949, an influential book reporter could question whether Dreiser was a subject of general interest to the public at all" (149). The cold critical reception Dreiser received during these two generations did not subside until the mid 1960s, when Dreiser's fiction finally could be seen with more clarity as literary works: "No longer was it necessary to defend or attack [Dreiser's] subjects or ideas because of their challenge to contemporary convention" (Pizer, Dowel, and Rusch 93).

An explosion of interest in Dreiser's work occurred in the 1960s. MLA cites over 700 articles, books, and dissertations published on Dreiser since then, over half of them published between 1980 and 1999. These studies are varied in their scope and application, but the majority are still concerned with the way in which his work deals with the question of naturalism in American life. Miriam Gogol states that "much of the significant writing about him since the mid 1960s has focused on the issue of whether he is a naturalist, which suggests that this controversy has become one of the permanent
centers of Dreiserian criticism" (ix). These essays differ from their predecessors, though, in that they use Dreiser's fiction as a way to better understand how the definition of naturalism has shifted over the years. Pizer, Dowell, and Rusch explain:

In short, though such critics as Donald Pizer (1984), John Condor (1984), June Howard (1985), Walter Benn Michaels (1987), and Lee Clark Mitchell (1989) still engage the problem of defining American literary naturalism and explaining Dreiser as one of our principle naturalists, they incline towards an acceptance of the complexities and ambivalence both of the movement and of Dreiser. (93)

This interest in Dreiser's work as a reflection of the shifting nature of naturalism is the subject of two of the most recently published books on Dreiser: Miriam Gogol's edition of collected essays, *Theodore Dreiser: Beyond Naturalism* (1995), and Irene Gammel's *Sexualizing Power: Theodore Dreiser and Frederick Philip Grove* (1994). Also during the past three decades, Dreiser scholars have begun the process of reexamining claims that his prose is heavy-handed and awkward, that "his style [is] atrocious, his sentences . . . chaotic, his grammar and syntax faulty" (Whipple 96). Recently, scholars have actually found the opposite to be true. They argue that Dreiser's prose is, in fact, a delicate blend of "subtlety" and "finesse" (Pizer, Dowell, Rusch 93). Most important in current Dreiser studies, however, is the way in which scholars have been able to reclaim his work as a truthful mirror of American life, both now and in the past. Gogol says that Dreiser, unlike Henry James, was willing to "get his hands dirty." Dreiser

---

1 Pizer, Dowell, and Rusch make a similar statement: "Other issues of long-standing controversy in the discussion of Dreiser's work continued to attract much attention, which suggests that they have become the permanent center of Dreiser criticism. One of these is naturalism . . ." *Theodore Dreiser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1991) 93.
"shows us the external forces that shape his characters' lives and [therefore] provides some of the first authentic portrayals of working-class people" (*Beyond* viii). Dreiser's work is, Gogol states, "a repository for the era's literary and cultural developments" (x).

In addition to the emphasis on Dreiser's naturalism, his rhetorical style, his depiction of American life, and his biography, other critical issues have emerged. During the 1980s, for instance, there was an effort to place Dreiser within the scope of Marxist and new historical notions of "capitalist values" (Pizer, Dowell, Rusch 93), and, even though Gogol asserts that not enough women have written on Dreiser or about Dreiser's women, a "handful of women scholars" have sparked an interesting discussion on Dreiser's treatment of women. (xi). Also of interest are essays dealing with Dreiser's attitude towards issues of ethnicity, such as Arthur D. Casciato's essay "How German is Jennie Gerhardt."

The emphasis in critical studies has always centered on *Sister Carrie* and *An American Tragedy*, but recently an increasing amount of work has been published on Dreiser's minor novels, such as *Jennie Gerhardt* and *The Bulwark*. Also, collections and editions of Dreiser's unpublished works have emerged, such as, for instance, James West III's *An Amateur Laborer*, published in 1983 and Yoshinobu Hakutani's *Selected Magazine Articles of Theodore Dreiser* published in 1985. This new era of Dreiser

---

2 For instance, Miriam Gogol states that although most of the essays in her collection deal with *Sister Carrie* and *An American Tragedy*, it is only because they are his most "popular works": "It seems appropriate," she writes, "that essays in this volume, which introduce Dreiser in new ways, focus on books that readers know and feel they are comfortable with." *Theodore Dreiser: Beyond Naturalism*. (New York: NYUP, 1995) xi.
studies was aided and enhanced by the massive collection of letters, diaries, and manuscripts donated to the University of Pennsylvania by the Dreiser estate in the early 1960s (Pizer, Dowell, Rusch 92). This material has provided scholars with the much needed biographical information necessary to place Dreiser and his work within a larger context. Many seminal biographies made use of this material, including what is considered to be the most important, Richard Lingeman's *Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates of the City, 1871-1907* and *Theodore Dreiser: An American Journey 1908-1945*. Additionally, memoirs and correspondences written and/or collated by personal friends and lovers provide more intimate detail for Dreiser scholarship and biography (92-93).

Perhaps the most interesting current debate taking place in Dreiser scholarship is the assessment of West's edition of *Jennie Gerhardt*. First published in 1911 by Harper and Brothers Publisher, *Jennie Gerhardt* is the story of a poor working girl who, in order to keep her family from being destroyed by poverty, lives outside of accepted moral conventions, first by giving birth to an illegitimate child and then by living with a wealthy carriage manufacturer. The novel, however, is not sentimental but a realistic portrayal of a society at the turn of the century that refuses to acknowledge the intricate complexities of the human condition. Although both Dreiser and H.L. Mencken thought *Jennie Gerhardt* to be better than *Sister Carrie*, critics were divided as to the novel's literary value. In turn, the public was hesitant to invest time and money in a novel that met with such skeptical reviews. Overall sales were barely mediocre, and by 1912 *Jennie Gerhardt* had disappeared from public view. Even with the enormous success and critical recognition of *An American Tragedy* and, eventually, of *Sister Carrie*, *Jennie Gerhardt* remained largely unrecognized by the critical community.
Only in the last ten years have critics begun to reconsider its place in the Dreiser
canon. Although the critical material on Jennie Gerhardt is minuscule in comparison to
material on his other novels, the interest has sparked a new discussion among Dreiser
scholars. The novel's renaissance can be attributed in part to the 1992 publication of the
Pennsylvania edition of Jennie Gerhardt by West. In this edition, West restored the
thousands of changes made to the text by the editors at Harper & Brothers prior to its
publication in 1911. The restored version has raised questions about how much the
extensive cuts and emendations changed the novel from Dreiser's original intention.

The debate sparked by the publication of the Pennsylvania edition has become
intense. Proponents of the restored text contend that the editorial changes so altered the
novel as to seriously undermine its artistic merit. West, for instance, argues that what
emerged for publication in 1911 "was a considerably different work of art--changed in
style, characterization, and theme" ("Historical" 442). Dreiser biographer Richard
Lingeman, in his essay "The Biographical Significance of Jennie Gerhardt," adds that
senior Harper editor "[Ripley] Hitchcock and his subeditors tarted up Dreiser's plain
style with rewriting that made it closer to what was popular fiction" (13). In his
discussion on textual editing, Philip Cohen argues that although West does not go far
enough in his textual reconstruction of Jennie Gerhardt, "[t]wo editions are better than
one" (736). Cohen agrees with West's contention that the editorial cuts and emendations
transform the novel from a "blunt, carefully documented piece of social analysis to a
love story merely set against a social background" ("Historical" 442), and adds that a

3 MLA cites thirty-five articles on Jennie Gerhardt since 1960.
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careful examination of these changes could be instrumental in demonstrating how "a commercial editorial process reinforced a masculine perspective" (Cohen 735).

Supporters of the restored text, such as West, contend that Harper's bowdlerization of the novel may explain why it has never measured up critically to such Dreiser classics as *Sister Carrie* and *An American Tragedy* (Restored ix). In his essay on the restored *Jennie Gerhardt*, Robert Elias states:

> Like *Sister Carrie* the story contrasts material success and failure, and also like *Sister Carrie* it suggests that there is something elusive beyond material success that the sensitive individual experiences and that no one can definitely verbalize. But where *Sister Carrie* concludes by leaving readers sensing they have followed the account of two ultimately diverging careers, *Jennie Gerhardt* portrays connections. (3-4)

Such arguments are supported by comments on the original manuscript that were made before or during Harper's revision and publication of the novel. For instance, when Dreiser asked Lillian Rosenthal to comment on the original manuscript, she writes in her letter dated January 25, 1911, that

> There is a simplicity of action and expression which is distinctive. It is aesthetic and convincing, and one is constrained to recognize the truth about life. A book of this kind may well stand comparison with the best works on psychology. It is worthy of applause which you may well claim for its versatile realism. (Van Pelt)

An unsigned letter to Dreiser dated March 23, 1911 reads, "I should infer from these letters that 'Jennie' is better in technique than 'Sister Carrie' . . . I always regretted there wasn't more of that bit of realism in 'Sister Carrie'" (Van Pelt). James Huneker, too, writes to Dreiser on June 4, 1911: "I'm not yet certain whether I like it better than Sister

---

All passages that are cited "Van Pelt" are taken from documents held in the Dreiser Collection of the University of Pennsylvania Van Pelt Library.
Came, but it doesn't matter - it's different . . ." (Van Pelt). After he read Dreiser's manuscript, H.L. Mencken wrote to Dreiser: "I needn't say that it seems to me an advance above 'Sister Carrie'. Its obvious superiority lies in its better form" (Dreiser-Mencken 68).

The critical opinion that the restored, Pennsylvania edition is a better text than the 1911 edition, however, is not unanimous among Dreiser scholars. Stephen Brennan argues that the 1911 "Jennie Gerhardt is preferable because it is a historical artifact that not only reflects the conditions of its production but also has served generations of scholars as object of study" (37). Brennan takes issue with the textual method West used to restore the novel to its original state. He argues that because West preserves some of the original Harper editorial changes and introduces a few of his own, the novel cannot be considered a pure restored text. Issues of textual scholarship, however, are tricky and complex, and to date, textual scholars have achieved no consensus as to the best method of textual restoration. They do agree, however, that textual restoration is not simply a matter of tossing aside all editorial changes because they are not the author's. Instead, the textual critic must examine each change within the context of the work's artistic integrity to establish a text that reflects the author's vision in its best light. The argument becomes even more heated when the word "intention" is used to explain or validate the restoration process. The method of restoration that West used is commonly referred to in critical circles as the "intentionalist" theory and method, though "intentionalist" does not mean that the critic presumes to know more about the work than the author himself.

Proponents of the intentionalist method of textual restoration contend that formal intention can be determined through the words of the text, and that a stable text
can be formed around this intention. In restoring *Jennie Gerhardt*, West followed
guidelines set out by W.W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and G. Thomas Tanselle, all of
whom are pioneers in the study of textual editing. These scholars were instrumental in
setting the foundation for intentionalist theory and in bringing about significant
recognition to the field of textual studies. The guidelines set out by Greg, Bowers, and
Tanselle have been adopted by the Center for Editions of American Authors (CEAA),
and have been followed by all critical editions endorsed and financially supported by
the CEAA (Tanselle 26). West, however, does not note in the Pennsylvania edition of
*Jennie Gerhardt* whether the text is endorsed by the CEAA.

The intentionalist method is best explained by a brief overview of Greg, Bowers,
and Tanselle’s influential work. W.W. Greg’s 1948 essay, "The Rational of Copy Text,"
has been, by far, the most important in establishing a ground for intentionalist studies.
The purpose of Greg’s essay was to dismantle the popular idea that the most
authoritative text is always the last edition published during an author’s life, an
"assumption" that "rested on an undocumented (and often undocumentable) theory that
it was the normal practice for authors personally to see all editions of their work through
the press" (Greetham 333). To insist on such rigidity in editorial theory is a mistake,
states Greg, because "authority is never absolute . . . only relative" (Greg 41). Instead,
Greg suggests a method of dual-authority, wherein the first edition, if available, is used
as a starting point. Because "spelling is now recognized as an essential characteristic of
an author," he explains, the first edition should be the most authoritative text for
establishing accidentals (43). In determining substantive readings, however, the textual
scholar should use his/her critical skills because "the choice between substantive
readings belongs to the general theory of textual criticism and lies altogether beyond the narrow principle of the copy-text" (48). The result is the formation of an eclectic but stable text:

The copy-text is therefore converted into a critical text by means of a technique of controlled eclecticism whereby the editor, in the light of all the evidence, emends the copy-text by substituting or by supplying new ones himself; he does this where he believes that the alterations represent the author's intended text more closely than the copy-text readings . . . .

(Gaskell 5)

Fredson Bowers' theoretical works amplify Greg's theory and clarify his ideas concerning the use of the first edition as copy-text. Bowers asserts that the purpose of Greg's theory is not to exclude earlier authorial manuscripts for use as copy-text, but to keep scholars from assuming that a later edition is more authorial than an earlier edition. Bowers, like Greg, argues that the copy-text should be that which most closely reproduces the author's original words, usually one that is "set directly from manuscript, or a later edition that contains corrections or revisions that proceeded from the author" (195). Also, like Greg, he states that once the copy-text is established, the textual scholar should differentiate between accidentals and substantives, constructing "[a]n eclectic text . . . which combines the superior authority of most of the words of the revised edition with the superior authority of the forms of words of the first edition" (195). G. Thomas Tanselle, a later proponent of Greg and Bowers, explains:

It follows that the editor who chooses the edition closest to the author's manuscript as his copy-text when he does not have strong reason for choosing a later one, and who follows the reading of that copy-text when he does not have strong reason to believe them erroneous or to believe that a later variant in wording (or, more rarely, in punctuation or spelling) is the author's—that such an editor is maximizing his chances of incorporating the author's intended reading in his text. (14)
In preparing the Pennsylvania edition of *Jennie Gerhardt*, West had three original copies of the text to choose from for use as copy-text. The first is the ur-manuscript, which is the novel in its earliest, unfinished form, having "only a distant verbal relation to the composite manuscript of 1910-11" ("Historical" 486). The second is what is commonly referred to as the "Fair Copy" document. This is the completed text Dreiser sent to the typist to produce the manuscript eventually sent to Harper for publication. West explains that "in its early chapters it incorporates parts of the ur-manuscript and the typescripts of 1901-2; the bulk of its text, however, is inscribed in black-ink holograph" (486). The third text is the Barrett typescript, a carbon-copy of the manuscript sent to Harper for publication (486-487). Although any one of these documents could have served as copy-text, West chose the Barrett typescript document because it best reflects the author's language before the intrusion of outside editorial forces. West then compared the copy-text to the first edition published by Harper in 1911, and found that at some time during the publication process 16,000 words were cut, thousands more than he had seen cut when he edited Dreiser's earlier novel, *Sister Carrie*, first published by Doubleday in 1900. Unfortunately, we do not know who made these changes because the plates and proofs are no longer extant. We can decipher from letters and other outside documents, however, that Dreiser was not happy with these changes and wanted a great deal of material put back into the novel: "TD protested

---

5 This document is called the Barrett Typescript because it is kept in the Barrett collection at the Alderman Library, University of Virginia.

---
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vigorously, Harpers restored some of the text, but not all of it (the 16,000 missing, about which we can be precise)," states West (email). 6

West's method in establishing the ideal text was to examine the changes made to the copy text in the context of what he believed was Dreiser's "active" intention. In discussing the composition of the restored text, West relies on the sense "intention" as first defined by Tanselle. West states that "active intention is the author's intention to be seen or understood as acting in a particular way" ("Historical" 487). It is different from programmatic intention, which is the author's "general plan" to "create something" and final intention, which is the author's "intention to make something happen" (487). For the textual scholar, active intention is most important, because, as Tanselle explains, it "'concerns the meanings embodied in the work'" (487). For West,

The aim of this edition is . . . to recapture, as nearly as possible, Dreiser's own active intentions as they existed in the spring of 1911 when he submitted Jennie Gerhardt, through his agent, to Harper and Brothers. Such intentions are seen as extending horizontally throughout the compositional process and achieving a kind of systematic wholeness. (486)

In this sense, West did not feel it imperative to restore all of Dreiser's original language, only that which constitutes Dreiser's active intention. Nevertheless, a comparison of the Barrett typescript and the Pennsylvania edition shows that West remains loyal to virtually all of Dreiser's original language, making very few changes of his own and incorporating only those Harper editorial changes that are clearly in the best interest of the novel's artistic integrity. West included some Harper changes in the recognition that

6 This issue will be more fully discussed in chapter two.
"authors can delegate intention to editors or amanuenses, and these persons can act in
the author's stead, correcting errors and repairing verbal confusions in ways that are
satisfactory and beneficial to the author" (487).

West's Pennsylvania edition of Jennie Gerhardt, is as Brennan says, an eclectic
text. This does not mean, however, that it cannot represent Dreiser's active intention for
the novel, West says: "The history of Jennie Gerhardt is so complicated that
definitiveness is not possible," and therefore, an eclectic text is the only possible
solution:

[Jennie Gerhardt] presents a critical, eclectic text constructed from
several documents; it does not reproduce the text of a single historical
document. The edition aims to present, however imperfectly, an ideal
text . . . to make a responsible attempt to reclaim a text that fulfills the
author's final artistic intentions . . . (485)

Now that the restored text has been published, it is the critical community's task
to determine its place within the Dreiser canon. The question before us is whether or not
it should replace the 1911 edition as the "object of study" for Dreiser scholars. We must
evaluate its artistic merit in comparison with Harper's 1911 edition and with Dreiser's
other novels. Scholars, even skeptics, must acknowledge that the Pennsylvania edition
especially restores the text that "Dreiser brought to a point of stasis in the spring of
1911" and that "so deeply impressed H.L. Mencken" (495).

A primary object of this study, then, is to establish the argument on firm ground
by determining how the thousands of changes the Harper editors made to Dreiser's
original manuscript affected the thematic concerns of the novel. West himself admits
that a "[c]omparison of the 1911 text with the restored version of 1992 is a useful (even
essential) exercise, [which will] reveal much about the climate in which Jennie
Gerhardt was originally published" (Restored ix). My task has been to examine the restored words in the Pennsylvania text and consider whether they produce a better work of art than the 1911 edition. My conclusion is that the Pennsylvania edition reveals Dreiser's formal intention more fully, as, for instance, in its realistic portrayal of an immigrant family; in its more complete placement of the mother at the center of the family; in its greater emphasis on the greed and selfishness of capitalism, as evident especially in the Kane families; and in the tensions it more fully articulates between the aspects of experience more adequately expressed by the conventions of literary realism and those better expressed by the conventions of the romance. This formal intention can be apprehended by closely studying, in part, the world of Dreiser's manuscript as compared to the world of the 1911 Harper edition. As Robert Penn Warren explains,

The world that an author accepts is more than material, it is the great overarching and undergirding image of the author's deepest concerns; and all his particular fictions merely develop what is implicit in that germ image. The world thus rendered—that is, the material of a novel—cannot, in the end, be distinguished, except by an act of abstraction, from the quality of the rendering. It is only by some deep coherence of the 'rendered' and the 'rendering' that a novel achieves the total, inner vibrance that guarantees permanence. (35-36)

This "inner vibrance" of Dreiser's manuscript was lost, I believe, during the editorial process, which may explain why the novel never received the "permanence" of some of Dreiser's more popular novels.

Formal intention of Jennie Gerhardt can be found only in its words. W.K. Wimsatt says that words are an author's means of conveying meaning. Concerning the difference between public and private rhetoric, Wimsatt states in the introduction to The Verbal Icon that "the judgment of poems is different from the art of producing them"
(9), and that once a work leaves the hands of the author it becomes a public document. Criticism of this document should center on "whether the work of 'art' ought ever to have been undertaken at all,' and if so 'whether it is worth preserving'" (5-6). By critically studying the Pennsylvania edition, we can conclude that Dreiser's original language, the "public evidence," reveals a Jennie Gerhardt definitely worth undertaking and worth preserving. It is a more richly textured, clearer, and more meaningful work of art than that published in 1911. Because West's critical edition essentially restores the Barrett typescript, it is the best edition for readers and more rewarding to critical attention. More than the Harper edition, it offers a rich, profound literary experience.

West himself has begun the critical dialogue with the publication of Jennie Gerhardt: Essays on the Restored Text. Although the essays are useful in their "interchange of ideas, information, and interpretations" concerning the novel, only one of the nineteen essays in the book specifically examines exactly how changes made to the original text affect certain thematic concerns (West Restored ix). Stephen Brennan notes the absence of editorial criticism in his review of the collection, stating that "[s]urprisingly, the collection neither directly defends the Pennsylvania edition nor directly attacks the 1911 edition" (36). He adds that West's contention that the restored version represents the "dialectical novel" is a generalization that is "repeat[ed] by [a]t least five other contributors . . . [who] offer little or no textual evidence" (37).

To date, only three essays specifically examine how textual editing affected the larger thematic concerns of the novel. The first is West's "Historical Commentary" published as a part of the critical edition of Jennie Gerhardt, which examines the effect of more obvious editorial cuts and emendations on the text. Specifically, West points
out, the editors cut all profanity and all references to sex, alcohol, and "organized religion." These cuts, he says, were "an intentional effort by Harper to 'socialize' or 'domesticate' Dreiser's novel for public consumption" (442-444). According to West, the most glaring problem is in the revised characterization of Jennie, who loses her place as the central character. As a result, "Lester and his point of view come to dominate the novel" (446). West's commentary is rather sweeping, and his intent was not to definitively describe how all the editorial changes affected the novel but to give the reader an idea of how the large scale changes altered Dreiser's manuscript.

The second essay is Nancy Warner Barrineau's "Recontextualizing Dreiser: Gender, Class, and Sexuality in Jennie Gerhardt." In this essay, Barrineau considers specifically the editorial changes made to scenes dealing with sex. Barrineau's careful historical research on censorship, birth control, and attitudes towards sex at the turn of the century provides an apt framework to demonstrate that in the original manuscript Dreiser included material that "push[ed]... the boundaries of censorship" (67). The editors' deletion of key passages on sex and birth control removes Jennie from the actual condition of the working class environment in which Dreiser placed her. Barrineau concludes that "reestablishing the complex and vital historical context out of which Dreiser wrote Jennie Gerhardt can help readers grasp just how realistic and radical this novel really is" (73). In the third essay, "Triangulating Desire in Jennie Gerhardt," Susan Albertine examines how editorial cuts alter Dreiser's characterization of women characters and the relations between them. Albertine argues that in the original manuscript Dreiser "uses relations between women to confer power on a man" (65). In the Harper edition, "key phrases indicating Jennie's womanly power and her closeness
to her mother are dropped from the narrative," and these deletions obscure Dreiser's point entirely (66). In the latter half of the novel, she states, Dreiser develops a mutual "thoughtfulness" between Letty Pace and Jennie, and he "evidently intended that Letty's and Jennie's self-awareness and mutuality should not create antagonisms" (68). These careful studies have begun the process of demonstrating that Jennie Gerhardt, if restored to its original form, can stand alongside such great works as Sister Carrie.

Dreiser is known best as a writer of naturalistic fiction. As Judith Kucharski notes, it is within this context that his works are usually placed: "critics have centered their attention on the stark, unemotional, naturalistic aspects of Dreiser's work . . . his novels continue to be read as exemplifying naturalistic principles" (17). To more fully appreciate the import of Dreiser's work as a reflection of the human condition, however, we must now go "beyond naturalism," as Miriam Gogol states, and begin "treat[ing] his work as a whole" (ix). The restored version of Jennie Gerhardt, though reflecting some naturalistic tendencies, goes beyond naturalism, employing romance elements to represent a fuller, subtler range of human emotions and experiences: "Those in search of hopelessness are likely to miss the underlying subtleties and beauties, the knot of interests and emotions that [Dreiser] so brilliantly and painstakingly analyzes in [the restored] Jennie Gerhardt," states Valerie Ross (39). Also, "[The restored] Jennie Gerhardt departs from the constraining tenets of naturalism and represents aspects of Dreiser's thinking that are at odds with the reductive definitions that do not so much define as essentialize both Dreiser and his second novel" (Kucharski 18). John B. Humma adds, "[O]ne might call [the restored] Jennie Gerhardt somewhat oxymoronically, a naturalistic-pastoral novel" (165).
Those who read Dreiser's manuscript before it went to Harper's also attest to the novel's force and range before editing. In a letter dated June 4, 1911, James Huneker found the original manuscript's lack of social or political agenda the most interesting part of the novel: "What made me happy while reading it was that it attempted to prove nothing; didn't advocate socialism, or Christian Science, or any of the new thought breakfast foods. A moving, vivid picture of life, nothing else" (Van Pelt). Lillian Rosenthal writes similarly of the original text in a letter dated January 25, 1911: "It is aesthetic and convincing, and one is constrained to recognize the truth about life" (Van Pelt).

The restored Jennie Gerhardt presents the reader with a wider picture of American life than any other Dreiser novel. Unlike the characters in An American Tragedy or Sister Carrie, whose actions are solely defined by external forces, the characters in Jennie Gerhardt respond to a variety of internal and external stimuli. These different responses, are, in turn, blended with each character's specific ethnic, financial, social, and cultural background. In the original text, for instance, Lester Kane is sensitive and perceptive, but his upper-class rearing also makes him a cynical, deterministic snob. Although attracted to Jennie's innate spirituality, he eventually abandons her for a life of wealth and prestige. His father and brother, Archibald and Robert, are also accustomed to great wealth and prestige, and their actions are motivated by their desire to increase their already enormous profit and power. In contrast, Jennie Gerhardt is a romantic mystic who, although tossed and turned by a succession of different circumstances beyond her ability to control, always remains loving towards everyone, even those who abuse her. In the end, although her lover has left her and
members of her family have either died or deserted her, she maintains her integrity and openness to others. Unlike others in the novel, she does not disintegrate under the pressures of her desperate and sometimes even tragic existence. In the excised coda, Dreiser writes:

Only this daughter of the poor felt something—the beauty of the trees, the wonder of the rains, the color of existence. Marveling at these, feeling the call of the artistry of spirit, how could it be that she should hurry—that she seek? Was it not all with her from the beginning? . . . . Jennie loved and, loving, gave. Is there a superior wisdom? (coda P574-575)

Jennie's parents, too, react to their environment in a way that it consistent with their specifically ethnic background. These different responses keep Dreiser's novel from being restricted to one predetermined perspective, which in turn makes it an apt representation for the form of the novel itself:

If the novel were realistic merely because it saw life from the seamy side, it would only be an inverted romance; but in fact it surely attempts to portray all the varieties of human experience, and not merely those suited to one particular literary perspective: the novel's realism does not reside in the kind of life it presents, but in the way it presents it. (Watt 11)

Past criticism of Jennie Gerhardt, however, has seen these various responses to life as "curious diversions within an otherwise overarching [naturalistic] scheme" (Kucharski 17). Past criticism, though, has largely been based on the 1911 text, which is substantially different from the restored Pennsylvania edition. Editors of Dreiser's original manuscript cut and emended a large amount of material that had placed each character within his/her specifically cultural, financial, and social context. Once this material was removed, their response to external stimuli becomes stereotypical, flat, and at times completely unmotivated. Jennie, who is able to find beauty in even the most tragic of circumstances, becomes, in the 1911 text, little more than a woman who,
seeking a better life, makes bad decisions and ends up tragically alone. Lester rightfully leaves her for a better woman, and although he and Jennie are momentarily reunited in the end, Jennie is left unfulfilled, looking only to "an endless reiteration of days" (P418; H822). In the 1911 edition, the wealthy, as represented by the Kanes and Letty Gerald, are less selfish and less egocentric. They are even less wealthy. The poor, on the other hand, as represented by the Gerhardts, are less familial, less moral, and even less poverty-stricken. Once the gap between the classes is closed, as it is in the 1911 edition, the Kanes become more sympathetic and the Gerhardts less sympathetic. In the 1911 edition, then, the novel becomes not a realistic portrait of the human condition but a portrait of what was acceptable to a certain readership.

As a novelist, however, Dreiser was not interested in traditional forms; rather, he was interested in portraying the human condition as it was, and for him this included the world's beauty as well as its ugliness. Dreiser's earliest philosophical leanings show him to be continuously contemplating the tension between the beauty and peace inherent in a larger natural order and the ugliness and decay that accompany the circumstances of man's existence. He reflects in Dawn, "I have . . . thought that for all my modest repute as a realist, I seem, to my self-analyzing eyes, somewhat more of a romanticist than a realist" (198). Although it is well documented that Dreiser saw the world as a place where the harsh nature of chance and circumstance make it difficult for the weak to survive, he was also moved by a spiritual force that he believed formed and guided all life forms. Dreiser believed that there is perfection and beauty in this world, and that this perfection and beauty is an expression of a creator. According to Dreiser, man's spiritual sense comes not from organized religion but from his willingness to allow a
force manifest in a larger order, which is good, merciful, and sacrificial, to guide and
teach him how to live: "For design, however one may feel concerning some of it,"
writes Dreiser, "is the great treasure that nature or the Creative Force has to offer man
and through which it seems to emphasize its own genius and to offer the knowledge of
the same to man" (Notes 332). If man desires to achieve the spiritual here on earth, he
must be willing to accept and internalize the most perfect qualities inherent in the
aboriginal creative process. In his autobiography Dawn, Dreiser states that in the larger
natural order the

creative impulse is perfect, its ways ineffable, its spirit song . . . Though
ten thousand plagues beset a fumbling world, this shall answer for its
perfection. 'I shall set my sign in the heavens!' Say rather: 'In the
woodland depths I shall put the song of a bird, and for thee it shall be a
coventant and an agreement between thee and me! Lo, I am music, and
this is my testimony! I am all color, and in it shall you find me! I am all
ancient sorrows, and lo, they are song! I am forgotten joys, and thus, and
thus only, are they remembered! Be thou an ear—mine—and I shall speak
to thee of myself and thee. (58)

In Jennie Gerhardt, Dreiser expresses the tension he himself felt between the
beauty and goodness he saw in a larger order and in some persons, and the desperation,
greed, selfishness, and poverty that people so often confront and embody. In the
restored text, Dreiser's characters are confronted with and respond to these various
forces. Thus, the novel becomes a rich mixture of romanticism, realism, and naturalism.
Kucharski explains that the restored novel is "the fullest expression of an idealism and a
sensitivity to life that are often ignored but that were central to Dreiser's thinking" (24).
We can only see this "fullest expression" in the restored text, because unlike the 1911
edition, it presents Dreiser's intricate portrait of the complexities and ambiguities of
human experience.

23
The Authorial Creation of *Jennie Gerhardt*

A question facing the textual scholar of *Jennie Gerhardt* is why Dreiser allowed the editors at Harper to make so many changes to a manuscript he considered complete. We may assume that Dreiser was forced to accept these changes because he believed that the novel would not be published otherwise, but we must acknowledge that he approved the negotiated edited text even though his contract with Harper stipulated that he could take the manuscript to another publisher if he was unhappy with the result (West "Historical" 435). We must also recognize that the history of the writing and subsequent publication of *Jennie Gerhardt* is complex, and to better understand why Dreiser allowed his text to be edited so heavily, we must examine closely his own personal history as well as the social and moral climate that surrounded the editorial and publication process.

Dreiser began working on *Jennie Gerhardt* immediately after the publication of his first novel, *Sister Carrie*, and his experiences in publishing *Sister Carrie* certainly influenced his decision to allow *Jennie Gerhardt* to be edited so heavily. When he began *Sister Carrie*, Dreiser had spent some ten years as a writer and editor for newspapers and magazines, and he believed that the realistic portrayal of American society was the most important literary concern of his time. In a letter to Walter H. Page, he writes:

I . . . believe that no true picture of life is without its justification in the eyes of the public. I feel and I know that what I have seen and what I have heard of the rudeness and bitterness of life are in the eyes and the ears of all men justifiable—that the world is greedy for details of how men rise and fall. (*Letters* 61-62)
Thus committed to realism, Dreiser began and quickly finished *Sister Carrie* in 1900, and presented it to *McTeague* author Frank Norris. So impressed was Norris with the force of the novel that he immediately recommended it for publication to the newly established Doubleday Page Company, which employed him as a reader: "It gives me pleasure to say . . . that 'Sister Carrie' is the best novel I have read in M.S. since I have been reading for the firm . . ." he wrote to Dreiser (Van Pelt). Doubleday senior partner Walter H. Page was also impressed and immediately accepted *Sister Carrie* for publication: "We are very much pleased with your novel!" he wrote to Dreiser (qtd Riggio *Letters* 50). With *Sister Carrie* accepted for publication, Dreiser believed that his career had taken a definite turn, and he began to envision himself as a force in the literary community. He set about publicizing the novel to friends and colleagues, hopeful that they would spread the word of its publication to potential reviewers. As Lingeman describes, "[Dreiser] was rapidly spinning illusions of literary fame, if not fortune, and planned to make his living as a novelist--'to join the one a year group'" (*Dreiser* 160).

Unfortunately, problems with publication began immediately. Negotiations were handled in the absence of Doubleday senior partner Frank Nelson Doubleday, who did not have a chance to read the work until after a publication contract had been signed. He was appalled at the subject matter, calling the novel "'immoral.'" *Sister Carrie*, he announced, should not be published by "'anybody,'" let alone Doubleday Page (qtd 161). Doubleday's judgement of the novel placed both Dreiser and Doubleday Page in a difficult position. Dreiser believed that if *Sister Carrie* was given a chance, the public would rally behind him: "If the book is worthy," he writes to Page, "it will be honored
with the public's approval and our mutual profit" (Letters 58). Doubleday Page, however, was not convinced, and asked Dreiser to release it from the contract. Dreiser refused, stating that if the novel were not published, "I should be ashamed to face the literary coterie and . . . many others" (Letters 57). In addition, Dreiser believed that his literary career would be severely damaged if the novel were not released as soon as possible: "The orderly development of my literary career depends upon the early publication of Sister Carrie . . ." he wrote to Page (Letters 61).

Doubleday Page, however, would not relent and warned Dreiser that if he did not release the company from its contract, it would suppress the novel upon publication: "[Doubleday Page] would make no effort to sell it as the more it sold the worse he would feel about it" (Lingeman Dreiser 161). Dreiser was encouraged to take the novel elsewhere, but he refused to break the contract: "I venture to move against all your objections," wrote Dreiser to Page, "and to beg you to proceed to the fulfillment of the original plan. I will ask you to publish the volume as quickly as possible . . ." (Letters 62). Doubleday Page did publish the novel after some careful editing, and Sister Carrie was released on schedule in the fall of 1900.¹ It also made good on its threats, however, and refused to publicize the novel, though it did fill contracted book orders to retail stores. Due largely to the enthusiasm of Frank Norris, reviews of the novel appeared,

¹ Principally, the manuscript was purged of profanity and all real names and places were changed to fictitious ones. For a more thorough discussion of the textual editing of Sister Carrie, see Frank Doubleday's letter of September 4, 1900 to Dreiser (Dreiser Collection. University of Pennsylvania, Van Pelt Library). See also, Dreiser's response (undated) in Robert Elias's Letters of Theodore Dreiser Vol 1 (Philadelphia: U of Penn P., 1959). 63-65. Also see Richard Lingeman's Theodore Dreiser: An American Journey (New York John Wiley and Sons, 1993) 164-167.
most of which were positive, but by and large the reading public was not aware even of *Sister Carrie's* existence let alone its possible literary significance. As a result, sales were dismal and Dreiser netted barely sixty-eight dollars in royalties (Lingeman *Dreiser* 165-166). Although Dreiser had succeeded in producing one of the greatest works in literary realism that "this fair land has ever produced," he saw himself as a failure (Mencken *Dreiser-Mencken* 64). He had hoped that the publication of *Sister Carrie* would introduce him into the literary community, and early reviews had suggested that despite the novel's suppression it would be recognized as a great work of art. Dreiser was learning, however, that it was not enough to write a great novel. To achieve success, he had to be sensitive to the desires of a public that had not yet reconciled itself to the realities of its existence. He had this public clearly in mind during the publication of *Jennie Gerhardt*. In a letter written in 1911, he states that "I sometimes think my desire is for expression that is entirely too frank for this time--hence that I must pay the price for being unpalatable" (*Dreiser-Mencken* 65).

Although Dreiser remained committed to the essential realities portrayed in *Sister Carrie*, its critical and commercial failure haunted Dreiser through to the publication of *Jennie Gerhardt*. Thomas P. Riggio explains that the experience "took on excessive symbolic meaning in the young novelist's mind" (*Diaries* 4). Dreiser believed that the failure of the novel branded him a "literary pariah" and that his literary vision would forever remain unacceptable to the reading public (5). In order to be successful, he would either have to find new material to write about or change his material to make it palatable to the reading public.
With this concern in mind, Dreiser began work on Jennie Gerhardt, originally entitled The Transgressor, a novel that he hoped would make up for the financial and literary failure of Sister Carrie and salvage his career. "I can . . . write a [book]," he wrote to Page, "important enough in its nature to make its own conditions and be approved of for itself alone" (Letters 61). His plan for Jennie Gerhardt, then, was much more ambitious than Sister Carrie because now he had to prove to the literary community that he was capable of writing a novel both important and successful.

Dreiser's original plan was to finish the novel within nine months, and he wrote Joseph Taylor in 1901 that he was "straining every nerve--bending every energy to give this new theme its unity, simplicity of progression and force. All my mind is colored by this problem" (Letters 68). He wrote quickly, and in just over four months had finished some forty chapters. He was certain that he could finish the novel within the year, even though he had already found "'an error in character analysis'" that would force him to rewrite "'everything from the fifteenth chapter on'" (West "Historical" 424). Early in 1901, with the novel only half finished, Dreiser sent a copy to editor Rutger P. Jewett, who had been impressed with Sister Carrie and wanted to see his firm, J.F. Taylor and Company, adopt Dreiser as one of its principle authors. After reading the unfinished manuscript, Taylor offered Dreiser a contract. The company would pay Dreiser a monthly advance of $100.00 in order to accommodate a full-time writing schedule that would enable him to finish Jennie Gerhardt. Upon completion not only would they publish it, but also they would reissue Sister Carrie (425). At this point, Dreiser had only completed the first fourteen chapters, but Taylor's financial offer gave him the confidence he needed to finish Jennie Gerhardt. He was to work full time on the novel.
so that it might be published by the fall of 1902 (West "Harper" 425). He sent the
incomplete manuscript to Mary Fanton Roberts, who agreed to edit the manuscript for
him (426). Dreiser asked her to "pull" the finished chapters "together close—everything
can go except the grip" (qtd Lingeman Dreiser 183).

Then occurred what must have seemed to Dreiser a nightmarish repetition of the
Doubleday Page episode. After rereading Sister Carrie, Jewett wrote to Dreiser that he
had made an error in judgment and now felt that before his firm could reissue Sister
Carrie, it would have to be rewritten: not only would the ending need to be recast so
that Carrie would suffer more for her transgressions, but the title would have to be
changed. In the letter to Dreiser dated November 22, 1901, Jewett suggests that Carrie
should "propose marriage" to Drouet, and that "her past would be the reason that he
would not, could not, accept her suggestion. Unfair . . . cruel though it be, it is exactly
the position that 99 men out of every 100 would take" (Van Pelt).² He also proposed
that the company "issue [Dreiser's] second book, and then after that has made a success,
to reissue Sister Carrie." Coming so close on the heels of the Doubleday rejection, this
news stunned Dreiser. He had believed that J.F. Taylor was a more liberal publisher
than Doubleday Page and that because Jewett had praised Sister Carrie, he would want
it reissued unchanged. This double disappointment was the probable cause of the
nervous disorder Dreiser soon developed that forced him to cease work on Jennie
Gerhardt altogether.

² For additional comments on Jewett and Dreiser's relationship and more of Jewett's
comments on the revision of Sister Carrie see Lingeman, Dreiser. 183-184.
Distressed and restless, Dreiser became unable to sleep more than a few hours at night. Exhausted, he would attempt to write but with little success, and eventually he confessed to Jewett that he would not be able to finish Jennie Gerhardt in time for its scheduled publication. During the latter part of 1902, he filled his diary with entries that reveal his growing anxiety over his inability to write. On October 31, 1902, he writes, "Rose at 7 after having lain awake from 3 A.M. on . . . . Began work at 10, but with little enthusiasm. No imaginative ability whatsoever—no interest . . . " (Diaries 58). On November 22, he writes, "Going to work I do not get very far before I question the order and merit of what I am doing and find myself utterly confused as to what is best and interesting" (67). On November 25, "incapacity for working out my novel as great as ever. The mere thought seem [sic] to weaken my reasoning capacity and I at once become confused" (68). Under the care of dermatologist Louis A. Duhring, Dreiser began using prescription drugs such as quinine, panopepton, and hydroscin to help him sleep, and at times, he did find some relief: "I . . . rejoic[ed] in the general feeling of returning health and feeling very sure that one of these days I would be on my feet again, writing articles and finishing my story" (99). His emotional distress, however, was far more complex than either he or Duhring recognized. The insomnia continued, and soon Dreiser stopped working on Jennie Gerhardt altogether. He had already received $700.00 in advances from J.F. Taylor and could find no way of repaying the company back.

In January of 1903, Dreiser's wife Sara left him for an extended visit with her parents, and Dreiser was left to battle his condition alone: "I never felt more wretched in my life. All the horror of being alone and without work, without money and sick swept
over me and I thought I should die," he wrote on February 3, 1903 (94). He was now heavily in debt; he had no income and could see no way of making a living for himself: "I have need of money . . ." he wrote on February 14th, 1903, "and yet I feel as if I cannot write. Lucidity of expression and consecutiveness of ideas is what is bothering me. I cannot write continuously. I lose the thread and forget" (108). Like Hurstwood in *Sister Carrie*, Dreiser tried to live off of the few dollars he had saved, but as this money dwindled, so did his self-esteem. In February 1903, he did not have enough money to last him a week. During this time, Dreiser was developing physical ailments in addition to his psychological problems. He did not have enough money to seek medical care from Duhring, though, so he sought treatment from the free clinic at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, a humiliating experience for him. So destitute was he that he did not have money for the medicine the doctor prescribed.

During this time, however, Dreiser thought often about *Jennie Gerhardt*, and his diary makes clear that much of what he experienced during this time directly affected the thematic concerns of the novel. His poverty and emotional desperation linked him to people, who, like Jennie Gerhardt, could not climb out of their misery despite their greatest efforts: "I walked downtown thinking of the lot of the poor who sometimes under such circumstances have no resource in their own intellect, and speculating on how hard it must be," he wrote on February 10, 1903 (101). In another entry dated February 14, he adds, "Men, working men, a mass of any men desiring something and not being able to get it is always depressing to me" (108). Dreiser understood what it means to have unattainable dreams, to watch others rise while he could not even afford to pay the $2.50 rent on his shabby boardinghouse room. Like Jennie, Dreiser felt that
security and success eluded him and that life was, as he writes in his diary on February
12, 1903, "[t]o be alone, to live alone, to wait, wait, wait, that is the lot accorded us, and
only the dreams are real. The substance of them is never with us—never attainable (106).
This entry is echoed in some of the final lines of Jennie Gerhardt: "Days and days, an
endless reiteration of days, and then—?" (P418).

Dreiser, however, was still committed to Jennie Gerhardt and believed that at
some point he would be able to continue working on it. He submitted the half-finished
manuscript to Joseph Horner Coates of the publishing firm H.T. Coates and Co., who
had become a good friend of Dreiser's, and who, as editor of the magazine Era, had
published several of Dreiser's articles. Coates's reaction to the novel validated Dreiser's
conviction that even though he could not at the moment write, the novel was worthy of
completion and should be placed in the hands of meritorious readers while he was
attempting to recuperate. In a diary entry dated February 10, 1903, Dreiser summarizes
Coates' comments upon reading the unfinished manuscript:

in parts he considered [it] very good. It was mixed, he thought, and
overwrought in parts, but when I told him the whole story, as I had
originally conceived it, he was as moved as everyone else had been and
told me it was fine. I could see by his interruptions though that he was
ev even more wrought up than his words would indicate and when we
parted for the night, it was with the assurance that he would give the mss
some new thought and see if he could not suggest a way of improving it.
'We will hear more of you, yet,' he exclaimed when we parted and I
could not help smiling. (Diaries 101-102)

For more information on Dreiser's relationship with Coates, see Thomas Riggio's
introduction in The American Diaries (Philadelphia: U of Penn P., 1982). Also see his
footnote on page 58 of the same text.
Dreiser had received similar praise from his typist, M.E. Gordinnier, who, after typing twenty thousand words, wrote to Dreiser on January 12, 1902, "Am sorry I did not have the first chapters . . . the story having great interest to me, it being so truly everyday and human. It is surprising to me that a man can so comprehend the minute details of household life as you have" (Van Pelt). Later, however, in a letter dates July 5, 1902, she also complained about the novel's dark moral, suggesting that Jennie should be made to suffer the consequences of her actions. Gordinnier's comments about the novel eerily foreshadow the Harper editors apparent response some seven years later.

Despite the positive remarks on his novel, Dreiser recognized that it still needed extensive revision before it would be ready for a serious publication inquiry. Unfortunately, the spirit that drove him to write forty chapters in less than four months had disappeared, and the frustration of not being able to complete what others thought was a good work weighed heavily on his mind: "I felt as if I could curse heaven and earth for the moment," he wrote just before his Diary breaks off in February, 1903. He would not resume his entries until 1916 (112). The year 1903 would be Dreiser's darkest. According to Dreiser biographer Richard Lingeman, Dreiser spent the year wandering from city to city, and came so close to a mental collapse that at one point he even contemplated suicide (204-208).4 Dreiser later writes of the experience in a letter to H.L. Mencken: "I, myself, have cursed life and gone down to the East River from a

$1.50 room in Brooklyn to a canal dock to quit. My pride and my anger would not let me continue, as I thought" (Dreiser-Mencken 688).

Instead, Dreiser mustered up the courage to visit his sister Mame, an experience that becomes remarkably like a chapter out of Jennie Gerhardt. Mame was living with a wealthy married man named Colonel Silsby, who provided her with the same attention and financial support that Lester supplies Jennie. Despite her socially unacceptable circumstances, she enjoyed a sense of financial security that Dreiser had never known. Mame contacted their brother Paul, a songwriter, who immediately found Dreiser and offered his support: "We've all been that way from time to time" he told Dreiser (Dreiser Amatuer 208). Paul immediately sent Dreiser to a prestigious sanatorium, where he stayed for six weeks. Without the distraction of finances, Dreiser was finally able to heal: "I have fought a battle for the right to live and for the present, musing with stilled nerves and a serene gaze, I seem the victor," he wrote after his release in An Amateur Laborer (qtd Elias 181).

Even then, however, Dreiser did not feel fit enough to resume work on Jennie Gerhardt. Perhaps his recognition of the effect Sister Carrie's failure had on him kept him from purposely placing himself in such a vulnerable position again. Robert Penn Warren explains that in many ways, Dreiser became much like his own Hurstwood, "hagridden with the fear of failure" (28). The whole experience, adds Lingeman "was a watershed in his life. The helplessness and humiliation of his poverty lacerated his soul"

If he finished Jennie Gerhardt and it was published, would it receive the same reaction as Sister Carrie? Would the public refuse to read it because of its moral coloring, and if so, could he deal with a second rejection? Certainly, Dreiser knew that the moral concerns of Sister Carrie had left a bad taste in the mouths of many publishers, and most of them refused to read anything he offered; and although unfinished, Jennie Gerhardt was proving to be even more controversial than Sister Carrie. As early as December 4, 1902, J.F. Taylor had already advised him to change the content of the novel to reflect more traditional morality:

It seems to me that in writing such powerful books as you do, the book should be written with some purpose other than merely giving a picture of life, for the reason that the books are bound to have in time a tremendous influence. This suggested to me the idea of pointing a strong moral in your second book. No matter how you may explain the transgressions of the heroine, the fact remains that the world, as represented by the hero's family, never could be made to tolerate her transgression . . . . (Van Pelt)

After receiving such comments, Dreiser must have wondered how he could get a publisher to accept his work. His response was to shelve the novel until he was more able emotionally to handle the immense critical and moral concerns that it presented.

Dreiser resumed work on the novel in May of 1907. He spent the intervening five years recuperating from his mental breakdown and slowly reestablishing himself in the magazine and newspaper world. But his experiences had changed him tremendously, and though he was still committed to the realistic portrayal of American society, he was no longer naive enough to believe that the publishing industry would welcome such portrayals with open arms. As he wrote to an admirer, Edna Kenton, in May of 1905,

[I] long . . . to do but one thing--write. Maybe--the Gods providing--, when I take up my pen again, the world will be a little bit more kindly
disposed. I am older now, a little bit wiser and not so radical I was going to say, but it wouldn't be true—simply sorrowful and uncertain. (Letters 74)

He began writing freelance articles for small magazines and newspapers, eventually working himself into a full-time position as an assistant features editor for the New York Daily News. Then, he took a position editing Broadway Magazine, and by 1905 he was the editor-in-chief of Butterick Publications (West "Historical" 428). The financial security that came with his position as editor freed Dreiser from the crippling anxiety that kept him from working on any sustained piece of writing.

For some reason, Dreiser did not immediately return to Jennie Gerhardt. Instead, he began a new work entitled An Amateur Laborer, the autobiography of his brief but productive days as a railroad worker following his stay at the sanitorium. At the same time, he began investigating the possibility of having Sister Carrie republished by another firm. If he could find success with Sister Carrie, perhaps the memories attached to its publication could be muted, which would, in turn, make it easier for him to complete Jennie Gerhardt. In addition, if Sister Carrie were republished and successful, the stigma attached to his name in the minds of the publishing community would be removed. Dreiser thus began negotiations with B.W. Dodge and Company, a small, struggling publishing firm, whose owner Ben Dodge was known more for his alcoholic binges than for his ability to recognize great works of literature. Since no one else in the publishing field would take Dreiser on, however, Dodge was his only alternative. A contract was signed and Sister Carrie reissued in May of 1907. This time, however, Dreiser was more active in the publication process and personally directed the marketing efforts. The novel met with generally favorable reviews, and although it did
not sell as well as Dreiser anticipated, he was satisfied with the results (West "Historical" 428).

The success of the reissued novel transcended financial concerns. It alleviated Dreiser's haunting sense that he was fated to be rejected as a novelist. In September of 1907, he wrote to Flora Mai Holly, who was responsible for helping bring *Sister Carrie* to publication, that before she came along, "[the] book, as well as myself, so far as the book was concerned, was in the doldrums." He adds that *Sister Carrie*’s republication, has taken a weight off my mind in one respect. If the book had not been published and been as thoroughly justified as it has been, I should have always been walking around with the thought in my mind that I had received a bad deal from fate. As it stands, that rather discouraging thought is gone, and, naturally, I am in a better mood about things in general. (*Letters* 84)

Immediately, Dreiser returned to work on *Jennie Gerhardt*. He had already done a great deal of rewriting, and he wrote fast and furiously in an attempt to complete the manuscript by the end of the year. He wrote new material while at the same time incorporating scenes from earlier drafts, including the 1901-02 ur-manuscript. The new draft, which he eventually sent to the publishers, was "a blending together of material from several stages of the composition of the novel" (West "Historical" 432). As a professional editor, Dreiser understood that the key to finishing and refining the novel for publication would be to find intelligent and sympathetic readers. He thus began circulating the manuscript to some ten friends and colleagues. Among others, he asked Lillian Rosenthal, the daughter of Dreiser's friends and landlords, Elias and Emma Rosenthal, to critique the manuscript. Riggio describes Lillian as one who "belonged to a breed of women who were leaving behind them the stricter codes that determined how
men and women mingle . . ." and therefore she was a perfect reader for Jennie Gerhardt (Diaries 18). In a letter dated January 25, 1911, Rosenthal praised the novel for its "convincing" and "natural" characters, adding that "a work of this kind is worthwhile and I think establishes a standard for American Fiction" (Van Pelt) She also, however, advised Dreiser to change the ending but with a different objective than Taylor and Jewett. In the original version, Lester marries Jennie, a culmination of events that, she argued, was not realistically possible given Jennie's past and Lester's social and financial status. If Dreiser wanted Jennie's end to be consistent with her past then she must be left wanting. She writes:

But as I think about it, it occurs to me that if Lester had married Letty, the tragedy of Jennie would have been greater. Poignancy is a necessity in this story and it can only be maintained by persistent want on the part of Jennie. The loss of Lester would insure this. (Van Pelt)

Other readers agreed, such as Freemont Rider, to whom Dreiser wrote on January 24, 1911,

I'm so much obliged for your interesting criticism for it is sincere, sound, & helpful. I had already made up my mind to revise the story when I wrote you . . . . I am convinced that one of the reasons of lack of poignancy is the fact that Lester marries Jennie. In the revision I don't intend to let him do it. And I may use your version for the rest. You are a good critic. (Van Pelt)

Dreiser took the advice of these readers and changed the ending to conform to his realistic intention for the novel. In the revised and subsequent published version, Lester never stops loving Jennie, but he leaves her for Letty Gerald, a wealthy woman of his own social rank. The change deepens the tragic nature of Jennie's life, and strengthens the realistic depiction of the social and economic circumstances in which she found herself.
Once he completed the revisions, Dreiser continued to refine the manuscript, "revising for style and clarity by adding words and punctuation . . . adjusting the details of the text to his evaluation" (West "Historical" 433). Dreiser sent the revised manuscript to his most trusted critical advisor and friend, H.L. Mencken, also an editor. Mencken was one of Dreiser's greatest admirers and, like Dreiser, he was opposed to the genteel effort to suppress realism in American art. Mencken believed that Dreiser could be a great force in American literary realism: "I am very eager to see Jennie Gerhardt," he writes, "and shall be glad to go through the ms. and give you my opinion of it . . . I'll make time for it" (Dreiser-Mencken 66). Dreiser sent him the manuscript, telling him: "I know you will give me a sound critical opinion" (67).

Mencken received Dreiser's manuscript on April 19, 1911, read it through that night, and responded to Dreiser in a letter dated April 23. Although he noted some repetition and "random, disordered notes" and was concerned with the implausible way in which Jennie conceals her child from Lester, he considered the story to be better than Sister Carrie. The novel, he said, was powerful enough to elevate Dreiser to the heights of Joseph Conrad and Thomas Hardy:

The reaction of will upon will, of character upon character, is splendidly worked out and indicated . . .; it is a complete whole; consciously or unconsciously . . . It is at once an accurate picture of life and a searching criticism of life. And that is my definition of a good novel . . . . I must go to Hardy and Conrad to find its like . . . . You have written a novel that no other American of the time could have written . . . . As a work of art it is decidedly superior to 'Sister Carrie.' (68-70)

Mencken was especially impressed with Dreiser's realistic portrayal of the immigrant family, stating that William Gerhardt is as "thoroughly alive as Huck Finn" (69).

Mencken felt that the novel's strength was in its "slow unfolding of character," and that
even though it was over 700 pages long, it should be published as is: "If any one urges you to cut down the book, bid that one be damned . . . Let it stand as it is" (69).

Mencken's comments validated Dreiser's conviction that *Jennie Gerhardt* was complete and ready for the reading public: "Yours is the sanest and best analysis I have received yet. It is broader in its understanding than the others," he wrote (*Dreiser-Mencken* 71).

At the same time that Dreiser sent a copy of the manuscript to Mencken he also sent a copy to MacMillan & Company, which promptly rejected it. He then sent it to Ripley Hitchcock at Harper and Brothers (West "Historical" 434). After reading *Sister Carrie*, Hitchcock had shown an interest in Dreiser's work, and had written Dreiser saying that if he could write something "'less drastic,'" he might be interested in publishing it. *Jennie Gerhardt* was no "less drastic" than *Sister Carrie*, but Harper did accept it for publication in April of 1911.

Mencken had already dubbed the book a "best seller" (*Dreiser-Mencken* 71), and had begun a vigorous campaign to publicize it among friends and colleagues before the Harper edition was released. As he wrote to Harry Lee Wilson, "'Keep your eye on [Dreiser]. He has lately finished a new novel, 'Jennie Gerhardt,' in which he tells the story of 'Sister Carrie' again, but with vastly better workmanship. Dreiser and I are old friends, and so he sent me the ms. Believe me the story is an astonishing piece of work . . .'" (qtd 58). Mencken's letters to Dreiser and his reviews of *Jennie Gerhardt* form a touchstone for our discussion, because like the early reviews by Rosenthal and Huneker, they give us a sense of the force and strength of the novel before its editing.

Mencken was anxious to begin running reviews of *Jennie Gerhardt* before it was released to the public, but he wanted to reread the manuscript for accuracy. Dreiser
returned the original manuscript to him, directing him to ignore the cuts and
emendations made to the text because it "was not cut in that fashion" (76). A second
reading only strengthened Mencken's initial response, and he wrote Dreiser saying,
"You have written the best American novel ever done, with the one exception of
'Huckleberry Finn.' It hangs together vastly better than 'McTeague.' It is decidedly on a
higher plane. The very faults of it are virtues . . ." (77). Based on a reading of the
original manuscript, Mencken wrote a review of Jennie Gerhardt for the November
issue of Smart Set, which appeared in mid-October--before the novel was released.
Harper excerpted a portion of the review for the back cover of the printed book, which
delighted Mencken. It is only after the reviews came out that Dreiser sent a copy of the
published work to Mencken, asking him to comment on the effect of the changes on the
novel: "I am sending you an autograph copy of Jennie. Will you do me the favor to read
it again & see whether in your judgement you think it has been hurt or helped by the
editing," he wrote on October 20, 1911 (78). Mencken replied that "[o]n first going
through 'Jennie' in the printed form, the cuts irritated me a good deal, particularly in the
first half, but now I incline to the opinion that not much damage has been done" (81).
Obviously, Mencken was familiar enough with the novel to have recognized the
changes without having been given a copy of the marked-up manuscript, which attests
to the substantial effect these changes had on the original story. In addition, after being
"irritated" by them, he must have realized that there was little he could do, as the novel
was published and his reviews were out. He could not very well rescind his own
reviews, and thus his postscript that "not much damage had been done." In a later letter
to Harry Leon Wilson, however, he writes, "I read the [edited] ms. and it floored me.
What the book will do, God knows. Such ruthless slashing is alarming. The chief virtue of Dreiser is his skill at piling up detail. The story he tells, reduced to a mere story is nothing" (Mencken Letters 18-19).

In total, the editors at Harper cut approximately 25,000 words, of which 9,000 were restored, probably at Dreiser's insistence. Although the Harper proofs and plates no longer exist, the specific word count comes to us through the letter Mencken wrote to Wilson, in which he states that "Harpers cut about 25,000 words out of the ms" (18). West guesses that the only way Mencken would have known that 25,000 words had been cut is if Dreiser had told him. When West compared the 1911 version with the original manuscript, however, only 16,000 words had been cut. Thus, at some point in the editorial or production stage, 9,000 words were put back into the novel. Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing exactly who put the material back into the text or why, as the letters from Dreiser to Hitchcock are no longer extant. Several letters from Hitchcock to Dreiser do remain, however, and in them Hitchcock alludes to Dreiser's dissatisfaction with the amount of material removed from the novel. In one letter, for instance, it is obvious that Dreiser had been excessively verbal about the cuts and emendations made to the novel because Hitchcock writes, "Why should you abuse me I do not quite know; but I take it that the harsh terms you use are really an expression of affection" (qtd West "Historical" 450). Hitchcock adds that "thus far between one-third and one-half of the manuscript has been revised . . . It is certainly being done very carefully and I know very intelligently" (qtd 450). In an another letter dated June 1, 1911, he seems to be assuring Dreiser that he has Dreiser's best interest at heart, and that the cuts and emendations made to the manuscript have not altered the
story to the extent that Dreiser thought it did: "We have worked with the greatest care over the MS. with constant reference to the preservation of the artistic purpose of the whole and to the concentration of the effect. I think that nothing vital has been omitted" (Van Pelt). Most telling, though, is the content of a letter dated July 24, 1911, in which Hitchcock directly addresses Dreiser's concerns over the extensive nature of the cuts. Hitchcock writes,

You will find, I am sure, that your judgement and preferences have received full consideration. I do not think I need speak again of the time and care given to the book. I noted all your comments and I have put back pages and pages of MS. in accordance with your request. (Van Pelt)

As West points out, Hitchcock's comments suggest that Dreiser did not passively accept the enormous amount of cutting to which his novel was being subjected. Even so, he must have finally approved, or at least accepted, the revised edition because his contract stipulated that if he were not happy with the completed draft, he could take his novel to another publisher. ¹² Probably he accepted such extensive revisions because of his earlier experiences with publishers and the way he had suffered after the suppression of *Sister Carrie*. Experience had taught him that writing a great novel was not enough; it had to sell, and in order to sell, it had to be palatable to a large reading public and marketed accordingly. If it were not, it might fail, and he might re-experience the poverty and psychological breakdown that accompanied the failure of *Sister Carrie*.

Specifically, the contract reads as follows: "It is hereby understood and agreed that Harper Brothers will condense and revise the said work in accordance with the general understanding existing with the author, and that if the final outcome of such condensation and revision should result in a radical disagreement of views between Harper Brothers and the author then the said author shall have the right to take the book elsewhere. . ." (Dreiser Collection. University of Pennsylvania Van Pelt Library).
Moreover, by the time Dreiser finished Jennie Gerhardt, he was again feeling the pangs of poverty, having just been fired from Butterick for having an affair with the very young daughter of a Butterick employee. In several letters to Mencken before Jennie's publication, he reveals his anxiety over the novel's ability to provide him with an income. In one letter he asks, "Will it sell?" and in another, "If Jennie doesn't sell . . . I won't hang on to this writing game very long" (Dreiser-Mencken 71, 73). Thus, Dreiser's concern over the salability of Jennie Gerhardt was partly fueled by his intense fear of becoming psychologically and financially destitute, and so he acquiesced to editorial changes that were contrary to his instincts concerning the artistic integrity of the work. In addition, he knew that if he did not allow Harper to publish its edited version, the novel probably would not be published, and his reputation as a novelist would be tarnished permanently. As Hershel Parker explains,

[W]riters who have felt dishonored . . . during an expurgation, very rarely compound that shame by disowning a book after publishers have kept their end of the bargain. To repudiate a published book is to dishonor a business deal, as well as a nearly sure-fire way to lose a publisher and warn off other publishers. (38)

At the time of Dreiser's negotiations with Harper, West points out that it was the only publisher that had expressed interest in publishing Jennie Gerhardt or reissuing Sister Carrie for broad distribution. Perhaps Dreiser thought that this was as good a chance for publication as he was going to get. As West states, "Dreiser had waited eleven years for a chance to finish and publish Jennie Gerhardt and to reissue Sister Carrie with a reputable firm. Both of these things were guaranteed in the Harper and Brothers contract" ("Historical" 452). All of these factors together convinced Dreiser to allow Harper to publish its severely edited version of Jennie Gerhardt.
The changes the Harper editors made to Dreiser's manuscript attest to the moral climate of America at the turn of the century and to Harper's determination to tailor its publications to that climate. The emergence of new theories such as social Darwinism, and movements such as the rise of the university, industrialism, and women's suffrage made Americans increasingly aware of the country's movement away from traditionally accepted values. As a result, the religiously conservative became more visible than ever in an effort to protect America's tradition of Christian morality (Tindall 995-996). The religiously conservative were active in the literary marketplace and kept a close eye on material being offered to the reading public. West asserts that during the first quarter of the century, "[s]uppression and banning were still real possibilities for unconventional or sexually frank books . . . ("Historical" 440). Organizations such as The Boston Watch and Ward Society and The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, in addition to a host of conservative reviewers and critics, were "poised to attack morally objectionable literature" (440).

Harper and Brothers, a conservative publishing house, published books and magazines that reflected the tastes and judgments of its founders. James and John Harper, two brothers who began the firm in 1817, were both intensely religious and committed to ensuring that J & J Harper, as the company was first known, publish only works that supported traditional American religious values. When James's and John's younger brothers, Fletcher and Wesley, joined the firm in 1823 and 1825, respectively, little changed. Harper biographer Eugene Exman writes that "[i]n 1830 a Harper advertisement boasted that . . . the public could 'rest assured that no works will be published by J. & J. H. but such as are interesting, instructive, and moral'" (11). For the
Harper brothers, the family was an especially important consideration because it symbolized the unity, growth, and strength of America as a nation. So important was the family to the Harper brothers that its image became the visual "motif" for a number of their publications. For instance, a portrait of a family sitting and reading together around a large table was the title page for the 1847 and 1848 Harper catalogues. Similar familial images "dominated Harper publishing" throughout "the nineteenth century, from the beginning of their Family Library in 1830 to their admonition to Thomas Hardy in 1894 that Harper's Magazine must contain nothing which could not be read aloud in a family circle" (31). Prior to the twentieth century, Harper was content to publish works mainly on history, theology, education, and travel, and it hired theologians as readers in almost every department, touting them in advertisements as "'gentleman of high literary acquirements and correct taste'" (qtd Tebbel I 272). So pervasive and public was their commitment to Christian morality that James Harper's victory in the 1844 New York mayoral race was labeled "'the sublime triumph of the Bible'" because of "the firm's publishing of Protestant books and the church's subsequent support" (qtd Exman 277).

Harper and Brothers was well-known for accepting or rejecting works for publication based on their conservative content. According to Exman, when the company published the works of Dinah Mulock Craik during the latter half of the nineteenth-century, Fletcher Harper announced that he was "proud to be Mrs. Craik's publisher . . . [because] her books were so desirable for family reading . . ." (63). On the other hand, the firm heavily criticized and probably rejected Dreiser's Sister Carrie because of its moral coloring. In a letter from Harper and Brothers to Doubleday Page
on May 2, 1900, the Harper spokesman writes that although the novel is "a superior piece of reportorial realism," it is unpublishable because the "realism weakens and hinders the development of the plot." The writer adds that Dreiser is not "sufficiently delicate to depict without offense to the reader the continued illicit relations of the heroine" and that the novel's content would not "arouse the interest . . . of the feminine readers who control the destinies of so many novels" (Van Pelt). Although the firm did eventually publish a more diverse group of authors, such as Mark Twain, Charles Dickens, William Dean Howells, Henry James, and Rudyard Kipling, it was never a leader in publishing socially aggressive works (Exman 154). This was especially true of its magazines, which by the end of the nineteenth-century had become specifically committed to the sentimental genre (79).

There is some indication, however, that Harper sometimes contracted controversial works of fiction and then edited them for moral content before publication. Perhaps this is best seen in the 1895 serialized publication of Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* in *Harper's Bazar*. *Harper's Bazar* was a women's magazine that promoted a healthy combination of intellectualism and moralism. The magazine's editor, Mary L. Booth, "counted on her [audience] to be churchgoers (mostly Protestant), faithful to a strict moral code . . ." (122). In Hardy's publishing contract, he agreed to insure that the serialized work be "suitable for family reading" (67). Soon after he began the novel, however, he wrote to Harper editor Henry Mills Alden expressing his fear that the novel was moving in a direction counter to the firm's definition of "family reading." In order to get the work into print, however, Hardy agreed to allow the editor to "make any changes in the manuscript he thought necessary" (qtd 68). Although there is no extant
statement of the exact nature of the changes, apparently even the editors considered them substantive, as Alden later wrote to Hardy apologizing for forcing him to "make changes in 'work conscientiously done'" (qtd 68). In addition, Harper editor Frederick A. Dunecka, in a 1911 letter to Hamilton Wright Mabie, comments on the "controversial" nature of the Jude manuscript. He states that the only book that has "provoked more discussion after it was accepted for publication" than Jennie Gerhardt, was "Hardy's Jude" (qtd West "Historical" 453). Although these comments do not indicate the specific problems of the Jude manuscript, they do suggest that like those of Dreiser's Jennie, the objectionable material probably had to do with the novel's moral coloring.

Exman argues that the Harper serialization of Jude exemplifies the problems "facing an editor who wants an author's work to find the greatest possible reader acceptance" (68). Altering a work in order to make it acceptable to the "greatest possible" audience, however, also leads to financial gain for the publishing house. Such a policy, then, that the publisher may argue is "best" for the author certainly is best for the publisher. Early in its publishing history, Harper and Brothers had a reputation for placing the financial needs of the firm above the artistic integrity of the works it published, and the publication of Hardy's novel proved no exception. Exman states that as early as 1830 employees complained that "the Harpers were guided by their reader's judgment and their anticipation of profit and loss, rather than by 'any intrinsic merit of the work or its author'" (13). John Tebbel adds: "It may well be that Harper's was the first house to be regarded as being commercial and thinking more of business than
literature" (I 276). Hardy's experience with the firm suggests that even at the end of the nineteenth century its priorities remained unchanged.

In addition to Harper and Brothers' historical emphasis on profit when it accepted Jennie Gerhardt for publication, the firm was also in an extremely fragile financial situation. This financial situation, in turn, made the firm even more sensitive to the needs of its buying public. The problems began at the end of the nineteenth century when the country was suffering from a series of failures in banking and railroad commonly referred to as the "panic of 1893." The four original Harper brothers were dead by this time, and the new directors, all Harper relatives, so mishandled the company as to render it almost financially unsalvageable: "If the four brothers had been alive then," Exman states, "they would have retreated and retrenched, for they respected economic records as much as they did the Bible" (171). The situation was so bad that by 1896 family members were forced into a financial agreement with J.P. Morgan in order to keep the firm afloat. By this agreement, Harper and Brothers relinquished control to Morgan, though some of the Harpers remained employed by the firm.

Under reorganization, Walter Hines Page became director of book publishing, but he left the company in 1899 to form Doubleday Page (Tebbel II 196-197). Page, however, represents the type of editor Harper was employing at the turn of the century, barely ten years before Jennie Gerhardt was published. These men were conservative in their judgments and tastes, and aware of the rigid morality within which a work must fall to be successful. Unfortunately, despite its greatest efforts, Harper and Brothers was unable to pull itself out of its desperate financial situation, and by the end of 1899, the firm was forced to declare bankruptcy (Tebbel II 198-199). Under the direction of
Colonel George M. Harvey, the firm was once again reorganized, and Frederick A. Duneka was named manager and secretary of the board of directors (Exman 188). Duneka was an intelligent, shrewd businessman who, like Walter Page, understood the need to tailor the firm's publications toward its buying public. It was Duneka who sent an edited copy of Jennie Gerhardt to the extremely religious and very powerful writer and critic Hamilton Wright Mabie. To make the money it desperately needed, the firm would have to produce works that would sell, and sell well.

The financial problems that plagued the house of Harper into the early part of the twentieth century, coupled with the American moral climate and the firm's history of conservative publishing, made a censorious editing of Jennie Gerhardt inevitable. To edit the text, Duneka chose Ripley Hitchcock, who had started out as a journalist and later moved into editorial work. In American Authors and the Literary Marketplace Since 1900, West states that Hitchcock was the first editor to "take a more active role in working with the manuscripts of his authors" (51). His first editorial position was with D. Appleton, a company he left in 1902 for A.S. Barnes. In 1906 he accepted a position with Harper and Brothers, and remained there "until his death in 1918" (51-52).

Hitchcock is best known for his extensive revisions of Edward Noyes Westcott's much-rejected novel, David Harum, which he personally transformed into a bestseller (53). West notes that Hitchcock always considered this novel his best and most important work, even though he would go on to edit such great writers as Stephen Crane and Theodore Dreiser. In his obituary, David Harum is "mentioned prominently," but not The Red Badge of Courage or Jennie Gerhardt (54).
Hitchcock was considered a competent editor, and he was also politically conservative and extremely religious, which made him an ideal choice for houses desirous of publishing socially acceptable works. A eulogist at Hitchcock's funeral stated that Hitchcock "used a sensitive religious instinct in securing from brethren in his craft many books of higher life" (qtd 52). In this effort, however, Hitchcock was representative of his profession. At this time in America, it was not unusual for publishing houses to employ editors to comb literary works for moral content. Both Henry Binder and Hershel Parker note that the moral climate in America at the turn of the century demanded works that upheld a certain moral code, and therefore editors and writers alike leaned toward producing morally acceptable works rather than works that were artistically sound. Parker states,

The members of the American literary establishment were a remarkably homogeneous set of males of British ancestry and conventional upper-middle-class education, and for all the nominal allegiance they paid to literary realism, they were aesthetically timid to the point of prizing tameness over originality . . . . The majority of the reading public depended upon the editors to keep unnecessary unpleasantness out of their homes. (26)

Binder adds,

The most powerful editors of the time were attuned to if not representative of 'the inconsistent, yet potent force known as middle-class morality.' Authors, especially 'realists,' could be condemned for creating characters such as Huckleberry Finn who were not models of proper behavior, or for offering social portraits that were 'too honest' like Crane's Maggie, or for writing anything that verged on blasphemy such as the poems rejected by the editors of Copeland and Day for inclusion in Crane's Black Riders and Other Lines. ("Donald" 219)

Binder's observations concerning Stephen Crane are especially important to our discussion because Hitchcock, who edited Jennie Gerhardt, also edited Crane's The Red
Badge of Courage while at D. Appleton. Interestingly, Binder accuses Hitchcock of bowdlerizing Crane's text to such an extent that the sense and import of the novel was lost: "What Appleton offered the contemporary reader," states Binder, "was a seriously reduced version of Crane's carefully constructed and pointedly ironic psychological novel" ("Nobody" 17). Although Crane scholars such as Donald Pizer and James Colvert argue that the Appleton text is the better version, Binder's evidence is persuasive, and a host of scholars agree with him. The types of changes that he shows Hitchcock made to the novel are consistent with Hitchcock's changes in Jennie Gerhardt. Hitchcock reduced The Red Badge of Courage by some 37,000 words, Binder argues, taking out large portions of text, including an entire chapter, and so altering the ending that it is essentially unrecognizable. In addition to removing all profanity, he eliminated a great deal of Crane's naturalistic philosophy. Hitchcock's probable intention, states Binder, was to make the novel a good war story, as the war genre was especially popular at the turn of the century. As a result, the heavily ironic nature of the story was weakened considerably. In the process, Binder states, Hitchcock "reduced the psychological complexity of Henry Fleming, the main character... obscured the function of Wilson and the tattered man; and left the text incoherent at several places, in particular the final chapter" ("Nobody" 9). Binder adds that the cuts and emendations

---

account for the present state of critical confusion over the text in general, and the ending in particular.

Likewise, the cuts made to *Jennie Gerhardt* reflect an attempt to rid the text of controversial material and thus to render it a simpler, more sentimental story. Not only were specific cuts made to eliminate profanity and any mention of sex or alcohol, but an effort was made to soften the sharp and very realistic distinction between the upper and lower classes, which was probably done to weaken the realistic but morally difficult reading of America's treatment of the desperately poor. Hitchcock also rid the novel of virtually all of the narrator's comments concerning the rigid and hypocritical nature of traditional morality, and he weakened the complex and sometimes disturbing characterization of every major Gerhardt character, especially Jennie. He did so by excising much of the narrator's commentary, in addition to the private thoughts of the Gerhardtts. Binder argues that excising the narrator's comments and the private thoughts of characters was also Hitchcock's chief method in the editing of *Red Badge*. The result of this extensive cutting in *Jennie Gerhardt* is that the complex story of Jennie and Lester becomes much more simple and sentimental, which makes it consistent with much of what Harper was publishing at the time, especially in its ladies' magazines.

Because some of the story's philosophical content remains, the novel could still be said to reflect current literary trends in Western literature, such as seen perhaps in the works of writers like Emile Zola and even Frank Norris. At the same time, however, the story that remained after the cuts was sentimental enough to attract the genteel, paying

---

Binder discusses several of these excisions in "*Red Badge Nobody Knows*."
American audience to whom the book was publicized. So interested were Harper and Brothers in securing this audience that Duneka sent a copy of the edited novel to Hamilton Wright Mabie prior to distribution in order to insure that Hitchcock had purged all offensive material from the text. Mabie was a well-known and highly influential Christian writer who wrote for the extremely successful Christian magazine *The Outlook*, in addition to *Ladies Home Journal* and *Atlantic Monthly* (West "Historical" 440, 452). West writes that "Mabie was one among a group of genteel, avuncular, anglophile critics who still had considerable influence on American readers and publishers in 1911" (452). Most important of Mabie's writings was an extremely influential list of books acceptable for Christian homes. Hitchcock was well acquainted with Mabie, having editing a number of his works, which probably made it easier to procure his critical opinion of the novel. (West *American* 52). In his letter dated October 11, 1911, Duneka tells Mabie that he is unsure whether "'any really good end is subserved'" by publishing the novel. However, he also states that "'in spite of its heroine being outside the pale it is about as suggestive as a Patent Office Report or Kent's Commentary'" (qtd West "Historical" 453).

Mabie wrote back that though the subject matter of the novel did not appeal to him at first, he ended up "'lik[ing] it very much.'" He also warned that the "'theme'" of *Jennie Gerhardt* should "'not . . . be dealt with too frequently in fiction.'" Overall, however, his comments about the novel were positive. He even stated that Dreiser could probably be a popular writer if he could "'be kept from getting too obsessed by the general sex theme which has made so many writers of fiction insane'" (qtd 453).

Duneka's response attests to the relief he must have felt from Mabie's positive response:
"You do not know how glad I am to find that you discovered in Dreiser’s Novel the reverential treatment which we somehow felt was there" (qtd 454). As West points out, these letters reveal Harper and Brothers’ concern over the public’s reaction to even the small amount of philosophic and moral coloring left in the novel. Because Mabie had approved Jennie Gerhardt, however, "Duneka . . . knew that Hitchcock had edited the novel just as it should have been edited," states West (454), as such, the novel was distributed to the public at the end of October of 1911.

For Dreiser, the writing and publishing of Jennie Gerhardt was a long process that entailed a great deal of personal and artistic sacrifice. In the ten years it took him to complete it, he suffered from a nervous breakdown, poverty, loneliness, and humiliation. These experiences made him extremely vulnerable to large and powerful corporations such as Harper and Brothers. At the same time, Harper and Brothers was at the mercy of the buying public, many of whom were only interested in reading works that upheld and perpetuated conventional American values and beliefs. Jennie Gerhardt questions and criticizes many of America’s conventional notions concerning poverty, wealth, immigration, industrialism, individualism, and motherhood. Much as it did Hardy’s Jude, Harper probably accepted the novel with the intention of editing out its objectionable moral content. Nevertheless, its ultimate purpose in editing the novel was to make it more acceptable and so more saleable to its buying audience, most of whom would have been middle- to upper-class. In the myriad circumstances surrounding the writing and publication of Jennie Gerhardt, therefore, Dreiser’s decision to accept the final, heavily edited version of the novel was not a simple matter. Rather, it was as complex and many-sided as the original writing of his characters in Jennie Gerhardt.
Textual Editing and Dreiser's Framework of Opposition

Jennie Gerhardt's publication in October of 1911 convinced Dreiser that he was not to relive the unfortunate experiences associated with *Sister Carrie*. Harper was actively publicizing the novel, and by January of 1912, *Jennie Gerhardt* had sold almost eight thousand copies (Lingeman *Dreiser* 269). Overall, it would sell 14,000 copies and net Dreiser $2,500 in royalties (West "Intro" xvi). The novel did not, however, set Dreiser up as a literary genius, as Mencken predicted. Mencken had written to Dreiser that the novel "will be a best-seller" and that "it will make you," but early reviews were mixed (*Dreiser-Mencken* 71). Many critics were impressed with the story's realism, but others severely criticized Dreiser's writing style and character development. Elia W. Peattie of the *Chicago Tribune*, for instance, called Jennie a "fluffy little sofa cushion" (71), and the critic of the New York *Globe and Commercial Advertiser* stated that "[Dreiser's] narrative is as plain and straight as a gingham apron" (61). Floyd Dell of the *Evening Post Literary Review* wrote that "there is page after page of simple narrative," and that "Mr. Dreiser . . . is weak in the very thing in which a clever writer is strongest--in verbal taste" (65). The critic of the *Metropolitan Magazine* added that although "[Dreiser's] intention and spirit are things in themselves satisfying and noble," the novel is devoid of "charm and vitality in certain portions of the story" (87). The mixed reviews of the 1911 edition, at least in part, attest to the effects of the Harper editing on the work's literary value. Dreiser's next novel, *The Financier*, published by Harper the following year, and without such drastic cutting, was much more successful both with critics and with readers. *An American Tragedy* was even more successful. The success of these works caused *Jennie Gerhardt* to lapse quickly into comparative obscurity.
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Only in the last ten years has *Jennie Gerhardt* become the subject of significant critical attention. Why *Jennie Gerhardt* was ignored while Dreiser's first novel eventually became a phenomenal success has been an especially puzzling question for many Dreiser scholars. In discovering that the novel was heavily edited, West has redirected the scholarly focus, allowing critics to reexamine the novel as perhaps a new work of art. As West states, though criticism of the 1911 edition has its "place and usefulness in the Dreiser field," it is based on "a different work of art" than the text he has restored (*Restored* ix). Our assumption that Dreiser was the controlling force in the creation of *Jennie Gerhardt* has been called into question, and it is now the task of the critical community to seriously review how this text was altered by the editors.

In writing *Jennie Gerhardt*, Dreiser was specifically interested in examining the intricacy of human relationships, whether they be familial, romantic, or occasional, and his use of multiple modes of representation helped him better express his belief that human beings are not simple and that problems arise when we attempt to apply simple moral or societal codes to human behavior. People are not simply good or bad, right or wrong. They are difficult to define, difficult to understand, and at times so ambiguous that they escape definition. Motives are often hidden to the onlooker, and seldom are the circumstances of one human being the same as those of another. To show the complex nature of human existence and the inability of conventional morality, traditions, and values to adequately define this existence, Dreiser set up a series of physical, psychological, philosophical, social, and religious contradictions that mirror the rigidity of American society and that produce in the characters of *Jennie Gerhardt* a sense of futility, misery, and emptiness. At its most basic level, Dreiser sets up the world of
Jennie Gerhardt with a series of physical oppositions that emphasize the enormous difference between the Gerhardts' poverty and the wealth and luxury of Senator George Brander and especially of Lester Kane, the two men with whom Jennie has affairs. The Harper editors, however, destroyed the emphatic nature of this opposition in two ways. First they cut passages depicting the extent of the Gerhardt poverty, passages inspired by Dreiser's own experience. Second, they toned down the opulence of the wealthy by cutting one passage describing the Columbus Hotel, one passage describing the interior of the Kane home, and one extensive passage describing a ball that Lester attends.

In the original manuscript these excised passages emphasize the enormous differences between the world of the Gerhardts and that of George Brander and the Kanes. The physical contrast created by Dreiser serves to make the reader continually aware of the immense poverty of the Gerhardt family and the way it determines every aspect of their lives. The extent of their poverty, then, helps us to appreciate more fully why Jennie lives a life contrary to the moral standards of society. We can also appreciate more fully Jennie's greatness of character when we recognize that, unlike her predecessor Carrie Meeber, she is initially attracted to Brander and Lester (who are much wealthier than Drouet or Hurstwood) not because they can provide her with more things, but because they are an avenue through which she can help her family survive. The distinction between Carrie and Jennie's motivation for not conforming to society's moral standards is quite clear when Jennie is placed inside the physically tempting world of her male suitors. When the poverty of the Gerhardts and the immense wealth of the Kanes is obscured, however, as it is in the 1911 edition, Jennie's integrity is also called into question, because we no longer see her initial rejection of Lester as also a
rejection of immense wealth and comfort. In the end, Jennie becomes less sympathetic, and the Kanes becomes more sympathetic, as we no longer see them as so extravagant.

Essays and reviews of the 1911 edition are critical of this editorial oversight. Mencken, for instance, writes that "Lawrence Perin, a man of large wealth . . . thinks 'Sister Carrie' better than 'Jennie', chiefly, it appears, because he objects to certain obscure details in the high society scenes of the latter" (Dreiser-Mencken 91). Lawrence Hussman, too, writes that Dreiser "uncharacteristically passes up the chance to enrich the narrative with an extensively developed contrast between the lives of the poor and those of the affluent. Although we fully experience the Gerhardt's world, we see little of the Kanes" (Dreiser 68).

The opening chapters of both the Pennsylvania and Harper editions of Jennie Gerhardt contain vivid scenes of the Gerhardt poverty, although two of the most descriptive scenes were removed by the Harper editors. In the original manuscript, Dreiser uses these scenes to bring the reader directly into the poverty-stricken existence of this struggling immigrant family. Dreiser's vivid imagery draws us into a world that, for the most part, is unfamiliar, but which at the turn of the century was all too real for millions of struggling immigrant families like the Dreisers. Dreiser begins the story inside the Gerhardt home, where William Gerhardt and his wife are attempting to nurse their sick daughter, Veronica, back to health, a task they find difficult without the money needed for proper medicine and doctor's care. Their daughter's illness is made even more burdensome by Gerhardt's recent illness, which has made it impossible for him to work. As a result, "he . . . was forced, for the present, to see his wife, his six
children, and himself depending for the necessaries of life upon whatever fortune the
teaching of each successive day might bring" (P4; H460).

In depicting the poverty of the Gerhardts, Dreiser drew upon his own childhood
experiences in Terre Haute, Indiana. The Dreisers, like the Gerhardts, felt the pangs of
hunger and shame brought on by constant poverty. Like the Gerhardt children, Dreiser
was forced to steal coal from the railroad yards so the family would have heat in the
winter. In his autobiography he vividly recalls moments of "social and financial shame"
when he watched his brothers "carrying coal" stolen from the "tracks" (Dawn 90). He
also writes of having to go to buy cornmeal "at a distant mill . . . because it was cheaper
there," and of "cornmeal mush eaten without milk because we had none" (109).
Likewise, the Gerhardts have to eat "cornmeal . . . made into mush" because there is no
money to buy staples. Most humiliating for Dreiser, though, was having to watch his
mother beg for credit because she did not have the money to buy groceries. Dreiser
transports this experience into the novel: "Not infrequently, [Mrs. Gerhardt] went
personally to some new grocer, each time farther and farther away, and starting an
account with a little cash would receive credit, until other grocers warned the
philanthropist of his folly" (P5; H460-461).

Dreiser intensifies the desperate situation of the Gerhardt family by explaining
that, because of a lack of funds, "[o]ne child, Veronica, was already forced to remain at
home [from school] for the want of shoes" (P4). This passage was excised from the
1911 edition, which weakens the impact of poverty on his characters that Dreiser is
trying to paint from his own past. Dreiser understood the degradation associated with
having no shoes to wear to school, and for him it signified the very depths of his own
family's desperate poverty. In his autobiography *Dawn*, he writes of the first time he became "sharply aware of what it meant to have less as opposed to more." It was "the fact that neither Ed nor I had shoes to wear" (52). He also vividly remembers the "sorrow" he felt in looking at his mother's "torn shoes" (19). For Dreiser, the damage that resulted from the family's inability to produce a few cents for a pair of shoes is extended beyond the moments of humiliation and into the important concerns of education and assimilation, and the chance at a better life.

In his reminiscence, Dreiser subtly but harshly criticizes the church, which in his view turned a blind eye to the material needs of the impoverished. Veronica goes to a parochial school, but she cannot attend because she has no shoes. If the church were truly interested in her welfare, it would provide shoes for her to wear to school. Early in his autobiography, Dreiser recalls being sent home from parochial school for not having any shoes, and being told "to put on shoes as it was much too cold to be without them." Unfortunately, no amount of washing and ironing on his mother's part could raise the money she needed to put her children in shoes: "[S]hoes cost money, and having no money to spare . . . she had been compelled to let us go this long without shoes." The school, however, would not relent. It was only by the grace of a goodhearted neighbor, who worked it out with Mrs. Dreiser that she could exchange "future washing and ironing--and a large bundle it was that he provided," that "shoes and possibly a few other things" were finally bought and the children allowed to return to school (52-53). This was the first of a long line of experiences with the Catholic Church that led Dreiser to believe that its purpose was "profit" and its theology "psychopathic balderdash" (*Dawn* 26).
In the vivid opening chapter of *Jennie Gerhardt*, Dreiser portrays in the Gerhardt's desperate situation what it meant to be poor in America. Dreiser does not want us to sentimentalize Jennie's condition. Senator Brander does. He "pictures in his mind . . . a low cottage, a cheerless chamber, a lovely girl carrying a bundle to him through the shadows of a dreary November evening" (excised from Harper text P23). Instead, Dreiser wants us to see clearly the reality of the Gerhardts' poverty-stricken existence and the "isolation and indifference which accompanied a lack of means" (*Dawn* 293). The Gerhardts' poverty is also emphasized and clarified when it is textually and thematically juxtaposed against the luxury and comfort enjoyed by the rich, who are represented in the opening chapter by those who stay at the Columbus hotel. In his essay, "The Hotel World in *Jennie Gerhardt*," West explains the important significance of the hotel in *Jennie Gerhardt*:

Dreiser was familiar with the elaborate culture of hotel life that had developed in the United States by the 1890s. This culture flourished in large American cities, where industrialists, politicians, entertainers, sports figures, and traveling businessmen patronized large and opulent establishments. (194)

The Columbus hotel is not as rich as the ones Jennie will later stay in with Lester Kane, West points out, but to the Gerhardts it "represents luxury and privilege" (195). In the 1911 edition, the parts of Dreiser's description of the hotel that best articulate the distinction between those who stay there and those who work there is cut. In the following passage from the Pennsylvania edition describing the Columbus hotel, the bracketed lines were excised by the Harper editors:

The structure, five stories in height, and of imposing proportion stood at one corner of the center public square, where were the capitol building and principal stores, [and, naturally, the crowd and hurry of life, which,
to those who had never seen anything better, seemed wondrously gay and
inspiring. Large plate-glass windows looked out upon both the main
and side streets, through which could be seen many comfortable chairs
scattered about for those who cared to occupy them.] The lobby was
large, and had been recently redecorated. Both floor and wainscot were
of white marble, kept shiny by frequent polishing. (P6; H46)

Dreiser adds that "[m]other and daughter, brought into this realm of brightness, saw
only that which was far off and immensely superior" (P7). The words "far off,"
however, were cut in the Harper text. These cuts soften considerably the contrast
between those "inside" and "outside" the social and economic world the hotel
represents, and so lessen Jennie and Mrs. Gerhardt's sense of their awkward "outside"
position at the Columbus Hotel. The barrier that exists between these women and the
world of the hotel is as transparent but as solid as the "large plate glass window" that
separates the "street" people from the hotel guests. As cleaning maids, mother and
daughter are a feature of the opulent, comfortable lifestyle of the upper class, yet they
are cut off from it, separated from a world they can easily see but which is "far off"
from them. It is a world they must function in continuously but which they "stood in
half confused," another phrase excised from the Harper text (P13). In their world, hard
physical labor renders few monetary rewards. It does not, for instance, entitle them to
occupy the comfortable chairs inside the hotel window. Rather, they will "kneel" on the
stairs, working at "the feet" of its patrons (P8; H463). The richness of the hotel only
makes them that much more conscious of their social position, which in turn intensifies
"the mother's timidity and the daughter's shame" at having to do their work in the
"bright" public halls of the building (P7; H463).
In addition, the "large plate glass window" represents one of the larger thematic concerns of the novel, the problematic effect of allowing wealth and abstract class distinctions to dictate personal concerns. Virtually everyone in the novel is on one or the other side of a "large plate glass window" that, though transparent, can never be breached. Lester, for instance, despite his love for Jennie, must leave her for Letty or lose his fortune: "It seems strange," he tells Jennie on his death bed, "but you're the only woman I ever did truly love. We should have never parted" (P410; H815). And even though Jennie gives herself completely to Lester, she is always on the outside of his world looking in. When Lester eventually married Letty, Jennie "followed it all hopelessly--like a child, hungry and forlorn, looking into a lighted window at Christmas time" (P383; H788).

The Harper editors' excision of the material from these passages, then, smudge and soften an otherwise sharp visual image of the "isolation" and shame that come with a "lack of means." The restoration helps us to appreciate more fully the conditions under which Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie must work to provide for their family. This appreciation, in turn, makes their willing sacrifice a cause of respect, not just of sympathy.

In this same manner, Dreiser continues to emphasize the Gerhardtts' poverty by placing it alongside the wealth and luxury that is visible to them but untouchable. This emphasis is strongest when Dreiser juxtaposes the Gerhardtts' poverty against the extravagant wealth of the Kanes. This emphasis was lost when the Harper editors cut passages describing the Kane wealth, especially two specific and lengthy passages. The first passage describes the physical opulence of the Kane home.
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When Lester Kane enters the story, the Gerhardt's situation remains as desperate as ever. The family has lost their home because they were unable to pay the mortgage, and their furniture has been confiscated because they could not finish paying for it. As a result, Mrs. Gerhardt and the children have moved to Cleveland in an effort to find work. The situation has been complicated by the birth of Jennie's child Vesta, whom Mrs. Gerhardt has to take care of during the day, thus leaving her unable to work. In Cleveland, Sebastian has found gainful employment in a cigar store, George has taken a job as a "cash-boy," and Jennie takes a job as a maid in the home of Mrs. Bracebridge for four dollars a week. With Gerhardt's five-dollar contribution and the older children's salaries, the Gerhardt's weekly income is fifteen dollars. Dreiser does not want his readers to think, however, that the Gerhardt's are finally on the road to recovery. He adds that "[o]ut of this total income... all of these eight individuals had to be fed and clothed, the rent paid, the coal purchased, and the regular monthly installment of three dollars paid on the outstanding furniture bill of fifty dollars." In addition, the family has no cooking stove, the purchase of which "would add greatly to the bill" (P107; H552). In the family's daily life, Dreiser writes, "[c]oal, groceries, the wherewithal to buy shoes and clothing were the uppermost topics—if not in words then in thought. It gave a peculiar atmosphere of stress with no obvious signs of relief" (P119). Mrs. Gerhardt "worked like a servant" to maintain the family, "with no compensation either in clothes, amusement or anything else" (P108; H552). Jennie is acutely aware of her mother's

---

1 This passage was emended by the Harper editors to read: "Coal, groceries, shoes and clothing were the uppermost topics. Every one felt the stress and strain of trying to make ends meet" (H552).
sacrifices for the family, and she "long[s] to give her [mother] the comforts which she had always craved" (P109; H553).

Into this scene of poverty comes Lester, who upon seeing Jennie at the home of Mrs. Bracebridge, immediately begins to pursue her. When she rebukes his advances after he has driven her home one evening, he offers her money: "And I'm going to leave you money . . ." he states, "you have to take it" (P134; H578). Despite Jennie's familial situation, she "quailed and withdrew" at his offer. "He insisted further, but she was firm and finally he put [the money] away" (P134; H578). At this point we are not sure of the kind of luxury that Lester can provide for Jennie, though we clearly understand her need for it. In the next chapter, however, Dreiser emphasizes the enormous material comforts Lester can provide by describing the opulence and luxury of the Kane home. The Pennsylvania edition's description reads as follows. The bracketed lines were removed from the 1911 Harper editions:

The Kane family mansion at Cincinnati to which Lester returned after leaving Jennie was an imposing establishment which contrasted strangely with the Gerhardt home. Here was a great rambling two story affair, done after the manner of the French chateaux, but in red brick and brownstone. It was set down among flowers and trees in an almost park-like inclosure, and its very stones spoke of a splendid dignity and refined luxury . . . (P136-137; H580)

[The interior atmosphere of this home was most charming. The furniture, the rugs, the hangings and the pictures were of course of the best . . . It was well-built and well-furnished, with a great old Nuremberg clock in the hall which chimed the hours mellifluously, with some charming landscapes by Corot and Troyon and Daubigny on the walls, with soft charmingly colored rugs and silken hangings at the windows. There was a grand piano for the daughters to play on, a chamber large enough for social dancing . . . and suites of bedrooms where friends and guests could be entertained in number. There was a splendid dining room, furnished after the period of Louis Quinze, and a library full of interesting, albeit standard, books. It was a fine home, a really
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comfortable American mansion, and was so known to be by all who knew anything about social life in Cincinnati.] (P138-139)

The fuller, more detailed description of the interior of the Kane home develops Dreiser's oppositional framework in the novel. Through such passages as the one above excised in the 1911 edition, Dreiser starkly contrasts the Kane's extravagant wealth with the Gerhardts' poverty. The Gerhardts, Dreiser states, have never had an indoor bathroom and have never enjoyed the simple convenience of gas lighting. In a passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes that the sight of a chandelier "shocked [William Gerhardt] into a realization of one luxury hitherto not enjoyed" (P176).

Moreover, while the Gerhardts eat "mush" for dinner, the Kanes, in the above excised passage "dress for dinner [and] [i]f one were not inclined to dress, dinner could be served in the little private dining room on the ground floor" (P140-141). Dreiser's vivid description of the Kane home, with its emphasis on service, privacy, space, color, music, and learning, is so extravagant that it is difficult even for the Harper middle-class reader to visualize. It is so enormous and well appointed that only those who "know anything about social life in Cincinnati" can comprehend it, that is, those who are equally wealthy. The Harper editors probably cut this passage because they understood that the intricate description of the Kane home interior would make it difficult for a middle-class audience to sympathize with Lester Kane.

In the "Historical Commentary" of the Pennsylvania edition, West notes this specific change, stating that Dreiser intended this passage to "reveal much about

\[equation\]

\[\text{Reprinted with permission from the University of Pennsylvania Press.}\]
Jennie's strong hold on Lester" (445). By portraying the wealth Lester was jeopardizing in his relations with Jennie, perhaps its more important function is to show Jennie as honest and sacrificial. Unlike Carrie Meeber, Jennie clearly is not attracted to Lester because he can provide her with nicer clothes and a finer home, a point that is sometimes missed by critics of the 1911 edition. Donald Pizer, for instance, states that like Carrie, Jennie meets the wealth of her male suitors with "an exultation of the spirit related to an Arabian nights elevation of the poor beggar boy to a realm of riches and beauty" (108). Pizer bases his argument on Jennie's obvious wonder at the material objects placed in Senator Brander's hotel room. When we juxtapose her reaction to Brander's material comforts against the excised passage describing the objects placed in the Kane home, however, we see her in a different light. She resists Lester's insistent overtures even though she is strongly attracted to him and he could give her things she could only dream of in her "Arabian nights elevation." Only two pages before Dreiser's description of the Kane home, Jennie thinks, "And [Lester] had offered her money. That was the worst of all" (P135; H579). Even though his wealth could be hers and even though she could provide her family with a more comfortable life, she will not compromise herself. Jennie's attraction to Lester's wealth is born only out of desperation, and at this point she does not need his money that badly. Only when her father comes home disabled and Jennie sees that "[e]ither more money must come in from some source, or the family must beg for credit and suffer the old tortures of want" does she consider Lester's offer that she move in with him. At that point she thinks, "He would help them. Had he not tried to force money on her?" (P152; H592).
In addition, a clear apprehension of the Kane wealth, such as we see in the Pennsylvania edition, helps to clarify a larger thematic concern. One of Dreiser's larger interests in the novel is to show that human beings are, more often than not, shaped by circumstances that are out of their control, "created, directed, and determined by exterior influences," states Philip Gerber (83). Whether or not a person is successful depends not so much on skill and hard work as on fortune. This is an awareness that Lester, with all his wealth, does not have, even though he thinks that he understands the world better than any one around him. In a passage excised from the Harper text, he explains to Jennie his conception of a person's power over his or her circumstances: "[monetary] fortune is a thing that adjusts itself automatically to a person's capabilities and desires. If you see anybody who wants anything very badly and is capable of enjoying it, he is apt to get it . . . most people get what they are capable of enjoying" (P195). Lester's conception, however, has been formed by the luxury that he has always had. He is the type who "ha[s] seen only the pleasant face of society . . . [and is] delud[ed] where money is concerned" (P368; H773). He is of the class that enjoys "charming landscapes by Corot and Troyon and Daubigny," "soft rugs and silken hangings," a "chamber large enough for social dancing," and "a suite of bedrooms where friends and guests could be entertained in number."

Lester's obvious comfort has made him a social snob, and although he attempts to justify his wealth though social Darwinism, Jennie knows better. West points out that Jennie, of course, cannot comprehend Lester's world-view because her experience has
taught her differently (448). Her understanding of the world is more realistic than Lester's, even though Lester has had more worldly experience than she. In a passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser explains, "she understood . . . what people were, how they acted, how life was organized, only she did not answer with argument" (P194). Jennie knows that people do not get ahead in life simply because they are willing to act, as Lester puts it. No one has worked harder than her father, and no one is poorer. In addition, her mother, too, "worked like a servant and received absolutely no compensation either in clothes, amusements or anything else" (P108; H552). As the narrator elsewhere observes: "It is so hard for us to know what we have not seen [and] it is so difficult for us to feel what we have not experienced . . ." (P368; H773). In this sense, then, it is presumptuous for us to judge that which we have neither seen nor experienced.

To further exemplify the immense and extravagant luxury of the Kanes, Dreiser follows the above excised passage with a two-page description of a ball that Lester attends with his sisters (Appendix B). This passage begins as Lester's parents urge him to attend the coming-out party of Maria Knowls, the daughter of wealthy Cincinnati socialites. Lester does not want to go: "'I didn't promise to go to that,' he said half-defiantly. 'I don't think I will either. I'm going to bed early tonight'" (P140). However,

Lawrence E. Hussman in "Jennie One-Note: Dreiser's Error in Character Development" also notes the problem of the excised passage wherein Lester tells Jennie that "if you see anybody who wants anything badly and is capable of enjoying it, he is pat to get it" (P195). Hussman states that "West correctly asserts that Jennie's family history has taught her otherwise and that the denouement of the novel will reinforce her understanding and change Lester's mind." *Jennie Gerhardt: Essays on the Restored Text*. James L. West III ed., (Philadelphia: U of Penn P., 1995) 47.
after much persuasion from his sister, Louise, the socialite in the family, Lester finally acquiesces. At the ball, a wealthy socialite approaches Lester and tells him that she wants to introduce him to a young woman: "It's high time you were bestirring yourself to find a wife," she tells him, "You're rapidly becoming an old bachelor." She explains that the young woman is beautiful and has a fortune in her own right. She adds that she is "altogether charming . . . [and has] . . . just made her debut last fall" (P144). When Lester meets the woman he is unimpressed, and thinks her as one of those ambitious flowers of the many newly grown rich of our country— ruddy with the ruddiness of roses, innocent with innocence that is instructed to guard and that still desires without knowing quite how to attain, fashionable with the well-groomed fashions not only of dresses but of ideas, [she] looked at him with the eyes that were not stars but mirrors only . . . (P145)

Lester attempts to be witty and conversational with her, but the reader easily senses his boredom and contempt for her and for other women of his own social class. He "searched for intellect" but could only find "coquettish barrenness, which at his experienced stage of life, was but slightly calculated to engage." In comparison to Jennie, she is "silly," a "bore." Lester, in turn, "found that he was talking down rather than up to a certain standard" (P142-146). Thereafter, his mind wanders to Jennie, and he goes home to write her the letter that leads to their moving in together: "And as he thought, his mind wandered back to Jennie and her peculiar 'Oh no, no!' There was someone who appealed to him" (P146).

In the 1911 edition, the ball scene is cut in its entirety. Lester does not go to the ball, but instead, goes to his room to compose the letter to Jennie. This passage was excised from the original manuscript for one of two reasons. Either it seemed intrusive
to the developing love story between Jennie and Lester or it showed too clearly the extravagant luxury of the very wealthy. Whatever the reason, the passage provides the reader a contrasting background against which to observe Jennie. Her inner beauty radiates in comparison with Lester's young socialites, and it is easy to see why he is attracted to her. West states that this scene places "Lester at a gathering of his own kind and [we] learn . . . how weary he is of its empty social pretensions" ("Historical" 445).

In contrast to these "silly" women, as Lester sees them, Jennie is a "type of womanhood worth while" (P146). Jennie's deep, honest emotion and her willingness to serve others make her a worthwhile human-being. Unlike these "ambitious" women, Jennie is "a big woman in her way: she was sympathetic, intelligent, kindly. That was a lot more than could be said for some of the women who were so ready to look down upon her" (excised from Harper text P299). In another passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator adds that Jennie "didn't care enough about society. She preferred large simple things" (P318). In the ball scene, Dreiser not only clarifies why Lester is attracted to Jennie but also underscores that Jennie is not after Lester's money. This perception eludes critics of the 1911 edition. Donald Pizer, for instance, states that Jennie makes "unconscious attempts to force [Lester] into marriage . . ." (114). He asserts this intention even in the face of a statement not excised from the 1911 edition in which Dreiser clearly states that Jennie is not "set like a man-trap in the path of men" (P146; H585). Without emphatic development expressed in the excised material, however, its sense is obscured and easily missed.

As seen in the Pennsylvania edition, the excised passage serves yet another function. Usually, Jennie is shown in comparison to social "types," wealthy women who
are not otherwise differentiated. Immediately before this important passage, however, Dreiser has Lester's sister, Louise, remind Lester of one socialite in particular: "Letty Pace asked me about you the other night, she called back from the door." Lester's father adds his rousing approval: "She's a nice girl, Lester ... I only wish you would marry her and settle down." Lester, as usual, "changed the subject" (P142; H585). In the context of Lester's eventual decision to leave Jennie for Letty Pace, the excised passage becomes heavy with irony. Lester does not choose Letty at this particular time because in comparison to Jennie, she is boring and silly. Even at the end, in a passage excised from the Harper text that alludes to this earlier scene, Dreiser writes that Letty was "a lover of brilliant social life" (P394). In a more direct connection, this excised passage parallels a similar scene at the end of the novel when Letty and Lester, before their marriage, are entertaining a group of socialites. In this passage, also excised from the Harper text, Lester is as bored as ever with the run of polite conversation and social norms, "drift[ing] conversationally" through discussions of music, art, science, and politics:

> It was the same tintinnabulation of words through this very interesting function, as it is ever on such occasions. All the women carefully gowned, all the men formal ... He studied them, when lack of attention to others permitted, wondering whether Sir Nelson Keyes was troubled with rheumatism ... Obviously Berry Dodge's long, thin head was becoming bald. (P371-372)

Both the Knowls' party and this party given by Letty are similar in their social agenda. The meaningless, dull conversation leaves Lester musing on balding heads and rheumatism. If Lester had connected this social event to the last one he attended years earlier, he would have recognized that his life was always better with Jennie. By this time, however, Lester has become what he feared most, a materialistic socialite. This is
what Letty recognizes when she tells him "[y]ou're too much of a social figure to drift. You ought to get back into the social and financial world where you belong" (P340; H744). The restoration of the excised passage helps us to recognize that Lester marries Letty for her money, rather than for love, an issue that is not clear in the 1911 edition.⁴ Jennie is always the bigger woman, the better woman, the woman whom Lester really loves. Throughout his life, even when they are apart, she remains the only woman he ever truly found "worth while" (P146). In an passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes that despite their split, Lester "had never separated from Jennie mentally" (P407). As he tells her when he is dying, "You're the only woman I ever did truly love" (P410; H815).

Dreiser, then, had in these passages excised by the Harper editors, emphasized the enormous differences between the wealthy and the poor and clarified Jennie's motivation in leaving her family for Lester. Unlike the Kanes and the socialites who shun Jennie, the reader sees Jennie in her true light. She is a daughter of poverty, whose life has been defined by her desperate circumstances. Nevertheless, despite her poverty and desperate circumstances, she remains good and loving, selflessly responding to the needs of those around her and the beauty inherent in the larger natural order of the world. Without a clear apprehension of the Gerhardts' poverty, however, it is difficult to comprehend Jennie's predicament. In turn, the intricate description of the Kanes' wealth helps us to fully comprehend the extent of the Gerhardts' desperate situation. Dreiser

⁴ See chapter seven for a fuller discussion of the way in which Letty and Lester's relationship is altered by the Harper editors to appear more romantic than materialistic.
clearly wanted his readers to see what it meant to be poverty-stricken in a country where people lived in homes with "a chamber large enough for social dancing" (P139).

Together with smaller excisions, the editor's excision of these passages depicting the Gerhardt poverty, the opulence of the Columbus hotel, and the Kane's wealth destroys Dreiser's careful oppositional framework. These environments have shaped characters' feelings, experiences, attitudes, and actions, and, they cannot be overlooked or seen as insignificant, even by a Harper editor.
Fathers, Daughters, and Cultural Identity

At the time Theodore Dreiser began writing *Jennie Gerhardt*, America was fast becoming the industrial center of the world. Immigrants from all parts of Europe flocked to this New World to become part of a developing economy that promised financial security and political and religious freedoms. These immigrants brought their skills as craftsmen and farmers, helping to strengthen the agricultural and industrial infrastructure of America at a time when it was most needed. They also brought social traditions and religious values that differed radically from the sense of individualism that pervaded the country at the turn of the century. Rather than assimilate into the existing pattern of Americanism, many immigrants fought vigorously to maintain their cultural traditions. In the person of Jennie's father, William Gerhardt, *Jennie Gerhardt* is partly a story about such an immigrant experience.

The Harper editors, however, changed William Gerhardt's characterization in four specific ways. First, by removing passages explaining his fidelity to the traditional German ethics of honesty, integrity, and discipline, they destroyed the strong ethnic element in Gerhardt's character. Second, by removing passages explaining the nature and importance of the church in the immigrant community, they reduced the complexity of his religiosity to mere fanaticism. Third, by removing passages depicting his affection towards his family and his sorrow in not being able to provide for them, they made him appear more unfeeling than the original manuscript suggests. These changes to passages depicting his relationship with his family are especially destructive to the original reading of his relationship with Jennie. In the original manuscript, although he is cruel to her when he finds out she is pregnant, they eventually become extremely
close, and from her he learns the meaning of true goodness. The editors' revision of
certain passages depicting Jennie and her father's relationship, however, obscures the
growth of love and affection between the father and daughter. Fourth, the editors
removed material depicting the love and devotion Gerhardt feels towards his
granddaughter Vesta. They also improved somewhat Dreiser's portrayal of this
relationship by changing some of Dreiser's ambiguous references to Vesta to make them
more personal.

Although we cannot know why the editors at Harper revised Gerhardt's character
so extensively, we do know that at the time of Jennie Gerhardt's publication, anti-
German sentiment was on the rise:

Even before America became directly involved as a combatant in 1917, the United States was flooded with anti-German propaganda, especially from Britain . . . . Anti-German feeling among Americans was not confined to Germany, but extended quickly to the whole German culture and to German Americans. . . . (Sowell 65)

The anti-German sentiment was so strong in America that "German books were
removed from the shelves of American libraries, German language courses were
canceled in the public schools, readers and advertisers boycotted German-American
newspapers" (Sowell 65). The pervading climate certainly would have encouraged the
Harper editors to ignore Dreiser's complex characterization of this German immigrant.
Their version of Gerhardt as a rigid, fanatically religious German immigrant would have
been more readily acceptable to most readers at the time.

In the original text, William Gerhardt must contend not only with economic
forces that threaten the survival of his family but also with cultural forces that seem to
threaten the very essence of his and his family's identity. As a first-generation German
immigrant, Gerhardt attempts to maintain the order of his and his family's life according to the values and traditions of his German heritage. The result of this attempt is a battle of wills between himself and other members of his family that, in Dreiser's original manuscript, can make him seem occasionally fanatical and even cruel. By cutting out a great deal of material that helped to place his concerns and actions within a larger cultural background, the Harper editors reduced him to a stereotypical cultural and religious fanatic. When these passages are restored in the Pennsylvania edition, Gerhardt's fidelity to his heritage, which some see as a too rigid adherence to social standards, is manifest also in sensitive acts of love and protection toward his family.

Critical responses to Dreiser's portrayal of the immigrant's cultural struggle has generally been positive. Dreiser's most passionate supporter, H.L. Mencken, also of German extraction, lauded Dreiser's attempt to portray the German immigrant experience and urged him to have Jennie Gerhardt and Twelve Men translated into German because "the Germans would understand both" (Dreiser-Mencken 370). In Homage to Theodore Dreiser, Robert Penn Warren sees Dreiser's intense awareness of cultural and ethnic differences as the force that shaped both the thematic content and form of much of his early fiction: "Theodore Dreiser was the immigrant and though he himself had been born in America, his family was not of this world. He was an outsider . . ." (10). Likewise, Thomas P. Riggio states that "Dreiser could . . . be listed among the first writers of the modern period to deal extensively and sympathetically with immigrant and ethnic life in America" (54). Discussing the restored text, Arthur D. Casciato adds that Dreiser's ethnic concerns reflect the assimilation of the immigrant into American culture. In Jennie Gerhardt, he states, "the relationship between the Old
and New worlds is not simply polarized but is instead more complex and usefully imagined as convergent" (172).

In light of such commonly positive responses to Dreiser's complex portrayal of the immigrants' experience, it seems odd that critics would judge so harshly Dreiser's most blatantly ethnic character, William Gerhardt. Traditional scholarship on *Jennie Gerhardt* has seen Gerhardt as oppressive, even tyrannical, fanatically opposed to Jennie's natural expressions of goodness and love. Donald Pizer says that he personifies the "narrow and prohibitive absolutes of social morality and formal religion" that judge and punish Jennie for expressing a "warm and generous spirit" (106). Miriam Gogol states that his moral tyranny is so oppressive that he makes his children feel as though they have "individually inherited some kind of curse" ("That boy" 101).

Such critics often seem to associate Gerhardt with Dreiser's own father. Miriam Gogol, for instance, calls Gerhardt a "prototype of Dreiser's own father" ("That boy" 101). Christopher P. Wilson states that Dreiser's "paternal portraiture" is based on "historical fidelity" to his own father's life (107). Carol A. Schwartz states in more general terms that "[t]he Gerhardt family is . . . the barely fictionalized Dreiser clan" (19), and Richard Lehan adds that "Mr. Gerhardt is an exact duplicate of Dreiser's father" (82). For Dreiser, however, the immigrant experience was not only his own experience but was also America's experience. When Dreiser created Old Gerhardt, he wished to portray a character that all immigrants could recognize as sharing in their experience. In Gerhardt, therefore, he does not merely recreate his father, but perhaps a character who, though he transcends any one historical person, responds as perhaps most immigrants would to this new "foreign" environment. Certainly the Harper edition
gives these critics warrant to compare Gerhardt to John Paul Dreiser. When Gerhardt is taken out of his ethnic circumstances, as he is in the Harper edition, his reactions to his family and to his American environment seem fanatical and even cruel, which is how Dreiser writes about his own father.

The most extensive cuts made to passages depicting Gerhardt appear in chapter six of the Pennsylvania and Harper texts. In this chapter, the narrator introduces us to Gerhardt with a long description (143 lines) of his specifically ethnic virtues. Of the 143 lines, the Harper editors cut seventy-nine (P50-51). Many of these lines describe Gerhardt's German business ethic of honesty, integrity, and prompt payment of his debts. In *The German Element in the United States*, Albert Bernhardt Faust states that the German, in both personal and business relations, always "pays his debts," as "[h]onesty is the virtue which is the foundation of all business enterprises" (467).¹ This virtue is evident in Dreiser's original portrayal of Gerhardt. In the Pennsylvania edition, Gerhardt is barely able to feed his family, yet he insists on paying his debts dollar for dollar, even though it means that he will do without; it is a trait that "came unto his veins undiminished" from his "sturdy German" "inheritance" (excised from Harper text P50). Also exemplary is the spirit in which he practices such honesty. He finds in his unquestionable integrity "a deep-seated happiness" (excised from Harper text P50).

Dreiser's portrayal of Gerhardt's honesty makes it easier for the reader to understand why he insists on working both day and night to pay his bills. His family

¹ Faust also states that the German was known for his "respect for the law, honesty and promptness in the discharge of business obligations, dogged persistence, industry, and economy" (465).
thinks he is being overly "zealous" (P62; H513), but he says that "[w]hen people stop me on the street and ask me for money, I have no time to sleep" (P62; H513). The restored passages also help us to better understand Mrs. Gerhardt, who, in a tender passage excised from the Harper edition, "sympathiz[es] . . . with the anxiety that brought such marked lines of care to [Gerhardt's] face" (P62). In the restored text, we see that Gerhardt's actions are ruled not so much by blind duty as by a distinctly German set of virtues and predilections. After Gerhardt's death, even Lester admits that "he had admired the old German for several sterling qualities" (P348; H754).

Further weakening the Harper's depiction of Gerhardt is another large cut in the same passage that describes his integrity. The opening passages describe Gerhardt's rigid religiosity, but Dreiser carefully balances it with the following passage:

Gerhardt felt, rather than reasoned. He had always done so. A slap on the back, accompanied by enthusiastic protestations of affection or regard, was always worth more to him than mere cold propositions concerning his own individual advancement. He loved companionship, and was easily persuaded by it, but never beyond the limits of honesty. (P50)

This passage was cut from the Harper text, and replaced with "Gerhardt was an honest man, and he liked to think that others appreciated him" (H503). A similar passage later in the text, also cut from the Harper edition, adds to this description of Gerhardt. In this passage he admits that "[h]e craved attention and affection" from his granddaughter, Vesta (P272). The restored passages reveal that Gerhardt is a human being who longs for "companionship," much like any one else, and that companionship is more important to him than personal "advancement." Without these and other excised passages we are unable to see Gerhardt clearly as a decent, hard-working old German, whose honesty and integrity are the foundation of his character.
As these passages demonstrate, Gerhardt strongly believes that money should never have the power to determine one's behavior, especially when he must protect his family against predators. Despite his desperate financial situation, for instance, Gerhardt refuses to place Jennie in a compromising situation with Senator Brander, even though to do so would insure the family’s financial survival. When Jennie explains that Brander wants to "help them," Gerhardt angrily retorts that "[h]e is too old" for her, and that no man of integrity would have compromised her reputation by taking her out "after dark" without her father's permission. He tells Brander "you are no man of honorable intentions, or you would not come taking up with a little girl who is only old enough to be your daughter" (P58-60; H510-511). Although Brander has been generous to the family, Gerhardt understands that his generosity is motivated by self-interest. Regarding his relationship with Jennie, Brander thinks to himself: "He had not so very many more years to live. Why die unsatisfied?" (P40; H494).²

In other passages excised from the 1911 edition, Dreiser is even clearer about Brander's motivations. In the following scene, after finding out that Brander has been taking Jennie out behind his back, Gerhardt tells him that he cannot see Jennie again. In the Pennsylvania edition, Brander's thoughts following this argument are as follows:

As for the Senator, he went away decidedly ruffled by this crude occurrence. Strong as was [Brander's] interest in Jennie, and fine as were his words, there remained an unavoidable sense of stooping, and of being involved among unfortunate and tainted circumstances. Neighborhood

² Donald Pizer states that Old Gerhardt's "moralism arises out of his desire to protect his family against an alien culture. His instinctive suspicion of Brander, despite Brander's good intentions, is of this nature." The Novels of Theodore Dreiser: A Critical Study (Minneapolis: U of Minn. P., 1976) 126.
slanders are bad enough on their own plane, but for a man of his standing to descend and become involved in one, struck him now as being a little bit common. He did not understand the religious disposition of the father. Only the ripening and alluring beauty of his protégé remained, a subtle fragrance hanging over all, which saved him from absolute disgust with himself. He thought that he would do something about it in the future, but did not know the variation and vacillation of his own disposition.

Time went by and he lingered speculating. A week or so later, he was called to Washington. (P61)

In the 1911 edition, this scene is revised as follows:

As for the senator, he went away decidedly ruffled by this crude occurrence. Neighborhood slanders are bad enough on their own plane, but for a man of his standing to descend and become involved in one struck him now as being a little bit unworthy. He did not know what to do about the situation, and while he was trying to come to some decision several days went by. Then he was called to Washington . . . . (H512)

The lines describing Brander's feelings toward Jennie and her family were removed. The first passage speaks specifically to Brander's belief that he is decidedly superior to Old Gerhardt, whose attempt to protect Jennie he sees as "unfortunate and tainted circumstances." Also, though Brander wants to believe that he loves Jennie as he would a woman of his class, he has the sense that he is "stooping" in his relation with her.

Gerhardt understands Brander, and he asserts his paternal authority to keep Jennie from being hurt: "When I first met you," he tells Brander, "I thought you were a fine man, but now, since I see the way you conduct yourself with my daughter, I don't want anything more to do with you" (P60; H511). Unfortunately, as Gerhardt fears, Brander later seduces Jennie at her weakest moment, and then leaves her, albeit accidentally, pregnant, unwed, and poverty-stricken. Similar passages concerning Gerhardt's distrust of Lester Kane were also excised from the original manuscript. When Jennie announces to her family that she and Lester will be married, for instance, Gerhardt, in an excised
passage, remains "doubtful," not because he cannot believe such a man could want Jennie, but because Lester refuses to stay in their home when he comes to visit (P174). The restored passages, therefore, make Gerhardt a more complex character than he is in the Harper edition. He does not act with blind tyranny but is clearly motivated by a desire to protect his family and to live an honest life.

Besides these passages that define Gerhardt's specifically German sense of honesty and integrity, the Harper editors also removed passages that speak to the way in which his Lutheran religion motivates him to act. In the old country, the church community was an extension of the family, and in the New World this attachment became a means of social and cultural survival: "The very process of adjusting immigration to the conditions of life in the United States," says Oscar Handlin, "made religion paramount as a way of life" (105). Church leaders guided the immigrant in every facet of his life, especially child-rearing. In Jennie Gerhardt, the Lutheran Pastor Wundt functions in this way. The Harper editors, however, removed his only sermon in Dreiser's manuscript. In the Pennsylvania text:

'Such shamelessness!' he used to say. 'Such indifference to all youthful reserve and innocence!—Here they go, these young boys, loafing about the street corners, when they should be at home helping their fathers and mothers, or studying and improving their minds.' And the girls—what bitter scenes had he of late not been compelled to contemplate. There was laxness some where. These fathers and mothers, whose daughters walked the streets after seven at night, and were seen strolling in the shadowy path of the trees and hanging over gates and fences talking to young men, would rue it some day. There was no possible good to come out of anything like that. The boys could only evolve into loafers and scoundrels, the daughters into something too shameless to name. Let there be heed taken of this.
Gerhardt and his wife and Jennie heard this, and, so indeed did all the others except Sebastian . . . (P52)

In the 1911 version, this same passage reads:

Gerhardt, his wife, and also Jennie accepted the doctrines of their church expounded by Mr. Wundt without reserve. (H504)

The purpose of Pastor Wundt’s sermon is twofold. First it explains the immigrant community’s emphasis on adhering to traditional American social and moral codes. Second, it helps us understand the moral and social context of Gerhardt’s actions when he lashes out against members of his family whom he thinks are acting immorally. Dreiser uses Pastor Wundt’s sermon to present a major facet of the immigrant experience. Like Dreiser himself, Pastor Wundt understood that the immigrant, as an outsider, had to work harder to be respected and accepted in the new world. Immigrant children would be criticized more harshly than American children for "loafing about street corners" or "hanging over fences talking to young men." Discrimination was common and the immigrant knew that a few "loafers and scoundrels" could ruin the reputation of an entire community. A German Lutheran immigrant proudly told Faust that "in the course of nineteen years only one of them has ever been brought to a place of shame or punishment" (467). The first-generation immigrant community, therefore, including the Clergy, worked to ensure the success of all its members by emphasizing the need of the family to adhere to American social and moral laws. Only by rearing children as good as or better than the "Americans," could the German immigrant community hope to become accepted in American society. As Leonard Dinnerstein and David M. Reimers explain, "the security derived from the family, ethnic neighborhood,
school, [and] church . . . hastened the day when the immigrant child or grandchild could stand securely on his own and move into the mainstream of American life" (35).

Dreiser portrays another form of the immigrant's desire to "fit in" to the American community in his creation of Gerhardt's oldest son, Bass. The Harper editors, however, also obscured this portrayal. In passages cut from the original text, Bass is described as "vigorous and self-willed," a "dandy," who had "got in with half-dozen other young boys, who knew Columbus and its possibilities thoroughly, and with them he fraternized until he was a typical stripling of the town" (P11). Unlike his father, Bass is under the "illusion" that "appearances" are worth more than honest labor (P11). Ashamed of his family's heritage, Bass will not allow them to associate with him in public, and he is eventually thrown in jail for punching a policeman to escape being caught stealing coal. His desire to escape seems motivated more by the social shame of being associated with an impoverished immigrant family than by moral shame for stealing coal. For hitting the policeman—not for stealing coal—the judge fines him ten dollars and puts him in jail until the fine is paid. Besides enduring the shame of association he sought to avoid, he imposes a great burden on the family. In a passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes, "[t]en dollars is ten dollars, and when one who is a day laborer is wanting it there are not so many resources" (P68). It is when Jennie goes to Senator Brander to beg for the ten dollars to get her brother out of jail that he seduces her and she becomes pregnant with their daughter.

Pastor Wundt's sermon also helps the reader to understand Gerhardt's reaction to Jennie's pregnancy. As a pious Lutheran, he considers himself responsible for his daughter's behavior even as an adult. If children go astray, as Pastor Wundt has said, it
is because "[t]here was laxness somewhere" on the part of the "fathers and mothers." If the father fails in his task, he will surely be held accountable. Dreiser writes, 

"[Gerhardt] trembled, not only for himself, but for his wife and children. Would he not some day be held responsible for them. Would not his own laxity and lack of system in inculcating the laws of eternal life to them end in his and their damnation?" (P53; H504). Therefore, when Gerhardt ostracizes Jennie, pregnant and alone, from the family home, he is also condemning himself for allowing her moral downfall, and he is protecting his other children from a similar fate. Had he been a better parent, had he instilled in his children the proper virtues, Jennie would not have gotten pregnant. Gerhardt clearly expresses such a sense in a passage cut from the Harper edition. He tells his wife, "If I had not let her alone, she would be a better woman today" (P182). He says the same thing to Bass after his arrest for stealing coal: "It is my fault that I should let you do that" (P64; H515). He clearly includes himself in the blame for his children's acts of immorality and disrespect. Pastor Wundt's excised sermon, therefore, together with these passages, show the motive for Gerhardt's sometimes seemingly tyranny and unfeeling actions. With these passages excised, however, Gerhardt's actions toward Jennie seem not only insensitive but egocentric and irrational.

Other cuts also obscure Gerhardt's characterization as a German immigrant. Two larger cuts specifically concerning the traditional authority Gerhardt must exercise over his children were cut in their entirety. In the Old Country, as in the New World, the father was the undisputed head of the household, his authority deriving from the fact that he provided economically for the family.
[T]he [immigrant] father's traditional status as head of the family was reinforced by the fact that he managed it as a producing unit. Conversely, the subordination of wife and children was accentuated by the fact that they were subalterns in an economic enterprise. (Warner and Srole 104)

In Jennie Gerhardt, Gerhardt's sense of authority over his family is constantly threatened by his inability to provide for them economically. Cuts made in chapter one, especially, obscure this portrayal. In this opening chapter we are made aware that the desperate situation of Gerhardt's family is due largely to his illness and the state of affairs in the glass-blowing industry. He is, in other words, a victim of circumstance, placed in a situation that is out of his control. Each day he is forced to swallow his pride and rely on the generosity of other people and the hard work of his wife and oldest daughter to ensure the family's survival. In the following scene, the bracketed portion of the passage was removed in the 1911 Harper edition.

Thus, they lived from day to day, each hour hoping their father would get well and that the glass works would start up. The whole commercial element seemed more or less paralyzed in this district. Gerhardt was facing the approaching winter and felt desperate.

['George,' he would say when the oldest of those attending school would come home at four o'clock, 'we must have some more coal,' and seeing Martha, William, and Veronica unwillingly gather up their baskets, would hide his face and wring his hands. When Sebastian or 'Bass' as his associates had transformed it, would arrive streaked and energetic from the shop at half-past six, he would assume a cheerful air of welcome.

'How are things down there?' he would inquire. 'Are they going to put on any more men?'

Bass did not know, and had no faith in its possibility, but he went over the ground with his father and hoped for the best.]

'I must get out of this now pretty soon,' was the sturdy Lutheran's regular comment, and his anxiety found but weak expression in the modest quality of his voice. (P5; H461)
In the excised passages, Dreiser was trying to achieve an intricate balance between the love Gerhardt feels for his children and the authority he believes he must exercise over them. The Harper editors' removal of the children's names diminishes the reader's sense of Gerhardt's emotional intimacy with his family. In the restored passage it is clear that Gerhardt is ashamed at having to send his children out into the cold to steal coal for the family fire, even though it is a necessity. In his shame, he reacts by "hid[ing] his face and wring[ing] his hands." The restored passage demonstrates that Gerhardt's anguish is a direct result of his family's suffering, and that his role as patriarch carries an emotional burden.

Additional passages in this early part of the novel clarifying Gerhardt's shame and sadness in having to force his children into such desperate acts as gathering coal at the rail yard were also cut from the Harper text. In chapter three of both the Pennsylvania and Harper editions, for instance, Jennie and her siblings have just returned from gathering coal at the train station. While collecting coal, Jennie sees Senator Brander, who had "newly arrived from Washington . . . upon the express" (P29; H483). Upon seeing him, Jennie turns and runs: "the desire to flee," says the narrator, "was attributable to what she considered the disgrace of her position" (P31; H485). This is the only passage in the text wherein Dreiser describes Jennie as being directly humiliated by her poverty. Usually, as in the present passage, she volunteers for such duties as collecting coal, washing clothes, and cleaning hotels, so that her family can be more comfortable. In this instance, however, Brander's presence makes her feel shame: "She was ashamed to think that he, who thought so well of her, should discover her doing so common a thing" (P31; H485). When she returns home, she is clearly
distraught. The following passage from the Pennsylvania text describes Gerhardt's reaction to her distress. The bracketed lines were removed from the Harper text:

'What is it?' said Gerhardt . . .

'Oh nothing,' said the mother, who hated to explain the significance which the senator's personality had come to have in their lives. 'A man frightened them when they were bringing the coal.'

[Gerhardt looked the distress he felt, but could say nothing. It was all too bad that his children must be subjected to this, but what could he do? Seeing the rest of them laughing over it and looking upon it in the light of a joke, he smiled also.

'We'll buy some coal pretty soon, maybe,' he added.]

The arrival of Christmas presents, later in the evening, threw the household into an uproar of excitement. (P31; H48S)

By this excision, the Harper editors not only took Gerhardt out of Jennie's experience, but completely diffused the pathos of the situation. Gerhardt, who, in the original passage, is directly connected to Jennie through his emphatic feelings for her humiliation, has been rewritten to seem unsympathetic towards her. In essence, once the passage is removed, he does not react to her plight at all. When the Harper passage picks up with the family receiving Christmas presents from an anonymous donor, this subtle but intimate connection between Jennie and her father is lost, with the emphasis now on the happiness and joy the family feels in receiving Christmas presents. The reader's attention has been shifted from Jennie's humiliation and her father's sympathetic response to Senator Brander's anonymous generosity.

---

The Harper editors also removed Mrs. Gerhardt's reaction to Jennie's chance meeting with Senator Brander: "Mrs. Gerhardt . . . secretly appreciated and sympathized with her feelings. It was too bad, she thought, that the distinguished senator should know" (P31).
A similar excision expressing Gerhardt's understanding of how his inability to provide for his family has left them destitute occurs in chapter nineteen of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter twenty-one of the Harper edition. In this chapter, Gerhardt has come home after having his hands burned in a glass-blowing accident at the plant in which he worked. In both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, he returns to the family "very pale . . . . His hands were heavily bandaged . . . . The two fingers had been amputated at the first joint . . . ." (P150, 151; H590). In the Pennsylvania edition, however, he does not feel sorry for himself but instead recognizes the enormous burden his accident has placed on his family. In the following passage, the bracketed lines were removed by the Harper editors:

'By chops!' he added, 'just at the time when I needed the money most. Too bad! Too bad!

[Then he shook his head in a very mournful way

Bass endeavored to reassure him, but he was very well aware of the calamity he was facing. It was a dreadful thing, and he didn't know what to do.]

When they reached the house and Mrs. Gerhardt opened the door, the old mill-worker, now conscious of her extreme sympathy, began to cry. (P151; H590)

Although the Harper scene still maintains some sympathy for Old Gerhardt, the Pennsylvania version portrays him as a father whose first concern is always for his family: "he was very well aware of the calamity he was facing." In addition, the restored passage shows that Gerhardt is quick to acknowledge the role poverty has played in bringing about his family's often desperate circumstances. This is also seen when Gerhardt realizes that if Jennie wants to remain with Lester, she will have to hide
her child from him: "There was nothing to do but wait . . . " he thinks to himself. "He wanted to get out of this mess of poverty and earn something" (P174). The latter part of this passage was emended by the Harper editors to read "deception and dishonesty" rather than "poverty" (H611). In the Pennsylvania text, the Gerhardts suffer not simply because Jennie gives birth to an illegitimate child but because they cannot break through their walls of poverty despite their honesty and hard work. Their efforts are futile in a world that recognizes only those at the top of the economic ladder. The Harper emendation, on the other hand, shifts the blame from an uncontrollable social force back to Jennie herself.

This pattern of cuts and emendations made to Gerhardt's ethnic and authoritarian characteristics is also evident in Dreiser's creation of the intricate, yet intimate relationship between Gerhardt and Jennie. As discussed earlier, Gerhardt's motivation in ostracizing Jennie from the home is tangled up with his religious values. Even though we can better understand Gerhardt's motivation after certain cuts and emendations are restored, we may still find it difficult to accept Gerhardt's cruelty towards Jennie once he finds out about her pregnancy. In turn, though, his cruelty allows us to realize more clearly Jennie's all-giving qualities. Her immense sympathy and love for her father even though he has treated her harshly are most apparent in chapter nineteen of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter twenty-one of the Harper edition, when Gerhardt has just arrived home after having been injured in an accident. The reunion in the original text is sympathetic yet realistic, a delicate balance that is broken in the 1911 edition through extensive cutting of lines that concern Jennie and Gerhardt.
After the family is reunited, Jennie's reunion with her father in the Pennsylvania edition is as follows:

When Jennie came home that night she wanted to come close to her father in this crisis and lay the treasury of her services and affection at his feet, but she trembled lest he might be as cold to her as formerly.

On his part, Gerhardt was also troubled. Never had he completely recovered from the shame which his daughter had brought upon him. The fact that she had been taken back, was here, and was leading an honest life were things which he was perfectly ready and willing to weigh in the balance, but, somehow, his pronunciamento upon what she deserved had served to hold him from any personal contact with her the last time he was here. Now he tried to think of some way in which a peaceful dwelling under the same roof could be effected. Although he wanted to be kindly, his feelings were so tangled that he hardly knew what to do.

Jennie came in and, with that feeling of affection and sorrow, now so overwhelmingly strong in her approached him.

'Papa,' she said.

Gerhardt looked confused and tried to say something natural, but it was unavailing. The thought of his helplessness, the knowledge of her sorrow--and he broke down and cried helplessly. (P151-152)

The Harper version of this scene reads as follows:

When Jennie came home that night she wanted to run to her father and lay the treasury of her services and affection at his feet, but she trembled lest he might be as cold to her as formerly.

Gerhardt, too, was troubled. Never had he completely recovered from the shame which his daughter had brought upon him. Although he wanted to be kindly, his feelings were so tangled that he hardly knew what to do.

'Papa,' Jennie said approaching him timidly.

Gerhardt looked confused and tried to say something natural, but it was unavailing. The thought of his helplessness, the knowledge of her sorrow
and of his own responsiveness to her affection—it was all too much for him; he broke down again and cried helplessly. (H591)

Although the Harper revision maintains the general idea of the reading, it fails to acknowledge the complexity of emotions that are "tangled" within Gerhardt. His old world pride makes it difficult for him to forgive her for bringing shame upon him, and yet he cannot overlook her honesty, a trait he holds in high esteem, and it wins out over her "sin." In turn, he finds himself responding to her when she comes in the room.

Jennie, sensing his sympathy, wants desperately to be close to him. The revision, with its emphasis on Jennie's "timidity," however, places her in a subservient position, afraid to face her own father, which is not what Dreiser's original words suggest. Jennie loves her father very much even though he has treated her badly. In the excised passage, her feelings of "affection and sorrow" are "overwhelmingly strong in her." The deep emotion Jennie feels for her father evokes in the reader a sympathy for Gerhardt and a respect for Jennie.

By the end of the restored passage, Dreiser has helped us work out our tangled emotions by writing that Gerhardt breaks down and cries, for "his helplessness, her sorrow for his state, his own responsiveness to her affection, [and] his gratitude for her tears" (P152). The emended version, however, robs the scene of its most vital and touching lines. When "her sorrow for his state" is reduced to "her sorrow" we can easily

4 A similar passage was removed in chapter twelve of the Harper edition. After the family has moved to Cleveland, Gerhardt, who stays behind to work, returns for Christmas. This is the first time Jennie has seen her father since he ostracized her from the family. In an excised passage she admits she wished to "be allowed to put her arms around his neck and kiss him, as she had been accustomed to do on his return" (P112).
misread it to mean her sorrow for having gotten pregnant and humiliated her family, which is clearly not the sense the original passage expresses. The deep feelings between Jennie and her father transcend the issue of her pregnancy. This moment is about the depth and complexity of the father's and daughter's emotional responses to each other, not about Jennie's "sin." Jennie's consistent and gentle patience with Gerhardt, as expressed in the above restored passage, is what eventually teaches him the true meaning of love.

The editors also removed a later passage that develops from the above restored passage and shows Gerhardt's sympathy and affection for Jennie that overcomes his pride and emotional reserve. The result is that Gerhardt's growing understanding of and appreciation for Jennie is destroyed, and we see his eventual connection to her as momentary, rather than having taken years to develop. In this next passage, all the Gerhardt children have left Old Gerhardt to go their own way. He takes a job as a night watchman in a "great rambling furniture company in one of the poorest sections of the city" (P253; H677). Jennie writes him to come and live with her and Lester in their expensive Hyde Park home. In the Pennsylvania text, Gerhardt's response is as follows:

He had lived alone this long time now—should he go to Chicago and stay with her? It did have an appeal, but somehow he decided against it. That would be too quick an acknowledgment of general forgiveness. Still, of all his children, who had come to him or offered him release in this way? Jennie only. And her offer breathed sincere affection, that he knew. (P252)

The Harper version reads,

He had lived alone this long time now—should he go to Chicago and live with Jennie. Her appeal did touch him, but somehow he decided against it. That would be too generous an acknowledgment of the fact that there had been fault on his side as well as hers. (H677)
Jennie's response to his rejection is to visit him and plead for his acceptance, and in the Pennsylvania edition, Gerhardt's reaction is as follows:

He threw out his hands after his characteristic manner. The whole decency of it touched him to the quick. 'Yes, I come,' he said and turned, but she saw by his shoulders what was happening. He was crying.

(P253)

The Harper version reads

He threw out his hands after his characteristic manner. The urgency of her appeal touched him to the quick. 'Yes, I come,' he said and turned; but she saw by his shoulders what was happening. He was crying.

(H678)

The revisions made to these passages obscure Old Gerhardt's true feelings toward his daughter. Although he cannot bring himself to accept her initial offer, he recognizes that she, of all his children, is truly good, the only one "who had come to him or offered him release in this way." This acknowledgment is the beginning of wisdom for him. Over the next few years, Jennie's "sincere affection" will soften him, and by the time of his death, he will have "come to realize very clearly that his outcast daughter was goodness itself." He asks for Jennie's forgiveness, explaining: "I understand a lot of things I didn't." "We get wiser as we get older" (P345; H749). By cutting and emending so much of these first three passages, the Harper editors destroyed Dreiser's emphasis on Jennie's sincere devotion to her father and his deep abiding affection for her despite his peculiar and sometimes cruel behavior. In turn, our perception of her as selfless and deeply loving is weakened.

In addition, changing the word "decency" to "urgency of her appeal" in the last passage also obscures Dreiser's emphasis on Gerhardt's burgeoning wisdom. As yet, "decency" is not a word Gerhardt has ever associated with Jennie's behavior. As a
matter of fact, it has always been the opposite. Thus, his acknowledgment of her "decency" in her continuing sympathy towards him reveals the power of her love. It is so real and so consistent that it can change people. In turn, Gerhardt's emotional reaction to her "decency" reveals his recognition of and response to her true goodness, and we feel sympathy towards him. To change the word "decency" to "urgency" destroys the pathos intended for this passage. As a whole, then, the revisions made to the above passages flatten our reading of William Gerhardt, and render his relationship with Jennie not as sympathetic as it is in the restored version. The intensity of Jennie's relationship with her father, as depicted in the original writing of the above passages, enables us to see that there is more to Gerhardt than religious fanaticism and moral rigidity.

Additionally, we also come to see Gerhardt's tender nature when we examine his relationship with Jennie's child, Vesta, who becomes the means by which Gerhardt is reunited with his banished daughter. When Gerhardt accepts Vesta as a member of the family, Dreiser reemphasizes his position as the traditional authority figure in his home. Because Vesta has no father, Gerhardt moves into the role and immediately begins connecting with her in the same way he connected with his own children: "It was during this most halcyon period, which now ensued after they moved into the new house, that Gerhardt showed his finest traits of fatherhood toward the little outcast," Dreiser writes in a passage excised from the Harper edition (P183). In another passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator states: "There was a lovelier side to this sordid story . . . Gerhardt . . . was both father and mother to [Vesta] (P182).
In both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, the scene of Vesta's baptism is pivotal in establishing Gerhardt's relation with her. In this scene, Gerhardt's stern Lutheran faith is directly challenged by his deep feelings for the "little outcast." It is a time when "[a]ll the forces of his conventional understanding of morality and his natural sympathetic and fatherly disposition were battling within him . . ." (P112; H556). In this scene, his rigid adherence to Lutheran moral doctrine, a stumbling block to his relationship with Jennie, must become the avenue by which he will bring this "outcast" back into the family fold.

In the passages presenting this scene, certain emendations made by the Harper editors helped rather than hindered the careful balance Dreiser was attempting to create between Gerhardt's religious intentions and his fatherly feelings for his grandchild. West maintains these changes in the Pennsylvania edition. Although Gerhardt begins the baptismal ritual "satisfied that he had done his duty" (P115; H559), his religious feelings give way to those of "natural affection" (P114; H559). In both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, the chapter ends with a second reference to Old Gerhardt's "natural affection" towards Vesta (P117; H562). Although this phrase is only an intimation of his strong emotion for the little girl, it is all the reader needs to understand that Gerhardt is not completely controlled by "the stern religion with which he was enraptured . . ." (P115; H560). Dreiser's original phrase for the second reference, however, was "necessary kindness," rather than "natural affection," a term that makes Gerhardt seem to be acting out of religious duty, not fatherly affection towards the child. (West Table, P507). At such a moment in the scene "necessary kindness" seems oddly out-of-place since Dreiser has already described Gerhardt's "natural affection" for his granddaughter.
The Harper emendation better maintains the overall balance between Gerhardt's religiosity and his feelings of affection for Vesta that are evident throughout the baptismal scene.

West also adopts some other of the Harper editors' changes in the passage. In both texts, when Gerhardt is asked to stand as "Godfather to the child," his lifelong commitment to this new member of the family is insured (P113; H558). Dreiser, however, originally referred to "the child" as "it," an ambiguous pronoun, normally used to refer to inanimate objects (Tables 507). The juxtaposition of the terms "godfather" and "it" represent a relationship devoid of feeling and intimacy, and we see Gerhardt as merely performing a religious duty rather than forming an emotional bond with the little girl who will "twin[e] [her] helpless baby fingers around the tendons of his heart" (P183; H617). The emendation insures that we read this particular scene in a way that is consistent with what we eventually come to know about their relationship. There are also other instances where Dreiser refers to the child by the ambiguous pronoun "it" (Tables 539). Although one could argue that Dreiser was trying to avoid being repetitious, the choice of the term "it" over a variety of other more personal pronouns seems a poor choice. Emending them to read either "the child," "she," or "Vesta," restores the familial intimacy between Old Gerhardt and his granddaughter and infuses the scenes with a subtle but more powerful sympathy.

Despite these small improvements in the portrayal of Gerhardt's relations with his granddaughter, however, the Harper editors' revisions affecting Dreiser's portrayal of William Gerhardt result in a flat, stereotypical outsider's view of the immigrant. In the original manuscript Gerhardt is very religious, staunchly moral, and deeply convicted,
but he is also sympathetic and loving towards his family, even towards Jennie. The
complexity of his character is considerably reduced, if not lost, in the Harper edition. As
a result, we are prevented from seeing him with the same sympathy as Jennie, which
Dreiser, in his original manuscript, clearly intended us to share:

Jennie only wept sympathetically. She saw her father in perspective, the
long years of trouble he had had, the days in which he had had to saw
wood for a living, the days in which he had lived in a factory loft, the
little shabby house they had been compelled to live in in 13th Street, the
terrible days of suffering they had spent on Lorrie Street in Cleveland,
his grief over her, his grief over Mrs. Gerhardt, his love and care of
Vesta, and finally, these last days.

'Oh he was a good man,' she thought . . . . (P346-347; H751)
When Dreiser began writing *Jennie Gerhardt*, America's business economy was fast becoming one of the most important in the Western world. It was, as historian George Brown Tindall describes, "a fact of towering visibility" (747). American industrialization afforded millions of Americans opportunities for economic growth and upward mobility. Equally as many, however, remained in the depths of poverty, oftentimes exploited by those held up as successful. Dreiser wished to portray the truth about American life, including the greed and exploitation inherent in the business world. In *Jennie Gerhardt*, Dreiser's best representatives of this aspect of American society are Robert and Archibald Kane, both of whom not only use others for their own ends, but are willing to sacrifice relationships with their own family members in order to achieve the highest level of material success. The Harper editors, however, apparently to mute Dreiser's negative portrayal of American capitalism, cut a great deal of material specific to the characterization of Robert and Archibald.

In the Pennsylvania edition, Dreiser's portrayal of Robert and Archibald as men consumed with making money is clear and precise. Although the Kane family is extremely wealthy, Robert and Archibald are willing to sacrifice any employee, long-time friend, or even family member who gets in the way of higher profit margins. Dreiser emphasizes their greed in two ways: First, in three passages he reveals the immense differences in the way Lester and Robert do business. In these passages, Lester thinks more of the needs and concerns of other persons than of profits. In contrast, Robert is concerned only to increase his own wealth and power. We also see in these passages that Archibald favors Robert's business ethics over Lester's. Second, Dreiser
includes several passages that reveal not only Robert's wish that Lester remain
disenfranchised from the family business, but also his intent to overthrow Lester,
manipulate his sisters' voting power, and reorganize the family business into a trust that
will allow him to control the entire carriage manufacturing business. The final result is
that in Robert's and Archibald's merciless behavior towards others, especially toward
Lester, they represent the ruthlessness of American business.

All of these passages, however, were excised entirely from the 1911 edition. In
the Harper text, we see Robert as an aggressive businessman, but not so aggressive as to
actively usurp his brother's position to increase his own power. Thus, he comes to
represent what is positive about capitalism: If one works hard and makes aggressive,
intelligent, careful decisions, one will make money. In addition, the excisions tone
down Archibald's character so that we see him more as a caring father than as a ruthless
businessman. Moreover, the excised text makes his revision of his will the result of
Lester's relationship with Jennie rather than partially the result of Archibald's own
ruthless greed. As a whole, in the 1911 edition, the Kanes become more sympathetic,
which in turn destroys his sharp dichotomies between the Kane and Gerhardt families.

Critics of Jennie Gerhardt have concentrated largely on Archibald's reputation
in the novel for honesty and kindness. Evidence of such kindness is his attendance of
the funeral of "Old Zwingle, the yard watchman at the factory, who had been with Mr.

1 For discussions on Robert and Archibald, see Christopher P. Wilson's "Labor and
Capital in Jennie Gerhardt" and "Arthur D. Casciato's "How German is Jennie
Kane for over forty years" (P140; H583). Archibald's moments of kindness, however, occur only when he has no profit at stake. In the Pennsylvania edition, his obsession with wealth and power overshadow his token gestures of kindness. When his sensitivity and kindness conflict with his profit motive, such as when Lester suggests implementing a pension program, they dissolve into an airy nothing. The most glaring example of his coldness is the way he divides his assets in his will. Presumably because of Lester's unorthodox relationship with Jennie, Archibald excludes Lester from any activity in the family business.

In the revised will, Archibald stipulates that upon his death, Lester's share of the voting stock in the family business is to revert to Robert. Lester can claim his share only if he leaves Jennie within two years. Otherwise, he is not entitled to any part of the company: "[T]he remaining fifth of my various properties, real, personal, money, stocks, and bonds," Archibald writes, "[are] to be held in trust by [Robert] for the benefit of his brother Lester, until such time as such conditions as shall hereinafter be specified shall have been complied with" (P295-296). By making Lester's inheritance contingent upon his leaving Jennie, Archibald forces Lester's hand. Lester can claim his share only by acting toward one he loves as callously as would his father and brother. He must display a capacity to put his own profit before his or Jennie's feelings and affection. In addition, the restoration of certain excised passages reveal that in fact Archibald preferred that Lester be disconnected from the business, because unlike Robert, he was not ruthless enough to insure the company's success.

In the text, four specific passages speak directly to Archibald's belief that Robert is a better businessman because, unlike Lester, he will insure that the welfare of workers
and their families does not come before profits. Lester, on the other hand, believes that the company can both make a profit and treat its workers properly. Together, these four passages suggest not only that Archibald sees Robert as able to handle the business more effectively, but that he revises his will to force Lester to become more like Robert. The Harper editors excised two of the most important passages alluding to Archibald's support of Robert's business ethics and revised another. These changes alter Archibald's motives for rewriting his will.

Originally, Archibald planned to divide his wealth equally among his children, leaving the company to Robert and Lester: "As [Robert] understood it, his father was going to divide the stock of the company into halves first, giving [Robert] and Lester one fourth each in order that they might remain the dominant factors, as at present. The other half was to be divided into three equal parts, one part for each of the three daughters..." (excised from Harper text P188). At some point, however, Archibald changed his mind. In Dreiser's's original manuscript, by the time of his death, Archibald clearly believes that Lester's sympathetic and somewhat passive nature could harm the company. If the business is to thrive in the next century, it must stay competitive; it must keep prices down, and the only way to do so is to make the finances of the company the preeminent concern.

The first change the Harper editors made that subtly alters Archibald's perception of his sons occurs in chapter seventeen of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter nineteen in the Harper edition. In this chapter, we learn that of five children, Lester is Archibald's favorite because he has a "bigger mental grasp of the subtleties
which compose life" (P137; H581).² According to Archibald, Lester is "softer, more human, more good-natured about everything," and for these reasons "Lester was to be the most loved son" (P137-138; H581-582). Robert "was perhaps more to be trusted in the solution of any financial difficulty" (P138). This last line was emended by the Harper editors to read, "Perhaps he turned to Robert when it was a question of some intricate financial problem" (H581-582). The Harper emodation suggests that Archibald relies on Robert only for occasional help in answering questions. The emodation softens the emphasis Archibald places on Robert's ability to take action concerning the company's assets. In the original manuscript, it is clear that Archibald believes that only Robert, whom the narrator describes as neither "warm-hearted [n]or generous," can be "trusted" to insure the company's success. He is the only one who "would in fact turn any trick which could be speciously, or at least necessitously, recommended to his conscience" (P169; H607). On the other hand, Lester might place humane considerations before production or profit. In this way, very early in the text, Dreiser aligns Robert and Archibald with the business ethic prevalent at the turn of the century and which Dreiser believed was responsible for much of the misery he saw around him.

To his father and brother, Lester believes the company can be both profitable and humane. Lester's humane concerns are clearly evident in the second large excision of 44 lines. In the Pennsylvania edition, the most prominent of these lines read:

² This line was emended to read, "he had a larger vision of the subtleties which underlie life" (H581).
For one thing, the treatment of old employees was a thing which had never been settled to their mutual satisfaction. Robert was for running the business on a hard and cold basis, dropping the aged, who had grown up with his father, and cleaning out the 'dead wood' as he called it. Lester had stood in counsel for a more humane course.

'I'm not going to see these old fellows who have grown up with this business thrown out bag and baggage, without anything, if I can help it. It isn't right. This house has made money. It can afford to be decent. I know a business has got to be conducted on a hard and fast basis in the main, but this thing of cleaning them all out without anything don't appeal to me. We could afford to get up a pension scheme which would take care of the most deserving. This house has made money.'

'There you go, Lester, saddling a new item on the cost of production,' protested his brother. 'But it isn't wise. This house is in the lead today, but there are other carriage companies. We can't afford to take any more chances or saddle ourselves with any more expenses than if we were beginners. The business of this concern is to make money, just as much as it can. . . .'

Kane senior . . . was rather inclined to agree with Robert commercially, though sympathetically and ethically he thought that Lester had the more decent end of the argument. . . .

'I like Lester,' his brother would reply. 'He's too easy for his own good though. He won't get anywhere by taking the other fellow into consideration.'

Kane senior agreed with this also. . . .' (P170-171)

The Harper version of this scene is reduced to the following:

Lester was for building up trade through friendly relationships, concessions, personal contact and favors. Robert was for pulling everything tight, cutting down the cost of production, and offering such financial inducements as would throttle competition.

The old manufacturer always did his best to pour oil on these troubled waters, but he foresaw an eventual clash. One or the other would have to get out or perhaps both. 'If only you two boys could agree,' he used to say. (H608)
In the revised passage, because Robert and Lester's differences are reduced to mere matters of planning rather than ethics, the plight of the individual worker caught in an insensitive capitalist economy is erased from the text. The result is a much more positive picture of American businesses and businessmen. What begins to become clear in the excised passages is Archibald's growing belief that if Lester were to run the Kane Manufacturing company, he would insure that pensions and other such compensations were implemented, which might, in turn, lower profits. In Robert's view, however, "[t]he business of this concern is to make money, just as much as it can." Although Archibald feels kindly and affectionate towards Lester, he finally agrees with Robert about the how business needs to be run.

The third important excised passage occurs just after Mrs. Kane dies and Archibald moves in with Robert and his family. Now in constant contact with Robert, Archibald, in both the Pennsylvania and Harper texts, observes that Robert is much stronger than Lester. Robert, thinks Archibald, "was not a sycophant in any sense of the word but a shrewd, cold businessman, shrewder quite than his brother gave him credit for" (P273; H692). Harper, however, excised a line that closely follows this passage, and which speaks to Archibald's belief that Robert's ruthlessness makes him more capable of running the family business. The excised line reads, "Long and close association with Robert, intimate observation of that individual's highly practical if chilly methods had led him to conclude that commercially there was no choice between them" (P274). The Harper reads, "Lester might be the bigger intellectually or sympathetically--artistically and socially there was no comparison--but Robert got commercial results in a silent, effective way" (H692). In the Harper version the words,
"silent" and "effective" convey a wholly positive sense, unless joined to the excised phrase "chilly methods," which more clearly articulates his father's recognition of the means by which Robert achieves such "effective" commercial results. The words "chilly methods" clearly recall to the reader the previous excised scene, wherein Robert has no problem firing loyal, long-time employees to cut down overhead. Essentially, Robert's "chilly methods" are to run the company according to the cold, hard laws of profit and loss, with no regard for the possible consequences on human lives. Also telling in the excised passage is Archibald's thought that Robert's "chilly methods" left "no choice between them." In his view, Robert must manage the company, not Lester. Without the excised passage, Archibald's choice of Robert's "chilly" business ethics over Lester's is never articulated, and therefore the reader of the Harper edition more easily sees him as a sympathetic character.

With these passages removed from the Harper edition, we are left with only one passage that alludes to the differences between Lester and Robert, and to Archibald's motivation for changing his will. This passage occurs in chapter twenty-five of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter twenty-seven of the Harper edition. In this passage, Robert and Lester are discussing whether to "sever relations with an old and well-established paint company... which had manufactured paints especially for the house" (P187; H621). Lester is against the move because he believes that the company should be loyal to its past associations. Robert, on the other hand, argues that the company should move forward: "We can't go on forever standing by old friends, just because Father here has dealt with them or you like them... The business must be hard and
Archibald is "inclined to think Robert is right" (P188; H622). After this "defeat," Lester "wonde[s] whether his father would discriminate in any way in the ultimate distribution of the property" (P188: H622). Lester's reaction, which is in both texts, is the first passage to specifically connect Archibald's judgment of his son's business acumen with the eventual disposition of his estate.

As an extension of the earlier passages excised in the Harper edition, this last passage moves Dreiser's thematic concerns outward, intimating how large corporations, such as the Kane Manufacturing Company, hurt small businesses by making it impossible for them to compete with larger companies. Coupled with the earlier excised passages, which suggest how corporate business ethics hurt the employees and their families, Dreiser's story clearly portrays the harsh, profit-driven practices of those at the top of the business world. When we examine Archibald in this light, he ceases to be a sympathetic character. Instead, he is an apt representation of the greed and human disconnection that pervades the world of corporate business.

To insure profits, Archibald is willing to sacrifice the welfare not only of his employees and suppliers but also that of "his favorite son." By revising his will, Archibald diminishes Lester's influence in the business for at least two years. Lester has no idea that his father disapproves of his business ethics, and his exclusion from the family business seems to come out of nowhere:

As he rode he had no suspicion that his father had acted in any way prejudicial to his interests. It had not been so long since they had had

3 In the Harper edition, this last line was emended to read, "The business must be stiffened up; we're going to have more and stronger competition" (H622).
their last conversation, and he had been taking his time to think about things, and his father had given him time. No untoward event could have happened since their last conversation. He also felt that he had stood well with the old gentleman, except for his alliance with Jennie, and now that he was dead he felt that he would be properly provided for. . . . Why should there be any discrimination against him? He really did not think it possible. (P294; H707)

The key line, excised from the Harper text, is "No untoward event could have happened since their last conversation," and for Lester this is true. Archibald has kept this decision to himself, and it shocks the entire family, even Robert: "'I think the old gentleman has been a little rough in this,' said Robert . . . . 'I certainly did not expect him to go as far as that. Certainly as far as I'm concerned some other arrangement would have been satisfactory'" (P297; H710). If Archibald had been concerned only to force Lester either to marry Jennie or to break off the relationship, then "other arrangements would have been satisfactory," and Archibald likely would have imposed them on Lester before his death. Jennie and Lester had by then been together for seven years, and everyone knew it, including Archibald.

In his will, Archibald states that his decision is based solely on Lester's liaison with Jennie, but he had already decided that Robert would be the better son to run the company. If Archibald had kept his original will, Lester would have had an equal voice in the company and therefore in a position to insure pensions for the elderly and employment for loyal suppliers, both of which would have been costly. By changing his will, Archibald not only forces Lester to break up with Jennie, but he effectively insures that Lester has no voice in the company for at least two years, enough time for Robert to stabilize the company after his father's death and to insure both its continuation and its growth. Archibald was well aware that numerous attempts to persuade Lester to leave
Jennie had ended with Lester's pat answer: "I can't say what I'll do. I'll have to take time and think. I can't decide this offhand" (P278; H696). He could be reasonably certain, therefore, that Lester would take all the time allowed him before he acted, which is exactly what he does. The result of the new will, then, is that Robert is able to implement his plans for the company without interference from Lester. In a passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes: "this new arrangement of making [Robert] trustee for his brother, to say nothing of the advice of his father to the other heirs and his own strong popularity with them, gave him just what he wanted" (P301). Taken together with passages remaining in the Harper edition, these excised passages show Archibald as a businessman first and a father and friend second.

The Harper editors also cut passages depicting Robert's similar behavior. Besides the excised passages already mentioned describing Robert's ability to disconnect himself from others when profits are at stake, other passages that describe the extent of his ruthlessness were also cut. These passages show that Robert not only would dispose of elderly employees and loyal suppliers to enhance the business's profit margin, but he would also eliminate his own brother from the company's management. In the original text, if Archibald had not changed his will to insure Robert's control, Robert would have seized it anyway.

Unlike Lester, Robert is ambitious and hard-working, and he makes his mark in the business world long before Archibald's death: "]Robert] was going ahead, making outside investments out of money made by investments he had made before. He was being spoken of as a coming man... a budding financial genius" (excised from Harper text P186). The first indication of Robert's greed and ambition occurs in a line in
chapter twenty-two of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter twenty-four the Harper 
edition. In the Pennsylvania text, Dreiser writes that Robert "was not so anxious to see 
Lester prosper" (P169). The Harper text substitutes for this statement: "the two brothers 
were outwardly friendly; inwardly they were far apart" (H607). Dreiser's original 
statement expresses early in the text Robert's feelings toward Lester and presages 
Robert's attempt to push Lester out of the company, an endeavor that begins long before 
Archibald's death. Although anxious to find his own way in the business world, Lester 
ever considers taking advantage of others to do so. He never wishes for Robert's 
failure, nor does he entertain the idea of using Robert to insure his own success. Robert, 
on the other hand, is pleased to see Lester's continual failure because it means greater 
wealth and power for himself.

The most telling textual evidence of Robert's ruthless behavior towards Lester 
occurs when Robert plans to force Lester out of the company after his father's death. At 
this time, Archibald is still alive and vigorous. Lester and Robert are arguing over the 
feasibility of implementing a pension program for elderly employees. Archibald agrees 
with Robert's plan to drop the employees from the payroll without benefits, but he has 
not revealed his intention to give Robert control of the company in his will. Without 
knowledge of his father's intention, Robert begins making plans of his own. In thirty-
five lines excised from the Harper edition, Dreiser explains Robert's plan to gain 
ascendancy over his brother and other members of the family:

The Pennsylvania text reads:

[Lester] had wisely handled every proposition which had come up to 
him. He was still the investigator of propositions put to the house, the 
student of contracts, the advisor in counsel of his father and mother--but
he was being worsted. Where would it end? He thought about this but could reach no conclusion.

In the meantime his brother Robert had come to a very definite conclusion in regard to the business and was planning a coup, once his father should die, which would put it all definitely in his hand. . . . Robert's idea was, after mature deliberation, to curry favor with his three sisters, putting them under financial obligation by reason of minor, successful investments he could make for them and so getting them to vote their stock through him. If he could pool it all, or sit as their close financial advisor, he would at once reorganize the company to suit himself. He saw himself naturally elected president. He saw visions of a union with several other carriage companies which would make him a magnate. The Kane Carriage Manufacturing Company was now, in its line, already the strongest concern in the country. If he could buy secretly into the stock of several others, he could exercise a powerful influence toward the general combination which he hoped to effect. Time was an essential and agreeable factor to him. He did not at all object to waiting. He was cold, cool, farseeing. Sitting in his office chair, as vice-president of the company, he could already see where his plans would end. He did not propose to force Lester out, but he proposed to use him to accomplish his ends, or possibly part with him agreeably, giving him a fair price for his holdings. . . .

At this time, Robert propounded a scheme which, while really very progressive on its face and single in its intention, was a plan to get Lester out of immediate contact with the business, as well as to push the interest of the company. He proposed, no less, that they build an immense exhibition and storage warehouse on Michigan Avenue in Chicago. . . . It would be a big advertisement for the house, a magnificent evidence of its standing and prosperity. . . . Robert suggested that Lester undertake the construction of the new building, and that possibly he might want to reside in Chicago a part of the time. They needed branch offices in Chicago. (P189)

The Harper text reads

[Lester] had done his work well. He was still the investigator of propositions put to the house, the student of contracts, the trusted advisor of his father and mother--but he was being worsted. Where would it end? He thought about this, but could reach no conclusion.

---
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Later, in this same year Robert came forward with a plan for reorganization in the executive department at the business. He proposed that they should build an immense exhibition and storage warehouse on Michigan Avenue in Chicago. . . . It would be a big advertisement for the house, a magnificent evidence of its standing and prosperity . . . . Robert suggested that Lester should undertake the construction of the new buildings. It would probably be advisable for him to reside in Chicago a part of the time. (H622-623)

In the Harper revision, the passage describes a friendly familial discussion concerning business, and Robert here seems more like a public relations visionary than a cold-hearted schemer. The cuts made to these passages are typical of the many cuts made to passages emphasizing Robert's enormous appetite for power and wealth. The term "coup" clearly articulates Robert's well-thought-out plan to gain sole power over the company. For Robert, his sisters are little more than a means to an end, and his father and brother are obstacles that stand in the way of his plans for the company. Only Archibald's death and Lester's exclusion will insure that he can reorganize the company to "suit himself," whatever the price for others. In the original manuscript, then, Dreiser clearly portrays Robert as a man concerned above all with his own wealth and power. As John B. Humma states: "In his purely material prosperity and business success . . . Robert embodies this new, corrupt ideal of the American dream" (160).

By revealing his darker motives, the original passage above sets the stage for Robert's eventual actions to wrest control from Lester and his sisters. The Harper editors also removed the passages that describe these actions, which completed their transformation of Dreiser's original portrayal of Robert. For instance, after Lester has finished the warehouse project in Chicago, Dreiser writes:
[Robert] was doing his best to push his personal interests, not only through the influence he was bringing to bear upon his sisters but through his reorganization of the factory during his brother's absence. It was so easy for him now to gradually replace, one by one, the people who were objectionable to him—to surround himself by degrees with people in responsible positions who were under obligation to him for putting them there. Several men whom Lester was personally fond of were in danger of elimination. But Lester did not hear of this, and Kane senior was inclined to give Robert a free hand. (P223)

This same passage in the Harper text reads:

[Robert] was doing his best to push his personal interests, not only through the influence he was bringing to bear upon his sisters but through his reorganization of the factory. Several men whom Lester was personally fond of were in danger of elimination. But Lester did not hear of this, and Kane senior was inclined to give Robert a free hand. (H649)

Upon Archibald's death, Dreiser writes of Robert's immediate attempt to push his siblings out of the company. The Pennsylvania edition reads:

Robert had long had his plans perfected for not only a thorough reorganization of the company proper, but for an extension of his carriage building and selling capacity to a combination of carriage companies and this new arrangement of making him trustee for his brother, to say nothing of the advice of his father to the other heirs and his own strong popularity with them, gave him just what he wanted. ... Lester must come to his senses, or he must let Robert run the business to suit himself. Anyhow, with his sisters' stock being voted by him, and his father's admonition to them that they should leave him in control, he could command the situation whether Lester chose to reform or not.

This passage in the Harper text reads:

Robert had long had his plans perfected, not only for a thorough reorganization of the company proper, but for an extension of the business in the a direction of a combination of carriage companies. ... Lester must come to his senses, or he must let Robert run the business to suit himself. (H712)

The Harper passage implies that if Robert does take over the business, it is only because Lester will not "come to his senses." Dreiser's original passages, however, show
that Robert carefully plans and patiently effects a "coup," and that the provisions in Archibald's revised will concerning Lester's stock in the family business are not necessary for Robert to complete his "scheme," though they do help bring it about much faster. Even before Archibald's death, Robert was replacing loyal, hard-working employees with "stool pigeons" who would be loyal to him, not to Lester or Archibald. Earlier excised passages imply that these employees were eliminated without compensation, though most of them have families to feed and clothe. Such an act demonstrates Robert's "chilly methods" and his freedom to implement them in the family business long before Archibald's death and Lester's exclusion from the company. Even if Archibald had not changed his will, therefore, Robert had so secured his authority that it would have been difficult if not impossible for Lester to exercise any authority in the company. As this passage excised from the Harper edition suggests, "[Robert] could command the situation whether Lester chose to reform or not." In sharp contrast, the Harper text portrays Robert as an aggressive businessman, but not so aggressive that he would manipulate or even overthrow members of his own family to increase his own power and wealth. As a representative of the corporate business world, his image has been changed from negative to positive.

As Robert's character is transformed in the Harper edition, he ceases to be Lester's foil. In Dreiser's manuscript, Lester can be somewhat heartless, such as when he leaves Jennie for Letty Pace, but when he is placed in opposition to Robert, he emerges as a much more sympathetic character. In contrast to Robert, Lester struggles between two opposing and equally attractive worlds. He wants to be wealthy and powerful, but he is also sensitive to the needs of others. Unlike Robert, he naturally gravitates towards
persons like Jennie who share his feelings and sympathies. At the same time, he has
been reared in an immensely wealthy and corporately oriented family. Required to leave
Jennie for Letty by the stipulations of his father's will and lured by his accustomed
wealth, position, and power, he is never happy or fulfilled, and he dies wishing he had
lived a different kind of life. The Harper edition, however, eliminates the sharp
distinction between the two brothers, rendering Robert more sympathetic and Lester less
sympathetic.

The above excised passages lay the foundation for Robert's eventual "coup" of
the carriage manufacturing business as a whole, turning it from a healthy, competitive
industry into a trust or monopoly that he controls and operates. The Harper editors also
excised virtually all of the passages describing how Robert creates and plans to operate
this trust. The most explanatory of these passages occurs in chapter forty-six of the
Pennsylvania edition and chapter forty-seven of the Harper edition (Appendix C). This
passage completes Dreiser's characterization of Robert as so ruthless and cunning as to
undermine not only members of his own family to accumulate power and wealth, but
also the American capitalist structure itself. As explained in the Pennsylvania text,
Robert's scheme is to unite the largest of the carriage and wagon manufacturing
companies under one roof, creating a corporation so large and so powerful that smaller
companies could not compete. In other words, Robert proposes to monopolize the
carriage manufacturing industry so that he can become the wealthiest and most powerful
not only in his family but in the industry.

Monopolies such as the one Robert is attempting to create were a very real
problem at the turn of the century because their purpose was to stifle industry by
solidifying the country's wealth in the hands of a few. Trusts, explains Robert L. Heilbroner, were an avenue by which the wealthy "used their power to raise prices[,] . . . magnify profits [, and] . . . stifle enterprise" (197). Trust were so destructive that by the end of the nineteenth century, anti-trust legislation (most notably the Sherman Anti-Trust Act) was passed to keep monopolies from destroying healthy competition.

Certainly, Robert's "scheme" is to put as many people out of business as he can. The narrator states in a passage excised from the Harper text: " Armed with the voting power of the entire stock of the company and therefore with the privilege of hypothecating its securities, [Robert] laid before several of his intimate friends in the financial world his scheme of uniting the principle carriage companies and controlling the trade" (P321).

Robert is intent on creating a monopoly that will put the small businessman or those who, like Lester, may want to build a carriage business of their own, out of business forever. He seeks out the most powerful manufacturers in the business and convinces them that a partnership would be in their best interest. A passage excised from the Harper edition reads: "In six weeks he was able to call a meeting of all the carriage and wagon manufacturers whom it was deemed advisable to include at this time . . . and to persuade them to organize according to his plan" (P323). The end result is that Robert "was a happy man" (P321; H730-731).

Besides obscuring Robert's role in the creation of the trust, the Harper revision also destroys Dreiser's careful description of its negative effects. Because the formation of trusts was a relatively new phenomenon in American business, most readers would have been unfamiliar with the logistics and consequences of such a "scheme." Dreiser, however, understood that the creation of a trust meant the loss of jobs for many middle-
class business owners and lower-class workers. Theodore Roosevelt labeled the trust "hurtful to the general public" (Tindall 915). Dreiser addresses the negative effect of trusts on the individual in a large passage excised from the Harper edition that appears in chapter forty six of the Pennsylvania edition. (Appendix C). Dreiser explains that Robert's trust will result in the elimination of thousands of workers: "Where possible, duplication of effort was to be eliminated, and salesman, buyers, laborers to be cut down to the minimum necessary to do the actual work. Useless plants would be eliminated or run on part-time only." Robert is even willing to "shut up the Kane company" "if it will save money" (P322). Instead of buying essential materials such as lumber in America, the new trust will buy them from "foreign countries," which, states Robert, will "cut the cost of manufacture by nearly seven per cent" (P323). Although the "scheme" is extremely beneficial to Robert and his partners, it is at the expense of many workers, who will be instantly displaced without so much as a pension to help feed themselves and their families. Small business owners who have worked a lifetime to build an adequate living will instantly lose their livelihood, as will their employees. As he contemplates establishing a carriage business of his own, Lester thinks, "[Robert's trust] would have every little manufacturer by the throat" (P327; H734). The result of Robert's greed, then, is unemployment, poverty, and misery for thousands of people.

In the end, Robert becomes president of the largest and most powerful carriage manufacturing company in the world, and although he attempts later to bring Lester back into the family fold, it is only after he has insured his own control in the industry: "Robert had things very much in his own hands now anyway and could afford to be generous" (P349; H754). As a result, he has his attorney convince Jennie that her
separation from Lester would be in everyone's best interest. This gesture is yet another example of how Robert controls the family. With little concern for Jennie or for Lester's feelings, he intimidates Jennie into leaving Lester so that the family's reputation can be salvaged.

As a whole, the Harper revision of Robert and Archibald Kane destroy Dreiser's distinction between the dream of American capitalism and its reality. Many Americans saw the immense industrialization of America as an avenue to happiness through immediate wealth and power. At the turn of the century, America was fast becoming one of the wealthiest nations in the world. Opportunity abounded, and the success stories of men like Andrew Carnegie, J. Pierpont Morgan, and William Randolph Hearst made people believe that America was indeed a land where dreams come true. As Heilbroner states, "to the quick the able and the bold wealth came liberally and fast, and it must have seemed, at least, as if it were available to everyone" (186). In reality, persons who experienced such material success were few and far between. According to historian Robert E. Gallman, between 1860 and 1900 "the richest 2 percent of American families owned more than a third of the nation's physical wealth, while the top 10 per cent owned almost three fourths and all the nation's physical assets were in the hands of half its families" (qtd Tindall 765)

The reality of industrialism for most persons was not wealth, power, and prestige but low wages, deplorable working conditions, little upward mobility, long hours, and no compensation for lost wages due to on-site accidents. Tindall notes that on average a working man at the turn of the century made only 21.6 cents per hour and only $490 per annum. In addition, working conditions were deplorable. In 1913, for instance, 25,000
people died in factory accidents and approximately 700,000 were injured, "more than half the number of American casualties in World War I" (766). There were few rules in the newly created world of American capitalism, and most employers felt no obligation to the employee beyond insuring that wages were paid: "The consciousness of power made [the average rich manufacturer] tyrannical, hard, sometimes cruel,' writes the economic historian Paul Mantoux. "Their passions and greed were those of upstarts" (qtd Heilbroner 57). "They conceived of the public as existing to serve them and not vice versa" (186).

In America's quest for a capitalist identity, then, there is a distinct contrast between the American dream and the American reality. Although Tindall states that there was a rise in the number of people who moved from the lower class to the middle class during this period (763), there was an overwhelming number who, though hard-working, continued to be exploited and trampled underfoot by the wealthy and the powerful. For Dreiser, this scenario was familiar. As a child, he watched his father deteriorate under the burdens of his poverty and unremitting toil. He watched his mother struggle for financial stability and social respect. As a writer, he covered countless stories of injustices against workers, and he saw his own novel suppressed by a conservative publishing conglomerate that refused to see past its profit margins. As a common laborer and recuperating mental patient, Dreiser recognized that he was "nothing" to the wealthy: "Rail as I would," he states in An Amateur Laborer, "the differences of life were largely based on materials, and [those] who had them could afford to let the beggars dream" (172).
As America developed into an economically powerful and industrialized country, Dreiser believed that human feeling and connection had been lost: "We live in an age," Dreiser writes in *Jennie Gerhardt*, "in which the impact of materialized forces is well-nigh irresistible; the spiritual nature is overwhelmed by the shock" (P125). The result was a country that was fragmented, disconnected, morally cruel, and wedded to illusions. Dreiser projected this vision of the effect of wealth on the wealthy into *Jennie Gerhardt* in a number of different ways, but his most glaring representation is his portraits of the Kane family members, who rarely experience loving, enduring connections with any one, including members of their own family. Unlike the Gerhardts, the Kanes, especially Robert and Archibald, are mainly concerned to get and keep wealth and power. Willing to exploit, to deceive, and to trample underfoot anyone who stands in their way, they represent all that Dreiser saw wrong with the American dream. Once the editors at Harper finished editing the text, however, Archibald and Robert Kane are more a representative of the American ideal than of the American reality. Archibald is a businessman who though extremely wealthy still manages to place employees and family before business, and Robert is little more than an aggressive and talented entrepreneur. Only in the Pennsylvania edition do they emerge as Dreiser portrayed them, as representatives of the greed, selfishness, arrogance and exploitation of American capitalism.
Mothers, Daughters, and Cultural Identity

In his autobiography *Dawn*, Dreiser states that his mother, Sarah Dreiser, was "[a] lamp, a dream, an inspiration, one whose memory even now walks ever on before, making a path of beauty" (50). Dreiser was devoted to her and saw her as the principle force that shaped him into a successful writer. Throughout his autobiography, he describes the way she interacted with her family, friends, and acquaintances, manifesting in all these relations a love that transcended the poverty and shame she often confronted. In her, Dreiser found the prototype for his two most maternal characters, Mrs. Gerhardt and her daughter, Jennie. Like Sara Dreiser, Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie are the center of the family, and share an intimate relation. Unfortunately, as with William Gerhardt, the Harper editors cut and emended passages that weaken her representation, flatten her character, and subtly alter her relationship with Jennie. In turn, the cuts weaken Dreiser's portrayal of the Gerhardts as a close-knit family.

In cutting and emending Dreiser's manuscript, the Harper editors altered Mrs. Gerhardt's character in a number of ways. First, passages cut at the beginning of the novel obscure Dreiser's portrayal of her as a naive immigrant who knows little about the world. In the restored text, Mrs. Gerhardt allows Jennie to become involved with Senator Brander and Lester Kane because she is naive and cannot comprehend the motives behind their words and actions. When her naivete is obscured in the 1911 edition, we more easily see her as allowing Jennie to carry on affairs with Senator Brander and Lester Kane because she wants better things for herself, not because she does not understand the potential problems of such relations. Second, several large cuts destroy Mrs. Gerhardt's unquenchable hopes for her children. In the original text, much
like Sara Dreiser, she only wants the best for her children. Even though circumstances are against her, her "hope" is always that her children will someday be happy and "not have to work so hard" (P108; H552). This hope is partly the reason why she encourages Jennie to see Senator Brander and Lester Kane, and it is also why she thinks that moving to Cleveland will result in an immediate change in the family's fortune. Her undimmed hope imbues the novel with an aura of romance that keeps it from being overwhelmed by its naturalistic elements. In the 1911 text, Mrs. Gerhardt is no longer dreamy and naive, and the novel's romance elements are lost.

Third, the Harper editors cut Mrs. Gerhardt's sympathetic responses to Jennie's most trying and tragic experiences. They also cut and emended several of Jennie's sympathetic responses to Mrs. Gerhardt's difficult experiences. In the restored text, Jennie and her mother are so intimately connected that they naturally feel deeply for each other's circumstances. Their relationship, with its honesty and deep emotion, is the most beautiful in the text. In the 1911 edition, however, Jennie and her mother's relationship is much weaker and overshadowed by Jennie's relationships with Senator Brander and Lester Kane. In addition, because Jennie is not as close to her mother in the 1911 edition, we more easily read her decision to have an affair with Lester Kane as self-serving, rather than as an attempt to alleviate her family and especially her mother's desperation.

To date there has been little critical inquiry into the character of Mrs. Gerhardt. Critics of the 1911 edition have overlooked her completely, and those of the restored text have so much work before them that they too have placed her in the background of their discussions. Nevertheless, in the restored text Mrs. Gerhardt has a prominent place
in the sympathetic and realistic picture Dreiser paints of an American family struggling against the forces of circumstance that constantly threaten to devour them. "A significant contribution of the Pennsylvania edition," states Susan Albertine, "is fuller characterization not only of Jennie but also of other major figures, including Mrs. Gerhardt ..." (63). As with all of Dreiser's characters, Mrs. Gerhardt cannot be read in black and white terms. As an immigrant, she has been linguistically and culturally bound to her small German community, which makes her passive and naive. In *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*, Lloyd W. Warner and Leo Srole explain that unlike the man in the immigrant community, who had regular access to the outside world via his job, the woman rarely left her immediate surroundings. She "centered her existence about the home, [and] ha[d] no relationships beyond it except with a few persons of her own ethnic background who may be her neighbors" (108). This is essentially what Mrs. Gerhardt's position in the home has been. When the novel begins, she has never ventured out of the little German neighborhood in which she and her husband live. Her life has consisted of little more than "devoting the intermediate hours to dressing the children, cooking, seeing that they got off to school, mending their clothes, waiting on her husband, and occasionally weeping" (P5; H460).

A passage clarifying the extent of her isolation, however, was cut by the Harper editors. In the original manuscript, Dreiser indicates that she has never even seen the Columbus hotel before she decides to apply there for work as a scrubwoman. West explains that such hotels were highly visible buildings "located near downtown centers of shopping and commerce, and often were marked by innovative or fanciful architecture" ("Hotel" 194). So prominent were the hotels during this period that cities
often "competed . . . over which city had the largest and most stylish hotels, just as they
would compete a few decades later over which city had the tallest skyscrapers" (195).
Despite the place the hotel held in the city in which Mrs. Gerhardt lives, she has never
ventured close enough to see it, which means she has never been to the center of the
city. She only knows of the hotel's existence because, in a passage excised from the
Harper text, the narrator tells us that "her son had often spoken of its beauty" (P6). This
passage clarifies the extent of Mrs. Gerhardt's isolation and helps us to understand why
she is so shy that, at the beginning of chapter one, for instance, she can hardly bring
herself to speak to the hotel manager. When he asks her "what is it that you would like
to do," she "timidly" replies, "Maybe you have some cleaning or scrubbing" (P3; H459).
She does not even know how much to charge for her services, "timidly" asking if "a
dollar a day would be too much" (P6; H459). Together with the excised passage, these
lines help the reader to understand the severity of her handicap, which in turn, will help
explain why she stands idly by and watches Jennie carry on a relationship with Senator
Brander.

Several other cuts made to the early part of the novel also weaken Dreiser's
original depiction of Mrs. Gerhardt as naive and socially awkward, most of which occur
in his portrayal of Mrs. Gerhardt's reaction to Senator Brander's advances toward Jennie.
From the beginning of the novel, we understand that Mrs. Gerhardt is no match for
Brander. As a "public official," a politician, Brander's ability to manipulate words is a
skill that he has spent many years perfecting. As a public person with a mastery of
words, he is placed in direct opposition to Mrs. Gerhardt, who is socially inexperienced
and linguistically handicapped. Unlike Brander who boldly walks among the crowds of
the city, Mrs. Gerhardt "steel[s] away" from the public eye, and exit[s] onto "the side street, by the rear entrance" (P7, 9). In turn, her isolation and consequential social inexperience make her vulnerable to men like Brander, who manipulate words to mean anything they want. Brander tells Mrs. Gerhardt, for instance, that "[y]our daughter . . . is perfectly safe with me. I have no intention of doing her any harm" (P44; H498). At the same time, however, he understands that his behavior compromises her integrity:

"He knew that it might come to the ears of the hotel clerks and so, in a general way, get about town and work serious injury, but the reflection did not cause him to modify his conduct" (P40; H493-494). Eventually, he even seduces and impregnates her: "He had not so many more years to live. Why die unsatisfied," he thinks (P40; H494). Mrs. Gerhardt, however, takes him at his word. Because he gives them money when they most need it and because he seems concerned about their poverty-stricken existence, she believes he "is a fine man," with a "good heart" (P24; H478).

The extent of her naivete, which accounts for her passive acceptance of the affair, is articulated by Dreiser in two other passages cut from the Harper text. The first is when Old Gerhardt finds out about Blunder's interest in Jennie from Mr. Weaver, a friend in the German community, and confronts his wife, who has thus far managed to keep the information from him. Unlike Mrs. Gerhardt, her husband's life-long experiences outside the home make him more aware of the disastrous potential of Brander and Jennie's relationship, and he is furious about the affair. He explains to his wife that Brander's behavior with Jennie does not befit a man of his public standing; that

1 This latter passage was excised in the 1911 edition.
he is too old for Jennie; and that if he were a gentleman, he would have asked permission to take out his daughter: "He is an old man," he states, "What should he want to call on a girl like Jennie for" (P56; H507). He adds that Jennie will have to break off her relationship with him. Mrs. Gerhardt, on the other hand, can neither understand her husband's anger nor comprehend the danger to her daughter in dating a man old enough to be her father. Mrs. Gerhardt's reaction to her husband's words in the Pennsylvania edition is as follows. The bracketed lines were removed by the Harper editors:

[While he was going on in this strain, Mrs. Gerhardt was collecting her troubled thoughts. How was it that this strange predicament had come upon her? What had she done? Suddenly, it shone as a light that she was not at fault. Had not this man been an emissary of kindness to them? Did not she know that Jennie was improving innocent opportunities and conducting herself without blame? Why should these neighbors talk? Why send these insinuations home to her through her husband? (P55-56)

'There is nothing the matter,' she declared suddenly using an effective German idiom. 'Jennie has done nothing. The man has only called at the house once or twice. There is--'

'What is this then?' interrupted Gerhardt, who was anxious to discover what had been going on.'

'Jennie has gone walking with him once or twice. He has called here at the house. What is there now in that for the people to talk about? Can't the girl have any pleasure at all?' (P56; H507)

The excised passage clarifies the limits of Mrs. Gerhardt's imagination. She believes that if a person is outwardly nice to her and if his words and actions seem "kind," then everything must be "innocent" and "blameless." She cannot probe beyond actions and words for intention and motivation. For this reason the "predicament" she is in seems "strange" to her. It has never occurred to her that a man of Brander's age and position..
would have an ulterior motive for giving expensive gifts and fistfuls of money to a pretty, young, and poor scrub girl. Nowhere in the text does she question his motives. For her, he is always a "fine man" with "a good heart" (P24; H478). Even when she momentarily begins to doubt him, she simply falls back on what she has "seen" and "heard" for assurance that he has Jennie's best interest at heart. In a passage excised from the Harper text, for instance, Dreiser writes, "Mrs. Gerhardt was dubious of all this generosity—of what it all might mean, but in view of what had gone before, his declaration of love, his announcement of his desire to marry her, it seemed, at worst, plausible" (P77).

Of course Mrs. Gerhardt's steadfast belief in Brander's honesty is altered when Jennie tells her that Brander not only has seduced her, but that he has also left her pregnant. Mrs. Gerhardt's reaction, though, is consistent with her naivete. Her confused frustration is detailed in the following passage from the Pennsylvania edition. The bracketed lines were excised by the Harper editors:

Mrs. Gerhardt only stood there too numb with misery for a time to give vent to a word.

'Oh!' she said at last, a great wave of self-accusation sweeping over her. 'It is my fault. I might have known.'

[The crowding details of this miserable discovery were too numerous and too pathetic to record. Concealment was one thing the mother troubled over. Her husband's actions, another. Brander, the world, her beautiful, good Jennie— all returned to her mind in rapid succession. That Brander should have betrayed her daughter seemed horrible.]
She went back after a time to the washing she had to do, and stood over her tub, washing and crying. ..

[Mrs. Gerhardt was no fine reasoner for such a situation.] (P80-81; H529)

The excised passages describe Mrs. Gerhardt's first response to her first experience with the real world, and her naivete makes this experience almost overwhelming. Certainly, she first fears her husband's response, but she also begins to reevaluate "Brander" and "the world" in light of this "discovery," even though she is not certain exactly how it has changed. Even her opinion of Brander is confused. Brander's actions clearly do not correspond with his words. Her sense, however, is that his actions "seemed" horrible, not that they "were" horrible. Her judgment is still unformed. Even in the presence of the consequences, she can hardly believe that he has betrayed her daughter after all of his shows of kindness and promised protection.

All that is left after the cut is Mrs. Gerhardt's cry, "[i]t is my fault. I might have known." This passage, when separated from the excised passage that describes the complex nature of Mrs. Gerhardt's thought processes, make her seem complicit in Jennie's downfall, readily accepting blame because all along she knew what she was doing. The restored passage, however, more clearly reveals the naive presumptions of Mrs. Gerhardt's judgment of others' behavior. Her naivete is so deeply rooted, so much a part of her, that this unfortunate experience hardly disturbs it. We come to understand through this experience that although Mrs. Gerhardt understands there is some evil in

---

This line was emended in the Harper text to read, "She broke down and sobbed aloud" (H529).
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the world, the knowledge cannot essentially change her. She remains much as we first meet her until her death.

In addition to being naive, Mrs. Gerhardt is also dreamy and romantic. In this way, she is much like Sara Dreiser, whom Dreiser describes in his autobiography *Dawn* as

a strange, sweet, dreamy woman, who did not know how life was organized; who was quick to forget the miseries of the past and contemplate the comforts of the present, or, those wanting, the possibilities of the future; who traveled romantically a colorful and, to her, for all its ills, a beautiful world. (10)

Like Sara Dreiser, Mrs. Gerhardt, in the Pennsylvania edition, always remains open to new possibilities even though circumstances are almost always against her. Although her belief that life will always get better may be due in part to her naivete, it is also the result of her innate goodness and profound hope. She genuinely wants the best for her children and for others, and despite the family's constant poverty, her "hope" is always that things will get better for them: "Often, as she moved about in her thin, worn slippers, cushioned with pieces of newspaper to make them fit, she looked in on their sleeping faces and with that divine sympathy which is born in heaven wished that they did not need to rise so early or yet work so hard" (P108; H552). Her dreaminess is seen most clearly when the family decides to move to Cleveland to start a new life. Mrs. Gerhardt can think of nothing but the positive effects of such a transition. She believes that moving to a new city will solve all their problems. She "hop[ed] for a betterment of their miserable life. If [Bass] would go and get work, and come to her rescue . . . what a thing that would be" (P91; H539). When Bass finds a job, he writes to her describing the beauty of the city and the opportunity available to any one who wants to work. His
words are enough to convince her that their fortune will change once they move. Mrs. Gerhardt's reaction to Bass's letter is described in the following passage excised from the Harper edition:

The crowds, the tinkling street-car bells, the measure of joy suggested by Bass in his mention of the theaters and beautiful streets, nicely furnished houses and the like, all of these reached out to her, and their accomplishment was as if it were a mere matter of moving into the city. Let them but once get started and all these things would be added unto them. (P99)

A similar passage describing her feelings as she actually boards the train to Cleveland was also excised by the Harper editors:

The putting off of old difficulties and old troubles, as this seemed to be, was perfect delight to her. This leaving the old shell and setting forth into the world of larger possibilities gripped her as it grips every heart. She was as happy as if all of her troubles had passed—had never been, in fact. Anticipation, expectation, these cleared away the fogs of doubt and sorrow, and created for her once again a happy world. (P100)

And in another passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes,

It is always fascinating to think how the feelings of our lives change and interchange. At the depot, a new zest for living seized upon her, a new hope grew. In a few minutes the train would be here. In a few hours she would be in Cleveland with Jennie and Bass. Jennie had secured work, and Bass had a good place. George could possibly get something, or maybe he would not need to leave school so early. She would see. The other children could probably be provided with suitable clothing and sent to school. What a heaven this earth would be if only from now on they could get along nicely. (P105-106)

These restored passages emphasize Mrs. Gerhardt's characterization as both naive and dreamy. Mrs. Gerhardt never completely comprehends the potential problems of any situation, and the mere words in Bass's letter are enough to arouse in her a sense of hope and wonder. The family has always been poor and moving to a new city will not instantaneously "add unto them" a "measure of joy" they have never had. Her child-like
innocence and innate goodness, however, keep her from accepting defeat, and her hope of a brighter future keeps her from being destroyed by the terrible, uncontrollable circumstances of her life. Her constant "hope" that life for Jennie and her other children will one day be "happy" seems to be coming true in the person of Lester Kane, and the limits of her imagination will not allow her to see beyond the fulfillment of this hope. The problems that can ensue because of the irregular nature of their affair do not occur to her. Her visionary hope, of course, is in opposition to the "mechanistic determinism" of other characters, such as perhaps Lester Kane. In the Pennsylvania edition, Mrs. Gerhardt's naivete and her dreaminess are, therefore, significant elements of her portrayal.

Dreiser emphasizes most fully, however, her intimate relationship with Jennie. Their bond is maintained from the opening chapters of the novel until the end, when Jennie dreams of Mrs. Gerhardt in an oarless boat. In the 1911 edition, mother and daughter still share an enduring friendship, but their relationship is much more intimate in the Pennsylvania edition. In the restored text, the bond between Jennie and her mother transcends the biological and takes on a spiritual quality that keeps them connected when times get so tough that the family must separate so that it can survive.

Mrs. Gerhardt refers to Jennie as her "beloved" child and secretly wishes "that circumstances had been more kindly to her and that life would serve her well" (P108; H552). Between mother and daughter there was always an "enduring affection . . . always perfect understanding," which "as the days passed naturally widened and deepened (P108; H552). On Jennie's part, these feelings are reciprocal. The narrator explains that of all the children, Jennie alone "grieved for her [mother] and strove with
the fullness of perfect affection to ease her burden" (P108; H552). Their affection is built on shared characteristics of innate goodness, naivete, and self-sacrifice, which, together, serve to bind them to each other in such a way as to make their relationship exceptionally pure and intimate. Dreiser's portrayal of their relationship most clearly defines the complexity of Mrs. Gerhardt's character and the overall effect of the novel as a rich combination of romanticism and naturalism.

Cuts and emendations to Dreiser's original portrayal of the intimacy between Mrs Gerhardt and Jennie begin in the first chapter and continue vigorously to Mrs. Gerhardt's death. In the first chapter, for instance, their love, respect, and dependence on each other is most clearly emphasized when both have to find work because there is simply "no bread in the house" (P6; H461). Desperate to earn enough money to feed the family, Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie accept jobs as cleaning ladies in the Columbus Hotel. There, they are to scrub the "brightly lighted" public halls where "men lounging, smoking, passing constantly in and out, could see them . . . (P7, 8; H463). Both Jennie and her mother have lived sheltered lives, and therefore, the "public" nature of the job is a difficult adjustment for them. Mother and daughter, however, fall eagerly to the task of "scrubbing the steps, and polishing the brass work of the splendid stairs," even though they "both needed to steel themselves, the mother against her timidity, the daughter at her shame at so public an exposure" (P7; H463) They feel no bitterness between them in having to work, only an earnest desire to "to ha[ve] something to do" so that they could feed the family (P9; H465).

As they scrub the hotel staircase, Jennie's mother tells her not to "forget to rub into these little corners . . ." Jennie is "reassured" by her comments and falls "earnestly
to the task" (P7). The term "reassured," however, was emended by the Harper editors to read "mortified" (H463), which changes the character of Jennie's response to her mother. The use of the term "reassured" emphasizes the intimacy and admiration Jennie has for her mother. Not only do Jennie and her mother wish to do an honest day's work, but they will work together to ensure that the task is done. Moreover, Jennie's "reassurance" at her mother's comments seems appropriate not only because she has little experience doing such work, especially in a public place, but also because in this new circumstance, Jennie is the child and her mother is the adult.

The Harper edition's use of the term "mortified" breaks the subtle bond between Jennie and her mother, and the result is that the reader may doubt the intimacy of their relationship for the remainder of the story. This change becomes even more significant in the context of the scene that follows, wherein Senator George Brander first sees Jennie. In this scene, Brander is forced to walk around the two women as they scrub the floors of the hotel. Instantly, Jennie "caught his eye," and he "carried" her impression with him" (P8; H463, 464).3 Within moments, Jennie almost forgets "the troubled mother" working beside her, thinking, rather, "of the fineries of the world" (P9; H464). By the time they leave the hotel that night, she has taken specific notice of the opulent world in which she works, "wishing" that a portion of it would come to her" (P9; H464). With little thought, she tells her poverty-stricken mother, "I wish we were rich" (P9; H464). Together with the phrase, "I wish we were rich," the emendation of the word "reassured" to "mortified" creates a tension between Jennie and her mother that
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3The Harper editors emended the word "impression" to "personality" (H464).
does not exist anywhere else in either the Pennsylvania or Harper texts. Alongside the above comments, the emendation allies Jennie more closely with the world of Brander, rather than the world of the Gerhardts. The result is that the reader begins to see Jennie early on as a type of Carrie Meeber, one who could easily be lured away from the distress and poverty of her own family if she were offered the "fineries" of the world. This is not, however, Jennie's character. Throughout the novel, her love for her family, especially for her mother, is consistent and sacrificial.

Several additional small cuts also serve to weaken the relationship between Jennie and her mother. In a pivotal scene, for instance, Jennie is collecting coal at the railway tracks with her siblings. Just as they finish filling their pails with coal, Jennie spots Senator Brander, who has just returned from Washington. In her embarrassment, Jennie runs away. When she returns home and tells her mother of the incident, her mother reacts in a way that is consistent with her intimate connection to Jennie. Her reaction is articulated in the following passage from the Pennsylvania edition. The bracketed lines were removed by the Harper editors:

[Mrs. Gerhardt could not help laughing at her daughter's predicament and the children's description of her flight, but she secretly appreciated and sympathized with her feelings. It was too bad, she thought, that the distinguished senator should know [of their poverty].]

'Well, maybe he didn't know you, anyhow,' she said. (P31; H485).

The excised passage subtly affirms the deep connection between Jennie and her mother. Jennie has not vocalized her humiliation, but Mrs. Gerhardt, because she knows Jennie so well, understands that she is ashamed of her poverty. Despite her sacrificial nature, she has her pride, especially when it concerns the affection of a man. She is, after all, a
young, single girl. Mrs. Gerhardt alone understands this, and thus she alone "secretly appreciated and sympathized with her feelings." When the passage is removed, all we are left with is her pathetic attempt to make light of the situation by remarking that "maybe he didn't know you," a comment that both she and Jennie know is not true.

A similar passage depicting Mrs. Gerhardt's sympathy for Jennie was also excised from the Harper text in a scene in which Jennie must sell the gold watch Brander has given her in order to provide food for the family. Mrs. Gerhardt does not want Jennie to pawn the watch, but "need is a stern commander" (excised from Harper text P48). When Jennie hands the watch to Bass, the narrator states that "[s]ecretly Mrs Gerhardt wept" (excised from Harper text P48). To Jennie, who does not value material possessions, the gold watch means nothing, but to Mrs. Gerhardt it symbolizes Jennie's future, the "hope" that her daughter's life will be different from hers. Selling the gold watch is tantamount to admitting that poverty will always define Jennie's existence. Other passages of this nature were also excised, such as when Mrs. Gerhardt finds out that people in the hotel are criticizing Jennie because she is seeing Senator Brander. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator states that "Mrs. Gerhardt's only thought was that Jennie was being maligned" (P57). In another passage in which Mrs. Gerhardt finds Jennie crying because she is pregnant and alone, she is "moved to the closest and most sympathetic inquiry"(P80). This passage was emended to read: "Mrs. Gerhardt resolved to question her daughter" (H529).

4 In this same scene, Gerhardt's "distress" in having to send his children to steal coal is also removed by the Harper editors. For a discussion of this excision see chapter four.
Because Mrs. Gerhardt understands her daughter, she knows that Jennie will never be completely happy until she has been reconciled to her father. Upon Gerhardt's return to the family home after they have moved to Cleveland, she sets about trying to reunite father and daughter. When Jennie comes home from work, Mrs. Gerhardt, who has already spoken to her husband about Jennie, encourages her to speak to him. The Pennsylvania edition reads as follows. The bracketed lines were excised in the 1911 edition:

Jennie paled, put her thumb to her lip and stood there, not knowing how to meet the situation.

['He knows you are here,' said Mrs. Gerhardt tenderly, anxious to soften, as much as possible, the ordeal though which her daughter must pass. 'I told him you were here.]

'Has he seen—?'

Jennie paused as she recognized from her mother's face and nod that Gerhardt knew of the child's existence. (P111; H556)

By removing Mrs. Gerhardt's sympathetic response to her daughter's plight, the Harper editors have moved her into the background of the experience. This is a pattern throughout the text. All of the above cuts remove notice of Mrs Gerhardt's sympathy and understanding in those circumstances that her daughter finds difficult and painful. In the restored text, however, she is always in the midst of Jennie's experiences, sometimes guiding, sometimes weeping, and always sympathizing. Throughout the story, neither poverty nor the condescending words of society nor the harsh treatment of Old Gerhardt can break the bond she shares with her daughter. Their relationship is stronger and more constant than any other in the restored text and it endures undiminished until Mrs. Gerhardt's death. It is Jennie to whom Mrs. Gerhardt looks for
solace as she lays dying: "Mrs. Gerhardt breathed her last, looking at Jennie in the few minutes of consciousness that life vouchsafed her at the very end. Jennie stared into her eyes with a yearning horror. 'Oh mama! Mama!' she cried. 'Oh, no, no!'" (P180; H616)

The cumulative effect of all these excisions and revisions is that Mrs. Gerhardt becomes a character that is flat, static, and somewhat materialistic. As a result, she fails to evoke our sympathy or even our interest. Besides these changes in passages expressing Mrs. Gerhardt's feelings for Jennie, the editors also changed passages describing Jennie's feelings toward her mother. Together, these changes alter their relationship from deeply intimate to little more than affable. Most emphatic are those changes that concern Jennie's motivation to leave her mother and live with Lester Kane. The restored text makes clear that Jennie eventually goes with Lester Kane only because she is concerned for her family, especially her mother, and wishes to provide them with a better life. Like Dreiser, who mourned for his mother's destitution, Jennie mourns because she cannot give her mother all the things she lacks. When the family moves to Cleveland and settles into their new home, Jennie, watching her mother work "like a servant... longed to give her those comforts which she had always craved" (P109; H553).

Lester Kane enters the story at a time when Jennie's sympathy for her mother is heightened because she is without her husband and cannot work because she has to take care of Vesta. In the original manuscript, Dreiser clearly indicates Jennie's motive in her early relationship with Lester: at first, though she is attracted to him she does not want to have anything to do with him. When Lester first says to her "you belong to me. I like you better every moment," and offered her money, Jennie "quailed and withdrew,"
crying "'No, no . . . .' I won't. I don't need it. No, you mustn't ask me. I won't do that.'" (P134; H578). When he makes advances toward her, she is "horrified [and] stunned," looking at him "with a growing terror" when he attempts to hold her (P123; H568).

When her father comes home from the glass manufacturer with his hands injured, however, the situation changes drastically. Jennie is most concerned about her mother's future, and she is "barely able to control herself" when she sees her mother's frustration and despair over Gerhardt's accident (P149; H589). At this point Lester's letter comes into her mind: "Without volition upon her part there leaped into her consciousness a connection—subtle, in a way unwarranted . . . . What about this man's offer of money now?" (P149; H589). The following passage in the restored text shows the connection Jennie makes between her mother's despair and Lester's money. The bracketed lines were cut from the Harper edition:

She looked so weak and helpless, [so much as if age and fortune were playing upon her as a tool, and as if all her life's hopes were slowly fading into ashes] that Jennie could hardly contain herself. [She knew for what her mother had always longed, how she had toiled and worn herself away for nothing.] (P150; H590)

The excised lines emphasize Jennie's understanding of her mother's natural inclination to "hope" for better things to come, and it is the thought that this hope will "fade to ashes" that provokes Jennie to first consider Lester's offer. Her intimacy with her mother enables her to understand that she has "toiled and worn herself" so that the family could have a better life. With this last calamity, though, the family is going to be thrown back into the same desperate poverty as before. The emphasis of this passage is not on her mother's helplessness, as it is in the 1911 edition, but on Jennie's recognition of and sympathy for the way in which her father's accident seals her mother's fate. At
least with the entire family working, there was some hope that they could pull themselves out of poverty, and her mother would at last have realized her "hope" of a nice home and an easy life for her children. When Gerhardt loses the use of his hands, however, Jennie understands that only a drastic change will keep her mother from continuing to be the victim of fortune. She responds to Lester's letter, therefore, mainly because of her sympathy for her mother. Her motive is made clear in the restored text. The following restored passage articulates Jennie's thoughts just after she has agreed to live with Lester in exchange for his financial assistance for her family:

Jennie, shocked and yet drawn by [Lester's] siren song of aid, ran along in thought to the full significance as far as her mother was concerned. All her life long Mrs. Gerhardt had been talking of this very thing, a nice home. If they could just have a nice home, a larger house with good furniture and a yard filled with trees, how happy she would be. In it they would be free of the care of rent, the commonplaceness of poor furniture, the wretchedness of poverty. He would help them, and her mother would not be troubled any more. (P157)

The final change that obscures Jennie's motive for agreeing to live with Lester appears when Jennie answers his letter asking her to live with him. In the Pennsylvania edition, she is left "wait[ing] with a sort o f soul dread, the arrival o f the day" (P153). In the Harper edition, this passage was changed to read, she "waited with mingled feelings of trepidation and thrilling expectancy, the arrival o f the fateful day" (H592). The emendation turns the terrible decision Jennie has to make into a sentimentally exciting moment of "thrilling expectancy." Certainly different forces push and pull her toward her final decision to answer Lester's letter, but all revolve around the effect her decision will have for her mother, not for herself.
The Harper editors' revision gives equal weight to Jennie's feelings for Lester and to those for her mother and her family. In the restored text, Jennie is attracted to Lester but she does not love him or feel any strong passion for him. West observes that the rewriting "changes the tone" of the scene, allowing "the reader . . . to escape Dreiser's implications more easily" ("Historical" P449). The 1911 text intimates that Jennie is a more or less accomplice in her own moral downfall, that she leaves because she wants to, not because she has to. In coupling her dread with "thrilling expectancy," the editors make Jennie's "sacrifice" little more than an exercise in self-proclaimed martyrdom.

The Harper editors' changes in Dreiser's original portrayal of Mrs. Gerhardt and the relationship she and Jennie share are significant and far-reaching. More than likely, the Harper editors wished to emphasize Jennie's relationship with her lovers, especially with Lester Kane, rather than her relationship with her mother. The affection and sympathy that Mrs. Gerhardt and her "beloved" Jennie share, however, is an essential part of Dreiser's story. After the editors altered the relation, Jennie's strongest motive in the original manuscript for accepting her lovers' advances no longer exists. Moreover the editors' revision of Mrs. Gerhardt's character forces her into the background of the novel. As we have already seen in other instances, these editorial changes seriously jeopardize the integrity of the novel. We cannot know whether the Harper editors intended to cut Mrs. Gerhardt's character the extent they did. Nevertheless, the result of these changes affecting the rendering of Mrs. Gerhardt and her relations with Jennie is to make them more accomplices in a search for material wealth than a loving, intimate mother and daughter.
Opposition: Mrs. Kane and Letty Gerald

In Dreiser's original manuscript, Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie provide their family with the love and compassion necessary for a happy and balanced life. In the novel, however, their maternal sacrifice and service are rarely appreciated. Nevertheless, Dreiser considered such love and compassion essential to the full growth and flowering of each person. In his own life, he says, it was his mother's affection that taught him how to give and to receive love: "I recall [my mother] taking me up and holding me affectionately against her breast and smoothing my head ... [T]hat was the birth of tenderness and sympathy in me," he writes in his autobiography *Dawn* (19). In *Jennie Gerhardt*, Sara Dreiser's affirming maternal behavior is projected into Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie. In this same autobiography, Dreiser states that even though his mother exhibited ideal maternal qualities, she could also be cruel and detached towards her children. It is this part of his mother's personality that he projects into the socially ambitious Mrs. Kane and the manipulative but wealthy Letty Gerald.

In the original manuscript, therefore, Mrs. Kane and Letty stand in clear opposition to Jennie and her mother. In between these two oppositional forces stands Lester, who is equally attracted to Jennie's maternal, loving nature and Letty's social and financial power. These opposing attractions, in turn, make him act ambivalently towards both women. The Harper editors, however, removed material that characterizes Mrs. Kane as cold and detached from her children and Letty as aggressive and manipulative. These changes destroy Dreiser's sharp contrast between the Gerhardt women and Letty and Mrs. Kane, thereby making it impossible to clearly understand why Lester's behaves the way he does.
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In the original manuscript there are three passages that describe Mrs. Kane as being more concerned with social mobility than with the health and welfare of her children. All three passages were rewritten by the Harper editors to make her appear more maternal and less socially aggressive. The result is that Mrs. Kane, in the Harper edition, is a much more sympathetic character, which makes Lester's attraction to Jennie seem physical rather than emotional and spiritual. In addition, Jennie's goodness and her sacrificial nature, which are emphasized by comparison in the original text, are weakened. Letty Gerald was also rewritten by the Harper editors to appear more sympathetic. In the original text, she is aggressive and manipulative. She actively pursues Lester even though she knows he is committed to Jennie. The Harper editors, however, cut four substantial passages describing Letty's aggressive pursuit of Lester and her dismissive disregard for Jennie. Thus, she becomes in the Harper edition much less aggressive, manipulative, and selfish, and her marriage to Lester seems the natural result of a courtship between two people who care deeply for each other rather than, as in the original text, a business arrangement motivated by Letty's desire to possess Lester and Lester's attraction to her wealth and power. A clear distinction between these women is also essential to understanding how Dreiser projects his long-time anxieties concerning his relationship with his mother into Lester's ambivalent behavior patterns.

Even in Dreiser's original manuscript, Mrs. Kane is a minor character. She is given few lines, and makes only a brief appearance. Even in her brief appearance, though, she presents a sharp contrast to Jennie's innate goodness and maternal sense. Her obsession with social mobility, which is projected onto her children, emphasizes Jennie's immense capacity to love, to give, and to mother. Unlike Jennie who is the
"ideal mother," Mrs. Kane is never associated with the type of love and affection
normally expected of a parental figure. Instead, she is distant from her children and
hostile to anything that inhibits their (and in turn her) upward social movement. This is
most clearly articulated in Dreiser's first introduction to her in chapter seventeen of the
version reads as follows:

Mrs. Kane . . . was not as much for social show as her children but who
in a way rejoiced that they should be. It seemed but fitting that the
children of her able husband should be distinguished—that she should be,
as his wife. They had always conducted themselves well, had given
evidence of mental and moral qualities which were admirable. Why
should not the community look up to them? It should. And in
consequence she carried herself everywhere proudly. (P138)

The Harper version reads:

Mrs. Kane . . . cared but little for social life. But she loved her children
and her husband, and was naively proud of their position and
attainments. It was enough for her to shine only in their reflected glory.
A good woman, a good wife, a good mother. (H582)

The rewritten passage gives Mrs. Kane maternal qualities that Dreiser kept from her.

The only time he uses the word "love" to describe her relationship with her children is
to clarify the effect of her "ambition" (P214; H642). She loves them because they have
helped move her up the social ladder. Dreiser states nowhere in the manuscript that she
is good or loving. The Harper editors, therefore, not only cut passages but added
material in order to transform Mrs. Kane into a mother who is more like Jennie and Mrs
Gerhardt. In the original passage, Mrs. Kane is vain and overly conscious of how others
see her. In the revised passage, however, her ambitious interest in her children's social
standing is reduced to a naivete. Their positive reputation in her social world is no
longer a reflection of her own ambition but just another reason to be proud of them. The revision of this crucial early passage transforms Mrs. Kane from a bad mother to a "good" mother. In turn, Dreiser's use of her maternal inadequacies to enhance Jennie and Mrs. Gerhardt's goodness and innate maternal sense, is destroyed.

Additional smaller changes to Dreiser's original depiction of Mrs. Kane further obscure her characterization as a socially ambitious woman. Several pages later, when Mrs. Kane becomes aware of Lester's relations with Jennie, the narrator states that because she "was a woman who had always retained the highest social ambitions for her children [she was] beside herself with chagrin and mortification" (P177). This passage was excised from the 1911 edition, along with an additional reference to her as a "socially ambitious woman" (P214). These excised passages show Mrs. Kane's priority to be social mobility, and her children are tools through which she can attain the social standing she so desires. Although there are few passages that speak directly to Mrs. Kane's character, those that do clearly depict her as overtly socially conscious.

Together, the changes made to Mrs. Kane's character shift Dreiser's definition of what it means to be either a good mother or a bad mother. In the Harper text, Mrs. Kane becomes "good" not because she is intimately connected to her children or because she makes sacrifices for them but because she cares just enough about their reputation to insure that nothing bad happens to them. Mrs. Gerhardt is defective by comparison. In the Harper text, Mrs. Gerhardt becomes a "bad" mother because she does not care enough about Jennie's reputation. As a matter of fact, she becomes a passive participant in her downfall. If she had cared about Jennie as a "good" mother should, she would have been more conscious of her reputation, and would not have allowed her to carry on
an affair with Senator Brander. Jennie, too, is seen as less "good" when compared to Mrs. Kane. If Jennie truly loved Vesta, she would be more concerned about how her behavior affects her daughter's reputation. A "good" mother would not live with a man out of wedlock. Instead, she would find someone to whom she could be a "good wife" and provide the proper moral environment for a child.

Mrs. Kane's obsession with how her children are perceived socially, as seen in the restored text, may account for Lester's attraction to Jennie and why he stays with her even though it alienates him from his family. Jennie provides Lester with the emotional consistency and loving home environment he craves. Many of the passages describing Lester's attraction to the loving home Jennie provides, however, were either cut or rewritten by the Harper editors. Dreiser explains in a passage excised from the Harper text that "under these pleasant home conditions, [Lester] liked [Jennie] better than ever" (P270). In another passage also excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes of Lester's joking remarks: "This home-life may have its attractions, but it takes a tall lot of forbearance when you think of the amount of breakfast-waiting a man has to stand for" (P197). In a later passage also excised from the Harper text, the narrator states that Jennie and Lester's Hyde Park neighbors "came to see and feel that this was rather an exceptional home atmosphere which had been established here, and over which [Jennie] presided" (P259). In another, much more revealing passage, the narrator states:

the three years of living with Jennie had, by the very quality of the sympathetic, affectional service rendered, made him in an affectional way dependent. Now he had been close to someone who at odd times and at his convenience, provided him exactly the service and the atmosphere which he needed to be comfortable and happy. (P214)
The Harper editors rewrote the passage to read: “Three years of living with Jennie had made him curiously dependent upon her” (H642). The restored passage indicates the complex nature of Lester's attraction to Jennie. Lester “likes” Jennie “more” when she provides him with a home environment. Her maternal-like "sympathy" and "affection," which were denied to him as a child, have made him “affectionally” dependent upon her. When coupled with the previously addressed passages excised from the Harper text clarifying Lester's need for a home-like relationship, we more clearly understand that the "services" Lester refers to are those supplied by a committed and loving partner (a type of mother). For Lester, Jennie is this partner. She waits on him hand and foot, knows his every mood, and is always there when needed. Unlike Mrs. Kane, Jennie's affection is not born from social ambition but from a genuine concern for Lester's health and happiness. Like a good mother, Jennie is willing to sacrifice her own happiness for that of Lester's. When she forces him to leave her, she believes that "she would be happy thinking that he was happy . . ." (P359; H765). Her unconditional, consistent love and affection for Lester provides him with the home-like "atmosphere" he was denied as a child. When these passages concerning Lester's relationship with Jennie are cut or revised, however, the complexity of Lester's attraction to Jennie is lost. When these cuts and revisions are coupled with those made to Mrs. Kane's character, we can no longer fully understand why Lester is so attracted to Jennie.

Letty Gerald is also placed in opposition to Jennie to emphasize Jennie's goodness and innate maternal sense. In the original manuscript, Letty is a more fully developed character than Mrs. Kane and therefore stands more clearly in opposition to
Jennie. Like Robert and Archibald Kane, she also represents the ambition and materialism that pervaded Dreiser's society. Unlike Jennie, Letty is aggressive and self-centered. She knows what she wants and goes after it despite the consequences for others. She actively pursues Lester even though she believes that he is married to Jennie. Jennie has only Lester's happiness at heart and refuses to fight back. In turn, Letty takes advantage of her goodness and self-sacrificial nature to convince Lester that leaving Jennie would be in everyone's best interest. The editors at Harper, however, excised several passages early in the story that reveal Letty as aggressive, selfish, and manipulative. In the Harper text, she has been toned down to such an extent that she is no longer a selfish schemer. Instead, she is a strong, socially affluent woman who simply falls in love with an interesting old flame.

The differences between Letty and Jennie are addressed immediately upon our introduction to Letty in chapter forty-four of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter forty-five of the Harper edition. In this introduction we learn that Letty had married Malcolm Gerald, a man she "did not love," and that after being married only four years, Malcolm Gerald died, leaving her "a very rich widow," a line that was toned down by the Harper editors to read, "very well off" (P309; H719). Letty is also the mother of a young girl, but unlike Jennie who is forced to leave her child with others out of financial necessity, Letty chooses to leave her child with others so that she can be free to travel: "She was the mother of one child, a little girl, who was safely in charge of a nurse and a maid at all times, and she was invariably the picturesque center of a group of admirers recruited from every capital of the civilized world" (P308; H719). These introductory passages place Letty's maternal behavior beside Jennie's to show that they are very different.
women. Letty lacks even the most basic maternal instincts, while Jennie is so naturally maternal that she is not only mother to her child but mother to all. Because Letty does not have the capacity to love that Jennie does, she is never able to provide Lester with the type of compassionate, service-oriented home he so craves. When Letty and Lester marry, Lester's home becomes a physical structure devoid of love and intimate connection: "Their home," thinks Lester, "wherever it was, would be full of clever people. He would need to do little save appear and enjoy it" (P376; H781).

Since Letty has neither the maternal instincts nor the ability to provide Lester with the stable, loving home environment he needs, why does he leave Jennie for her? In the restored text, the answer lies both in Letty's unrelenting, aggressive manipulation of Lester's ambivalence towards relationships in general, and Lester's need to reinstate his power and authority within the upper-class society that refused to accept his relationship with Jennie. The result is that in the restored text, Lester and Letty's marriage is created and sustained much like any good business arrangement, through persistence, manipulation, greed, and self-interest. This reading, though, is not very romantic. Therefore, the Harper editors cut out numerous passages that describe Letty's aggressive behavior towards Lester, and Lester's self-centered motives for marrying Letty. In turn, Letty becomes a much more sympathetic character, and the relationship between her and Lester is more sentimental and less critical of the wealthy.

In the original manuscript, the self-centered, mercantile nature of Letty and Lester's relationship is a microcosm for the capitalistic society Dreiser lived in: "Not to want to be rich or to be willing and able to work for riches was to write yourself down as a nobody," Dreiser writes in *Dawn*. "Material possessions were already the goal as
well as the sum of most American-life . . ." (293). The excisions made to the commercial nature of Letty and Lester's relationship begins immediately upon their reintroduction to each other in London. The narrator explains that Letty had always been a "sincere and ardent admirer of Lester Kane" and that "in her day she had truly loved him, for she had been a wise observer of men and affairs from the beginning, and Lester had always appealed to her as a real man." The narrator adds that Letty's attraction to Lester is enhanced by his dislike for "the little frivolities of common society conversation" (P308; H719). These qualities had left her "hop[ing] that he would propose to her" (P309; H719).

In both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, Letty's initial interest in Lester seems simple and honorable. In a passage excised from the Harper text that follows, however, the narrator clarifies that she is still in love with him: "She had imagined herself in his arms time and again, being held close and joyously caressed, and she had said to herself that if that day ever came she would be the happiest woman alive . . ." (P309). The phrase "if that day ever came" takes Letty's "hop[ing]" for "caress[e]s" out of the past and into the present, making her attraction to Lester immediate and real. Without this restored passage, the reader views Letty's and Lester's eventual relationship as having developed out of mutually renewed feelings. In contrast, the Pennsylvania edition emphasizes that Letty's feelings for Lester have always existed. These feelings motivate her to pursue him aggressively despite her understanding that he and Jennie are married.

Further references that reveal Letty's agenda to renew her love affair with Lester no matter who she hurts appear soon after this opening passage. Immediately after Letty and Lester meet in London, Letty maneuvers Lester into a situation where they can be
more physically intimate. When they are in Cairo, Letty seeks out Lester and invites 
him to go dancing with her that evening. She starts the conversation by asking him if 
Jennie dances, to which Lester replies that she does not. Letty tells him: "You come 
dance with me tonight. Your wife won't object" (P315; H725). After dinner she tells 
Jennie, "I've made your husband agree to dance with me. Mrs. Kane," to which Jennie 
replies, "He ought to dance. I sometimes wish I did" (P316; H727). In the original 
manuscript, this scene is coupled with the following passage:

He wouldn't like so many other men she knew, do a mean thing. He 
couldn't. But if he could and would--Jennie might look out for herself, 
and yet she felt sorry for her at that. She was lovely, but Lester needed 
another kind--herself --the Letty Pace that was. (P319)

This passage, excised in the Harper text, articulates Letty's attraction to Lester 
and her hope that he will cheat on Jennie with her. Earlier, Dreiser states that Lester, 
too, is clearly attracted to Letty, as he notes her "youth and "beauty," as well as her 
"slender" shape (P318; H728). Letty senses his attraction and behaves toward him in 
such a way so as to "ma[ke] him feel as if he owned her" (P319; H319). In a line 
excised from the Harper text, the narrator explains that she wanted him to feel as though 
he "could run to her if ever circumstance or fate permitted" (P319). If he would come to 
her she would "take him" (P319; H729).

Together these passages articulate the attraction that is developing between Letty 
and Lester, and the way in which Letty will actively pursue Lester despite the fact that 
he is in a relationship with another woman. Their attraction to each other is motivated, 
however, by very different desires. Letty has always been in love with Lester and wants 
to possess him. Lester, who has just recently lost his shares in the family business, is, on
the other hand, only attracted to her money. This attraction, in turn, makes him, after seven years, suddenly aware of her physical beauty. Unlike Letty, though, Lester, is not willing to act on his feelings because he loves Jennie and would not hurt her. Letty, on the other hand, feels quite different. She would "take him" tonight, if he came to her and make love to him even though he is married. How this affair would affect Jennie does not concern her. She easily dismisses her sympathetic feelings for Jennie, and then justifies her own immoral behavior by convincing herself that because she is wealthier than Jennie, she is a better match for Lester: "she felt sorry for her at that. She was lovely, but Lester needed another kind--herself." Even Jennie, whose nature is to always think the best of people, recognizes Letty's intent. During the trip back to America, Jennie thinks in a passage excised from the Harper text: "If she were not here, Mrs. Gerald would take Lester" (P320). Dreiser's placement of these passages early on in the text, reveal that Letty intends to make Lester "run to her" whether or not he wants to, and that she will do whatever it takes to insure that he does.

Upon their return to America, Letty learns that Lester and Jennie are not married and that Lester is no longer a shareholder in the family business. Letty, in turn, writes to Lester asking to see him while in Chicago: "'I'm going to take a house in your town this winter, and I hope to see a lot of you,'" she writes (P336; H741). In a passage excised from the Harper text, Lester debates meeting with her, but finally decides he must because he knows that she is aware of his unorthodox relationship with Jennie and wants to explain how it came about: "Ought he to go?" he thinks, "It was plain that there was coming a long conversation between himself and [Letty] some time. He would have to tell her all. Things couldn't be straightened out any other way" (P336). When Lester
arrives at Letty's home, Letty sympathetically tells Lester that she is not interested in the
"'gossip about Mrs Kane,'" but that Lester ought to "'have what rightfully belongs to
[him]'" (P337; H742). The end of their conversation in the Pennsylvania text is as
follows:

'It seems to me such a great sacrifice, Lester, unless of course you are
very much in love. Are you?' she asked archly.

Lester was truly in the house of the temptress, for Mrs. Gerald had made
up her mind that if he were not married (and it looked to her as if he were
not) and were going to leave Jennie, that he might as well come to her.
She loved him. With her fortune of several millions, to say nothing of his
interest in the Kane company, he would be a most imposing financial
figure. Some of the companies in which Robert was interested as a
stockholder and director were practically controlled by her interests. If
Lester were in charge, he could force his brother off the boards, if he
wished. She disliked the manner in which Robert had treated him, if
local reports were true. Why shouldn't he marry her? He liked her, and
she was an ideal companion for him--far more suitable than Jennie.

Lester paused and deliberated before replying. 'I really don't know how
to answer that question, Letty,' he said. (P337)

This passage in the Harper edition reads:

'It seems to me such a great sacrifice, Lester, unless of course you are
very much in love. Are you?' she asked archly.

Lester paused and deliberated before replying, 'I really don't know how
to answer that last question, Letty,' he said. (H742)

In the Harper text, Letty and Lester's conversation is nothing more than a heart-
to-heart talk between old friends. Letty is concerned about Lester's happiness and wants
him to more seriously consider his choices. She concedes, however, that if he is "in
love" his sacrifices have been worthwhile. In the Harper text, therefore, Letty is
sympathetic, considerate, and wise. In sharp contrast, the Pennsylvania edition reveals
that Letty is actively scheming to get Lester to leave Jennie and marry her. Dreiser's
choice of the word "temptress" clearly shows how he intended to characterize her relationship with Lester. As first revealed in earlier excised passages, Letty has "made up her mind" that she will have Lester, even if he does not want her. She also has no problem purposely obscuring her intent to make Lester think she is sympathetic to him and to Jennie. Although she intimates to Lester that he should stay with Jennie if he loves her, the above excised passage reveals that she intends to see his relationship with her end. Whether or not he loves Jennie is not a concern for her. Although her words seem sympathetic, they are little more than a means whereby she can further ingratiate herself with Lester at Jennie's expense. As Dreiser writes in an additional passage excised from the Harper text: "[Letty] tried to deceive herself into the belief that she was disinterested in giving . . . advice, but she wasn't at all" (P341).

In addition, the above excised passage reveals Letty's intent to exploit Lester's struggle between two worlds by offering him her money and position as tools to reclaim his authority in the business world. Because Jennie refuses to fight back, Letty becomes the stronger force, and her consistent offers of power, money, and revenge quickly seduce Lester into believing that he can sacrifice the home and love he has with Jennie for the wealth and power of Letty. In the original manuscript, Lester leaves Jennie not because he loves Letty but because Letty's money will help him reclaim his authority over his brother and his dignity amongst his social peers. A passage excised from the Harper text states:

[Letty] was possessed of millions, also, and of distinction. Together, they could repay an indifferent, chill, convention-ridden world with some sharp, bitter cuts of the power-whip if they chose. It seemed cruel to be speculating this way, but though he loved Jennie, and felt sorry for her,
Mrs. Malcolm Gerald was always vaguely in his mind as someone who could put things right for him socially . . . (P361)

This passage is the only one in the text to articulate clearly the nature of Lester's interest in Letty. Without it, the reader is led to believe that their relationship is based on a mutual attraction rather than on her economic and social position and his need. Her money, he thinks, will allow him to assert his authority and dominance in a society that rejected him because of his relationship with Jennie.

The above excised passage also clarifies that Lester does love Jennie. This declaration reveals the immense spiritual and emotional sacrifice Lester is making in leaving her for Letty, who has nothing to offer him spiritually. In choosing Letty over Jennie, Lester thinks: "Material error in the first place was now being complicated with spiritual error. He was attempting to right the first by committing the second. Could it be done to his own satisfaction? Would he pay mentally and spiritually?" (P369; H774).

Lester does pay for his decision. Once he marries Letty, life again becomes for him as meaningless and dull as it was before he met Jennie, and he calls it "a farce" and "a silly show" (P392, 403; H797, 807). His own life has reverted to the same animal-like, instinctual, unfeeling existence he was living before Jennie came along: "'[You're] a brute,'" Letty tells him, "'but a nice kind of brute.' 'Yes, yes', he would growl. 'I know. I'm an animal . . . ." (P404; H808).

When he marries Letty, then, he enters a relationship based on material rather than spiritual intimacy. Unlike his relationship with Jennie, his marriage to Letty is rooted in self-interest, greed, and power, and is therefore as stagnant and empty as the materially-obsessed world he lives in: "The trouble with this situation and this attitude,"
thinks Lester, "was that it adjusted nothing, improved nothing" (P405; H809). The result is that all involved end up miserable, and Lester, on his deathbed, is wracked by the painful realization that leaving Jennie was a mistake, and that money and power are no substitute for human sympathy and connection: "It seems strange," he tells Jennie just before he dies, "but you're the only woman I ever did truly love. We should have never parted" (P410; H815).

In the restored text, Letty's aggressive pursuit of Lester despite his relationship with Jennie is much clearer than in the 1911 text. Although Lester must bear the blame for his own behavior, his ambivalence makes it easy for Letty to manipulate him into a relationship with her. In the Harper text, however, Letty's character is rewritten so that she becomes more socially and morally acceptable. In the process, the nature of her relationship with Lester changes from negative to positive, and their eventual marriage becomes the socially acceptable and even morally appropriate ending to Lester's amoral life. The Harper message is that Letty is the better woman, which is why Lester chooses her over Jennie.

On another level, the changes made by the Harper editors to the maternal characters in the story obscure the picture we get of Dreiser himself. In contrasting Jennie and her mother with Mrs. Kane and Letty Gerald, Dreiser was working out his unconscious ambivalent feelings toward his mother. This complex ambivalence, however, is lost in the flatter, more sentimental version of the Harper text, as Mrs. Kane is transformed from a cold, detached mother to one who is loving and intimate with her children. Most critics agree that Jennie Gerhardt is at least partially inspired by
Dreiser's familial experiences while living in Terre Haute Indiana, and it is easy to see that the beauty and goodness inherent in Jennie and Mrs. Gerhardt were inspired by the love and devotion his own mother gave him. At the same time, however, Dreiser's autobiography states that although Sara Dreiser was loving and intimate with her children, she could also be extremely cruel towards them. It is this side of her that Dreiser projects into the character of Mrs. Kane. In the original text, then, Dreiser created Mrs. Kane to embody his mother's detachment, which places her in opposition to Mrs. Gerhardt and Jennie. The cold, detached mother we see in the original manuscript shapes Lester's dysfunctional adult behavior and makes him yearn for the love and sympathy of a girl like Jennie.

In *Dawn*, Dreiser writes of his conflicting feelings towards his mother. On the one hand, he loved and respected her: "She appealed to me as thoughtful, solicitous, wise, and above all, tender and helpful—qualities which evoked in me not so much dependence as love" (4). She held the family together despite the poverty that constantly threatened to consume them, and she could calm his fears with the touch of her hand: "when [her] velvety hand was laid on my cheek, could there be any real danger
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anywhere?" (19). Her devotion so drew Dreiser to her that he could not "recall a single one of [his] youthful plans for the future in which, somehow, [his] mother was not included" (157). After her death, he writes of her as "[a] lamp, a dream, an inspiration, one whose memory even now walks on before, making a path of beauty" (50).

Despite her capacity to make her children feel loved and secure, however, she occasionally threatened to abandon them. According to Dreiser, her middle-class rearing made her think herself better than others even though she was often more destitute than most. She sometimes directed her humiliation to her children. On more than one occasion she articulated her belief that "her life was accursed, or that she wished she were dead" or "that her children were" (7, 6). On other occasions, she tried to make her youngest son feel personally responsible for her condition: "'See your mother's shoes?'" she would say to him. "'Aren't you sorry she has to wear such torn shoes? See the holes here?'"(19). Her words caused a "swelling sense of pity that ended in tears," and made him feel "sorrowful and helpless" (19). Perhaps her cruelest words, however, were those that threatened to yank from under him the stability she alone could provide. Dreiser states that one of her "favorite tricks was to threaten to leave us." The emotional effect "evoked a storm of wails and tears" so strong that "intense depression and the most dissolving of emotions" resulted (Dawn 151). In the typescript of Dawn, Dreiser is even more honest, stating that her threats caused him to "faint." He writes: "'I thought it was a little short of criminal in her to even pretend to desert us . . . I looked on it as cruel'" (qtd Gogol 140). These incidents of emotional tyranny were so frightening that Dreiser continued to have nightmares about them long after her death:
I used to dream of her as being alive but threatening to go off and leave me, and would wake to find myself in tears. Even to this day, dreams of her invariably evoke in me a great sadness and longing, the result, I presume, of the psychic impact of those terrors long ago. (151)

In his relationships with women, Dreiser experienced an intense ambivalence, which was probably caused by the oppositional feelings he felt for a mother whose behavior was sometimes contradictory. He could never stay faithful to one woman, and could never commit to having children even though his wife, Sara, desperately wanted them. In Jennie Gerhardt, one of Lester's most frustrating characteristics is his ambivalent behavior even towards Jennie, which gives Letty the opportunity to manipulate him into leaving Jennie and marrying her. Throughout his life, Lester experiences oppositional mental and emotional forces that pull him in different directions, making him incapable of any type of sustained action. Lester himself admits as much: "Instead, he had drifted and drifted," he notes before he dies (P310; H720). In another passage cut from the Harper text, he states that "he was beset by hours of dissatisfaction with himself, with the smallness of his accomplishments and with the manner in which he was drifting along, having a good time" (P187).

His ambivalence is most evident in his relationship with Jennie, which constantly teeters between fulfillment and abandonment. Although he admits that he loves her, that "[w]ith [her] he had really been happy, he had truly lived" (P214; H642), he will not commit to anything permanent. Even after being warned by his father that

3 To examine the nature of oppositional feelings see sociologist John Bowlby's Separation: Anxiety and Anger. Bowlby asserts that contradictions in a parent's behavior towards a child can result in "emotional splitting," which in turn leads to ambivalent adult behavior patterns. (New York: Basic Books, 1973) 370.
his inheritance would suffer if he continues to live with Jennie, Lester cannot make a decision: "I can't marry you now," he tells her repeatedly, "I might in the future, but I can't tell anything about that" (P248; H673). Only when Kane senior dies and makes Lester's inheritance contingent upon his leaving Jennie does he begin to understand the far-reaching effects of his indecisiveness: "[H]e had made a very big mistake in not having married Jennie in the first place, openly and above board . . . . There were no two ways about it; he had made a considerable mess of this," he thinks (P298; H711). So ambivalent is Lester that he can never really make the decision to leave Jennie. Instead, she does it for him. Even Lester's marriage to Letty is a result of inaction rather than action. Lester never asks Letty to marry him. Letty makes up her mind that they will be married in April and together, they come to a "silent understanding" (P377; H781).

Lester's ambivalent behavior in his adult relationships can be traced to his relationship with his mother. The relationship between Lester and his mother can, in turn, be traced to Dreiser's experiences with his mother. Sara Dreiser's behavior towards her children would have made Dreiser especially sensitive to the effect of contradictory feelings towards an attachment figure. This reading, however, is dependant upon Dreiser's original writing of Mrs. Kane. When she is transformed into a good and loving mother, as she is in the Harper edition, it is impossible not only to see Dreiser's experience in the background of the text but to understand why Lester is so ambivalent.

Overall, Dreiser's original writing of both Mrs. Kane and Letty Gerald emphasizes the inability of the material and social world to provide for all of man's needs. Both Letty and Mrs. Kane, as representations of Dreiser's industrialized, material world, are incapable of a sympathetic, sacrificial relationship with any one, including
their own children. The result is dysfunctional behavior, misery, loneliness, and regret. Although both Letty and Mrs. Kane are wealthy and socially powerful, their lives are empty and meaningless. Mrs. Kane dies without a sign of deep loss or regret from any of her children, and Letty is replaced by another woman at her husband's deathbed. The original writing of Mrs. Kane and Letty also emphasizes Jennie's sympathy and affection. Unlike Letty, Mrs. Kane, and even Lester, Jennie leads a fulfilling life despite her circumstances. She does not sacrifice her essential goodness and integrity for material objects. In other words, she is not willing to overlook the person for her own personal interest and so unlike Lester, she is never consumed by bitterness or regret.
Maternal Matters

In Dreiser's original manuscript, Jennie's role as the central character in the novel is clear and precise. Jennie's tendency to act in ways that are consistent with the heroine of a romance place her in opposition to virtually every other character in the novel. Unlike Lester, the Kanes, and even her own siblings, Jennie is aware of and intimately connected to the world's larger natural order. Because she submits to its laws, not society's, she is free to give and receive love without question or fear of consequence. Often, Jennie acts toward those she loves with a maternal love and sacrifice that make her a type of "all-mother." For Dreiser, the connection between motherhood and the natural order of the world was undeniable. Motherhood is the fullest natural expression of all that is good, loving, nurturing, and wise. It is, he states in Jennie Gerhardt, "consecrated and hallowed as one of the ideal functions of life" (P93). Dreiser uses Jennie's innate desire to "mother all" to emphasize her connection to life's larger order. With their cuts and emendations, however, the Harper editors erased Jennie's maternal nature. These changes deflate Dreiser's characterization of Jennie, destroy the intimacy of her relationships with family members, obscure our understanding of why Senator Brander is attracted to her, and divest the text of those romance features that give it complexity and beauty.

Most critics associate Dreiser with naturalism, and most of his works develop naturalistic patterns and themes. Jennie Gerhardt, however, is different. Although most characters fall into naturalistic patterns, Jennie does not. In Dreiser's original manuscript, her character is more closely aligned with the romance genre. From beginning to end, Jennie is intimately connected to the larger order of the universe.
Much like nature itself, Jennie gives love to whoever needs it, and accepts it freely in whatever form it comes. Her connection to a larger order gives her a spiritual quality that draws people to her in ways they cannot explain. To her family, acquaintances, and lovers, Jennie is a mystery because unlike anyone else they know, she loves without condition and sacrifices without thought to the consequences. She is, as Dreiser states in his introduction to her, an "anomaly" in "the world of the material" (P16; H471). For Dreiser, many things we apprehend are unexplainable. As he states in the excised coda, "Behold there are hierarchies and powers above and below the measure of our perception" (P574). Despite the attempts by many characters to define and control her, Jennie remains indefinable by any man-made laws or tradition. She is controlled solely by the wisdom, beauty, and goodness inherent in the larger order of things.

Motherhood, with its intimacy, love, and sacrifice, is the perfect expression of this larger natural order. Dreiser therefore emphasizes Jennie's connection to this larger force by making her maternal concerns and actions so deep and so constant that she is not only mother to her own child but mother to all. In turn, Jennie's immense maternal sense separates her from other women in the text and defines her as both spiritually strong and fully feminine. Men like Brander and Lester, who could have virtually any woman they want, are drawn to her femininity and generous spirit, and find themselves acting in ways that are contrary to their nature. Jennie does nothing to attract them. Instead, they come to her. To Brander, Jennie "was a lodestone of a kind, and he was its metal" (excised from Harper text P22). Lester, too, was "instinctively, magnetically, and chemically drawn to her. She . . . answered . . . the biggest need of his nature" (P124; H569).
In the Pennsylvania edition, Jennie's maternal sense is first seen in her relations with her siblings. Like a mother, Jennie sacrifices her reputation and her future so that her siblings can have a chance at a better life. Unfortunately, not only do her siblings later fail to appreciate her actions and their motivations, but they criticize her mercilessly for her very actions they benefit from. Still, their behavior does not alter hers. She continues to love them and sacrifice for them despite their ungratefulness. The Harper editors, however, cut most of the material portraying Jennie's maternal concerns for her siblings and their responses, as well as passages criticizing both their and society's hypocrisy. The result is that in the Harper text, Jennie's connection with a larger order, as expressed in her maternal concern for her siblings, is weakened considerably, and along with it the painful burden of her siblings' disregard of her deep love and sacrifice.

Dreiser emphasizes Jennie's maternal sense through her relationships with various character, but in every case the Harper editors altered these relations. In the restored text, Jennie and her illegitimate child Vesta are intimate and loving despite their separation. They remain always emotionally connected, and Vesta grows up to be much like Jennie. In the end, when Lester leaves Jennie for Letty Pace, Vesta protects and consoles her mother. In the Harper text, however, cuts and emendations mute the intimate nature of Jennie's relation with her daughter, and make her appear to be an absentee mother whose priority is her lover, not her child. Again Dreiser emphasizes her maternal nature through her relationship with her father. By the end of his life, her sensitive care of and sympathy for him impresses on him the true beauty and goodness of his daughter. The Harper editors cut one passage that describes the way in which
Jennie nurtures her father and how he changes as a result of her nurturing. They also cut several passages that describe Brander's attraction to Jennie's maternal generosity, which makes it difficult to understand in the Harper edition why he is interested in Jennie.

Dreiser's portrayal of Jennie as maternal begins in the Gerhardt home, where she is a surrogate mother to her siblings, nurturing, loving, and sacrificing for them in the same way her mother does. Dreiser establishes the depth and quality of Jennie's ability to mother early in the text:

In the world of the actual, Jennie was such a spirit. From her earliest youth, goodness and mercy had molded her impulses. Did Sebastian fall and injure himself, it was she who struggled with straining anxiety to carry him safely to his mother. Did George complain that he was hungry, she gave him all of her bread. Many were the hours in which she had rocked her younger brothers and sisters to sleep, singing whole-heartedly betimes and dreaming far dreams. (P17; H471-472)

This early passage, which appears in both the restored and Harper editions, identifies Jennie's good and merciful spirit, and it foreshadows her later acts of maternal care that characterize her as the "all-mother." In the 1911 edition, however, the significance of this passage is lost because most of Jennie's later maternal acts were excised. Because the reader never actually sees Jennie acting maternally toward her siblings or others, the above passage becomes an isolated and essentially meaningless piece of sentimental prose, the type for which Dreiser is so heavily criticized. Mordecai Marcus, for instance, in his article based on the 1911 edition, states that Jennie becomes over sentimentalized because her most important characteristics are "presented in the form of statement and are backed up by little dramatic development . . ." (62).
The first of these cuts occurs early in the text, immediately following the last quoted passage (Appendix D). As the scene begins, Senator George Brander, who has become attracted to Jennie, is thinking about how lonely his life has been: "He could not help looking about him now and then and speculating upon the fact that he had no one to care for him" (P20; H475). At this instant, Jennie knocks on the door, having brought his washing back before the specified date to "give a more favorable impression of promptness" (P21; H475). Brander welcomes her company and strikes up a conversation with her, asking if her sister Veronica is getting better. Jennie, "who was greatly concerned over the youngest" (excised from Harper text), answers that "[t]he doctor thinks so." Brander asks more about Veronica's condition, and Jennie answers that "'[s]he has the measles . . . 'We thought once that she was going to die.'" Brander is clearly uninterested in Veronica's condition, and comments, "Well . . . 'that's too bad.'"

The editor excised the passage describing Jennie's reaction to this comment:

The spirit in which he said this was entirely conventional. He did not, by a hundredth part, feel the quality which it conveyed to her. Somehow, it brought to Jennie a general picture of her mother and father, and of all the stress and worry they were undergoing at present. She hardened herself intensely against the emotion, lurking so closely behind the surface in her, and silently let the comment pass. (P22)

This scene in the Pennsylvania edition is the first to develop Dreiser's earlier description of Jennie as a maternal figure to her siblings. Though she is in the presence of a handsome, financially secure, single public figure who is obviously interested in her, Jennie's thoughts are not on him but on her family. Jennie's thoughts and actions show her to be a distinctly different woman than Carrie Meeber, whose focus is always on the material. Jennie is so connected to the larger order of things that her first desire is
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to do what is best for her family, not for herself. In earlier scenes, Dreiser has made it clear that Jennie has taken notice of Brander's wealth and power, but the excised passages show that she is never so attracted to them that she forgets her parents and siblings. Because the editors excised virtually all of Jennie's thoughts, we cannot see her concern for the anxieties and needs of her family. Therefore, she may seem to act from the same motives as Carrie. To understand her motives, we must have access to her consciousness, as Jennie is not a woman of words, but of feeling: "She isn't quick at repartee," states Lester, "She thinks rather slowly. . . . Some of her big thoughts never come to the surface at all, but you can feel that she is thinking and that she is feeling" (P339; H743).

Critical essays reflect the changed sense of this scene in the Harper edition. In "Jennie Gerhardt: Gender, Identity and Power," Margaret Vasey singles out this scene as support for Pizer's statement that Dreiser "endows Jennie with the same moving quality he had given Carrie—'the wonder and excitement of an impressionable sensibility as it encounters for the first time the material beauty and splendors of life'" (28). She states that Jennie's passivity is magnified in this passage because "[w]e know nothing of Jennie's thoughts about Brander at this time" (24). The Harper editors emphasized the sentimental character of the scene by eliminating Jennie's sense, as in the restored text, that he might be willing to help her family. In the Harper version, she seems more interested in Brander for her own sake than for the sake of her family.

In addition, the restored passages also show Brander in a different light. Despite his expressed concerns about the Gerhardts' poverty, he is interested only in Jennie, and he uses Veronica's illness as an excuse to keep her with him longer. Jennie recognizes
the easy insincerity of his comment even as she must "harden herself" so as not to express the intense emotion it rouses in her. Her concern for her family contrasts sharply with Brander's unconcern, revealing not only his infatuation with her but also his lack of empathy with her family in their desperate circumstances.

Another excision affecting Dreiser's portrayal of Jennie's maternal sense occurs in a passage in which Jennie offers to pawn the gold watch Brander has given her because she once admired his. Brander has returned to Washington to finish his term, having decided to end all contact with Jennie because of gossip in the hotel. His absence throws the Gerhardts into a desperate financial situation, and Jennie is forced to sell her gold watch. The Pennsylvania edition reads:

In his absence, the family finances had become so strained, she had been compelled to pawn [the watch]. Martha had got to that place in the matter of apparel where she could no longer go to school unless something new were provided for her. Mrs. Gerhardt had spoken of this in her hopeless, helpless way, and Jennie had felt heart tugs many a morning when little Martha had gone forth, her old clothes demeaning her every feature.

'I don't know what to do,' said her mother.'

'You might pawn my watch,' said Jennie. 'I guess Bass could take it.'

Mrs. Gerhardt objected, but need is a stern commander. She thought more calmly over it after a day or two, and finally Jennie persuaded her to let her give Bass the watch.

'Get as much as you can,' she said. 'I don't know whether we'll be able to get it out again.'

Secretly Mrs. Gerhardt wept. (P47-48)

This same passage in the Harper text reads:

In his absence the family finances had become so strained that she had been compelled to pawn [the watch]. Martha had got to that place in the
matter of apparel where she could no longer go to school unless something new were provided for her. And so, after much discussion, it was decided that the watch must go. (H501)

In the restored passage, Jennie is willing to sacrifice the first fine thing she has ever had in order to see her sister better dressed. Jennie knows she will never get the watch back, but her overriding concern is for the health and welfare of her younger sisters. Mrs. Gerhardt spends the ten dollars Bass gets for the watch on the children, and "naturally Jennie was glad" (P48; H501). The Harper version suggests that Jennie sells her watch because of the family's poverty, but it lacks the emphasis on her "heart-tugs." She simply sees a need and fills it, with no emotion attached to the act. In the restored text this is the first time Jennie sacrifices a tangible "thing" for her siblings, and it foreshadows the more intimate and socially serious sacrifices she will eventually make for them. The foreshadowing is lost in the Harper text because we cannot connect her later acts to her maternal feelings toward her siblings.

Another passage portraying Jennie's maternal concern was so bowdlerized by the Harper editors that its similarity to the original is barely recognizable, which is unfortunate because it portrays the Gerhardts as completely at the mercy of their poverty.¹ In this scene, Bass is caught stealing coal. As he attempts to escape, he punches a policeman and is taken to jail. Eventually, he is fined ten dollars for being "altogether too free with his fists" (P67; H517). The ten dollars is an enormous sum for the Gerhardts, and despite much effort on the part of Old Gerhardt, they cannot raise it.

Jennie sits and worries alongside her parents, trying to think of some way that they can raise the money. She recognizes that Brander is the only person who could provide the money on such short notice. In an excised passage, the narrator states:

Only Jennie kept thinking over and over of Brander and what he would do if he knew.

But he had gone, or she thought he had. She had read in the paper shortly after her father's quarrel with him that he had departed. There had been no notice of his return. She wondered what she could do, thinking of Bass the while in his narrow cell. To think of Bass, so smart and clean as a rule, his eye cut, as her father had said, lying in prison. And for trying to get them coal. (P68-69)

This passage provides yet more evidence of the depth and strength of Jennie's maternal sense toward her siblings. In her deep sympathy for Bass, she seeks out Brander, even though her father has forbid her to see him. She cannot, however, passively stand by and watch her brother suffer, and so with his interests at heart, Jennie sets out to accomplish that which Mr. and Mrs. Gerhardt cannot. Dreiser states in an excised passage: "The problem which this daughter of the poor had undertaken to solve was a difficult one . . . . She was compounded at this moment of a sense of pity and a sense of hope" (P70). She willingly sacrifices herself to insure that her brother will not spend another night in jail. After his release, she "was so glad to see him back that she stroked his hair," an affectionate and specifically maternal gesture that was also excised from the Harper text (P76). The excision of these passages destroys the maternal aspect that Dreiser so carefully develops in Jennie's relations with her siblings. Jennie is not just a nice sister; her actions are clearly maternal, and her sacrifice on behalf of Bass is one that few siblings would be willing to make.
Moreover, when these passages are removed, Jennie's motive for seeking out Brander is subtly altered. In the Harper text it is clear that Jennie wants to help Bass, but the depth of love and sympathy that give her actions such urgency is not expressed or intimated. In the restored text Jennie sleeps with Brander because her maternal love and sympathy for Bass make her intensely "grateful" to Brander for getting him out of jail. When he tells her that Bass "is out," she "clasp[ed] her hands and stretch[ed] her arms towards him" (P73; H521). When her maternal concern is removed, however, the reader does not immediately connect her actions toward Brander as motivated by her deep love for Bass. Instead, the reader can more easily see her decision to sleep with Brander to result from her attraction to him.

In addition, the restored passages have subtly prepared the reader for Jennie's pregnancy and motherhood. The passages concerning Bass's incarceration, full of maternal allusions, show Jennie in her maternal aspect. For Dreiser, Jennie does not suddenly become a mother because she gives birth. She has always been a mother, and has proven so time and time again: "She had been born with the strength and with that nurturing quality which makes the ideal mother," Dreiser writes (P97; H543). Even after she is ostracized from her home for becoming pregnant, Dreiser writes in an excised passage that "[r]ich pathos was in her soulful eyes, and a tenderness that was not for herself at all" (P87). By making Jennie's pregnancy the result of her maternal impulses towards Bass, Dreiser intimates that she is a mother in her instincts and sensibilities even before she becomes a mother physically. This subtle intimation is essentially lost in the Harper text because passages describing Jennie's maternal connection to her siblings are gone. The result is that her pregnancy is more readily seen as simply
immoral, rather than the natural movement of her life from one stage to another: "The pregnancy of an unwed woman may violate certain community codes, but pregnancy constitutes an affirmation of a life force," states Elias in his essay on the restored text.

"Jennie's [pregnancy] is to be understood not as an event in itself but as a function of her character . . . [Dreiser] treats her subsequent maternity as a part of her womanhood, a fact of nature to be accepted, even praised" ("Janus" 4).

Jennie shows her care for her siblings and her child when she decides to live with Lester in Cincinnati. She decides to do so when her father is injured at the glass works factory and is unable to work. The only solution to the family's situation is for Jennie to move in with Lester. In order to make her father more comfortable with the unconventional nature of the family's livelihood, Jennie tells him that she and Lester are to be married. Although she does not want to deceive her father or her siblings, she knows that her father will accept the money necessary for the family's survival only if she does. Knowing her father's suspicions about the affair, Jennie solicits her mother's help in deceiving him and the family. Mrs. Gerhardt helps Jennie because she knows that if Lester does not help them, no one will. Like Jennie, she understands that a parent must make certain sacrifices in order to alleviate the "stress of family finances" (P175). Dreiser, however, qualifies this statement with the following passage, which was excised from the 1911 text:

Jennie had given her mother nearly all she had received from Lester and had advised her, against the time when they could spend, that the children should have good clothes, that a comfortable sitting room and dining room should be arranged, and that her mother was to have her almost-faded dream, a parlor. (P175)
This passage places Jennie's act of moving in with Lester within the larger context of her feelings toward her siblings. By mentioning Jennie's concern for the children, Dreiser again makes her sacrifice flow from her maternal concerns. Even though she has embarked on a new life and is geographically separated from her siblings, she still maintains a deep spiritual connection to them, continuing to insure, as any good parent would, that they "should have good clothes." The excision, then, again weakens Dreiser's depiction of Jennie as maternal. The excision of this passage also obscures the extent to which the Gerhardts are dependant upon Jennie's income. In the restored text, it is clear that during this time the Gerhardts do not have enough money to survive. Without Jennie, the family members would either have died of starvation or been separated and the children sent to relatives or orphanages.

Jennie's maternal concern for her siblings functions in the novel in a number of ways. One function is to criticize the stifling nature of American moralism. For Dreiser, rigid abstract moralism constantly threatened to devour the natural spiritual impulses inherent in all persons. Dreiser's criticism of society's judgment against Jennie, however, was removed by the Harper editors. In the restored text, the following two passages clearly articulate Dreiser's sense of society's cruelty. Both were excised:

As yet, we are dwelling in a most brutal order of society, against the pompous and loud-mouthed blusterings of which the temperate and tender voice of sympathy seems both futile and vain. Although able to look about him, and in the vast ordaining of nature read a wondrous plea for closer fellowship, yet, in the teeth of all the winds of circumstance, and between the giant legs of chance, struts little man--the indifference, the nonunderstanding, the selfishness of whom make his playground too often a field of despair. Winds to whisper that it is with the sum and not the minute individual of life that nature is concerned; waters to teach that of her bounty no man may be honestly deprived. All the beauty, the sweetness, the light poured forth with so lavish a hand that all may see
the lesson of eternal generosity; and yet, unseeing man, narrowly
drawing himself up in judgment, still seizes his brother by the throat,
exacts the last tittle of form or custom and, finding him unable or
unwilling to comply, drags him helpless and complaining to the gibbets
and the jails. (P93-94)

'Judge not lest ye be judged' is the wisdom of tenderness, but the human
mind will persist in doing this thing because it is preservative of things
as they are so to do. Given a certain code of morals—true or false—if you
wish to preserve them, the actions of all men must be judged
accordingly. In so much as anyone has faith in any given doctrine or
theory, in so far will he judge his fellow men by it, not more. (P208)

Dreiser's criticism of society becomes even more emphatic when placed within
the context of the Gerhardt siblings' disapproval of Jennie. In the restored text, Jennie is
a surrogate mother to her siblings, giving them that which Mr. and Mrs. Gerhardt
cannot. She understands that within the larger order of the world, her family's survival is
more important than her reputation. Her sacrifices enable them to grow up in a middle-
class home, to become self-sufficient, to marry well, and to end up relatively
comfortable and happy. "[Jennie's] sexuality . . . enables the family to survive and
further advances the possibility of her siblings' ability to seek, if not upward mobility,
other opportunities," Kathy Frederickson states (13):

George was in Rochester, working for a wholesale wall-paper house . . .
Martha and her husband had gone to Boston . . . a little suburb in
Belmont, just outside the city. William was in Omaha, working for a
local electric company. Veronica was married to a man named Albert
Sheridan who was connected with a wholesale drug company in
Cleveland. (P344; H748-749)

Nevertheless, in the Pennsylvania text, Jennie's siblings reject her for the very
actions that have kept them not only alive, but healthy and happy. After Mrs. Gerhardt's
death, Martha thinks in a passage excised from the Harper text: "The fact that Jennie
was serviceable and kindly was neither here nor there. Her life had been a failure, made
so by herself... and a bad life at that" (P180). The pathos of this passage becomes even more emphatic when Martha then decides to become a teacher, a respectable occupation that she can achieve only because Jennie's money has allowed her to finish her education. The excision of the above passages criticizing society's judgmental attitude destroys Dreiser's emphasis on the terrible cost of Jennie's maternal sacrifices, as not even those whose lives she has helped in such an enormous way can get past her social and moral transgressions. Those whose heads she has stroked and whose meals she has provided repay her by joining "the same unreasoning part of society, the judgers of those who do not judge" (P94). No one, not even her siblings, can see Jennie's actions in their larger context. Dreiser's clear intent is to open to his reader's wonder and admiration Jennie's rich and generous nature; her innately maternal sense; and her connection to a larger order, which enables her to give even when all she receives back is humiliation and disrespect.

Additional cuts further mute her siblings' disregard for her sacrifices on their behalf. For instance, although Bass tries to help Jennie through her pregnancy by finding her a place to live, he, like Martha, never fully appreciates or even understands the immense sacrifice she makes for him. Bass knows that Jennie has gone to see Brander the night he was jailed and that Brander is responsible for his release: "I went to see Senator Brander for you," Jennie tells him after he returns home from jail (P75; H524). Although Jennie turns up pregnant shortly thereafter and is ostracized from her home, it never crosses Bass's mind that he could be partly responsible for her predicament. In an excised passage the narrator states:
Bass stood still, feeling that it was too bad to have her go out in the night, but no thought of his own responsibility for her condition afflicting him. What the father had said about age proved that her seducer was Brander, but that anything had happened to her the night of his jailing did not cross his mind. In a vague way, he thought it was a pretty bad scrape that Jennie had got herself into, but did not want to see her harshly abused. Still, no fine magnanimity called him to any striking action. (P86)

By making Jennie's siblings a party to her social condemnation, Dreiser makes society's rigidity more concrete and persuasive. Although it is easy to understand that the Kanes judge Jennie because they are social snobs, it is quite another thing to see her own siblings reject her so thoroughly and so quickly. In the restored text, then, it is clear that almost everyone, not just the rich and the puritanical are morally rigid. By cutting the above passages, the Harper editors seem to be catering to rather than criticizing such moralistic judgment. These restored passages, however, show that Jennie cannot be judged adequately by society's standards because her actions are guided by a much larger order. She gives because to do so is innate in her character. Rejection by others cannot change her essential nature. The force of this moral rigidity and Jennie's ability to see and to act beyond it, however, are lost in the Harper edition, and the result is that the irony of Jennie's familial situation is destroyed and our sympathy for her weakened considerably.

Jennie's pregnancy in the restored text besides being shown to be the result of her maternal feelings toward Bass, also reveals and deepens her intimate connection to a larger natural order. The Harper editors obscured this connection by cutting and revising the narrator's comments on the way in which society misunderstands the nature of motherhood. In the restored text, Dreiser asserts that motherhood is so innately
connected to a larger order that it transcends social and moral codes. Even in her circumstances, Jennie experiences her pregnancy as wonderful and yields to it fully. Jennie "welcom[ed] motherhood . . . content to sit in quiet meditation, the marvel of life holding her as in a trance" (P97, 94; H542, 541). The birth of her child only increases her awe and love for the larger order of the universe.

For Dreiser, because childbirth and motherhood partake wholly of the rhythms of a larger natural order, they stand beyond conventional moral laws. In the original text, Dreiser criticizes harshly the community that reduces the conception and birth of Jennie's child to a shameful act. Of the 112 lines criticizing society, however, the Harper editors removed fifty. For instance, the reader does not find in the Harper edition the narrator's assertion that those who label the birth of an illegitimate child "sin[ful]" are "ignoran[t] of the highest wisdom which would care and make provisions for the happiness of every creature conceived," or that because "the budding and essential love" of childbirth is a natural process, it cannot be looked "upon as evil": "How could such a thing [birth], so lovely in its outward seeming produce only brutality and terror?" asks Dreiser (P93, 95). Those who would criticize Jennie are "pompous," "loud-mouthed," and "unreasoning . . . judgers of those who do not judge" (P94). People must allow themselves to "possess and be possessed by an environment whose mores and process they accept as the law of their behavior," explains Warwick Wadlington (422). As Dreiser states in the excised coda, "Shall you say to the blown rose--well done! or to the battered wind-riven, lightening-scarred pine, thou failure! In the chemic drift and flow of things, how little we know of that which is either failure or success" (P574).
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With the above passages removed from the Harper text, the novel's criticism of those who condemn Jennie's behavior is much softer. The Harper text still acknowledges the birth of a child as a natural act but does not accept let alone justify Jennie's illegitimate pregnancy as the expression of a larger natural order. Indeed, after the excisions, such judgmental morality is not only excused but encouraged. In the end, Jennie is seen as immoral and hence less sympathetic. As one critic states in a review of 1911 edition:

Jennie Gerhardt . . . a girl with no strength of character in fighting temptation, a girl with an unusually affectionate disposition who goes the easiest way to comfort and shelter. . . . One can be sweet and forgiving and yet have it all spring from flabbiness of spiritual fiber. Jennie is no model for any girl who sees life on all sides (Markham 59).

Additional cuts also obscure Dreiser's portrait of Jennie as a mother. In an excised passage, Dreiser writes:

There were months thereafter in which the child was as carefully looked after as any baby possibly could be. With the money which Brander had left, there was no worry as to the means of supplying such necessities of clothing as the child needed, and being of supreme motherly instincts herself there was no worry as to its care. (P97)

Positioned immediately after Vesta's birth, this passage sets out the nature of Jennie's relationship with her child before the reader has time to imagine Vesta's illegitimacy as a sign of Jennie's immorality or her inferiority as a mother. Jennie's "supreme motherly instincts" insure that Vesta will grow up happy and healthy, as indeed she does. In the restored text, Dreiser portrays Jennie, though a social and moral outcast, as a rare and superior woman. As we have seen in previous chapters, Mrs. Kane and Letty Gerald, though "moral" and socially accepted, are no mothers. Letty Gerald leaves her child "in the charge of a nurse and a maid at all times" (P309; H719), and Mrs. Kane's neglect of
Lester makes him psychologically passive and emotionally self-centered. The restored passage, therefore, continues Dreiser's comments on the natural state of motherhood. Those who acquiesce to nature's larger plan make the best mothers, not those who are "moral" and wealthy. Jennie is the "ideal mother" because she, unlike Letty or Mrs. Kane, "is from beginning to end, innately in harmony with and ultimately at peace with the natural world" (Kucharski 19).

Even Jennie's lengthy absences from her daughter cannot be considered a sign of her failure as a mother; rather, it is a sign of those "supreme motherly instincts" that cause her to sacrifice herself for the sake of others. In the restored text, Jennie's intense love for Vesta is emphasized over and over. The most intimate moments between Vesta and Jennie, however, were removed by the Harper editors. The first cut occurs when Jennie receives Lester's letter asking her to go away with him. In an excised passage, Jennie thinks "of her home, her child, and herself." This passage is followed with: "how [will she] adjust her movements so that . . . her child's future [should] not be jeopardized (P147). In another passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator states: "There was in her mind the thought that Vesta was to be well-educated and given station under an assumed name . . ." (P192). These passages articulate Jennie's maternal concern for Vesta's future. Although Jennie accepts society's condemnation of her, she does not want the same for her daughter. She understands that if Vesta is connected to her, she will be denied opportunities for a normal social life, most importantly, a happy and traditional marriage with a man she loves. This is what Jennie has been denied: "No one will ever have me as a wife--you know that," she tells her mother (P161; H600).
When Jennie leaves her family and Vesta to move in with Lester, Old Gerhardt becomes the dominant parental figure in the child's life, caring her "as both father and mother . . ." (excised from Harper text P182). In an excised line that follows, the narrator states that he "did not outstrip Jennie in attentions and affection when opportunity permitted" (P182). At this point in the story, Jennie and Lester's growing love for each other moves into the foreground, which places Vesta in the background, and these passages remind the reader that Jennie has not abandoned Vesta for Lester. To the contrary, Jennie does what she can for Vesta even though she is separated from her. Unlike Carrie, whose decision to live outside of social convention is motivated by selfishness, Jennie is motivated by what she sees as best for others, not for herself.

Additional passages also obscure Dreiser's emphasis on the deep feeling between Jennie and her daughter. When Jennie must find a new home for Vesta because Mrs. Gerhardt has died and William Gerhardt is too old to care for the child alone, the narrator in the Pennsylvania edition states:

She decided to find some good woman or family in Chicago with whom she could leave Vesta for a little while. Then, then--she looked at the prospect nervously and blanched. But she knew it must come some day. It must. The problem of relocating Vesta--transferring her without detection, was not easy. Lester was now in Chicago, or likely to be, almost continuously. She hoped to find some home--some quiet family or truly good woman who would take her for a consideration. Before transferring Vesta, Jennie returned to Chicago and hunted, at such times as she could arrange for the right person and the right neighborhood. Finally, in a Swedish colony to the west of La Salle Avenue, she found an old lady who seemed to embody all the virtues she required--cleanliness, simplicity, honesty. (P191)

This same passage in the Harper text reads:

Finally she decided to find some good woman or family in Chicago who would take charge of Vesta for a consideration. In a Swedish colony to
the west of La Salle Avenue she came across an old lady who seemed to embody all the virtues she required—cleanliness, simplicity, honesty. (H624)

Though the Harper edition maintains the essential facts of Vesta's "transfer," the emphasis on the time and care Jennie takes to find just the right person has been lost. In the Harper version, Vesta's transfer seems more like a hasty business arrangement than a personal decision that comes from much "hunting." In the restored text, Jennie is not getting rid of Vesta but wishes to find a place that is consistent with what she knows to be the best environment. Vesta's new home must be run by not just a "good" (moral) woman but by a "truly good" (maternal) woman. In the Harper edition, Jennie's motives are born out of a sense of convenience, and therefore the reader more easily sees her as a neglectful and selfish mother.

When Vesta becomes ill, Jennie is summoned by Mrs. Olsen. In the both the restored and Harper editions, Jennie has to tell Lester that she has a child because he cannot understand why she has to leave the house so late at night: "It's my child, Lester!' she exclaimed. 'It's dying. I haven't time to talk. Oh please don't stop me. I'll tell you everything when I come back'" (P204; H533). Lester is left dumbstruck: "Could this be the woman he had thought that he knew? Why, she had been deceiving him for years. Jennie! The white-faced! The simple!'" (P204; H633). In the restored text, his confused feelings for Jennie are balanced with Jennie's anxious thoughts for her daughter. These thoughts, however, were excised from the Harper text. The following passage from the Pennsylvania edition describes her feelings. The bracketed lines were removed by the Harper editors.
'If I can only get there,' she kept saying to herself. And then, with that frantic unreason which is the chief characteristic of the instinct-driven mother, 'I might have known that God would punish me for my unnatural conduct. I might have known—I might have known.

[She waited at the corner where the street-cars ran, every moment that passed between her reaching there and a street-car's quick arrival seeming like an age to her, and all the while she was busy heaping reproaches on herself, wondering whether the good God she believed in would vouchsafe her mercy enough to spare her child until she could reach her, saying over to herself that it was a visitation for all her past misconduct and promising that, no matter what happened, if God would spare Vesta now she would take her to herself as a mother should and never henceforward for one moment neglect her again.]

When she reached the gate she fairly sped up the little walk and into the house, where her Vesta was lying pale, quiet, and weak but considerably better. (P205; H635)

The restored passage emphasizes Jennie's maternal anxiety for the health of her child. Vesta is not an inconvenience to Jennie but a significant part of her life. Therefore, every moment that she is apart from her sick child seems like an eternity. Jennie cares so much for Vesta and so little for herself that she bargains with God for Vesta's health. If God saves Vesta, she will "never henceforward for one moment neglect her again." She loves her child deeply, and she will do whatever it takes to insure her health. In the restored text, there is a balance between Lester's surprise and frustration at Jennie's announcement and Jennie's anxiety for Vesta's health. Both Lester and Jennie react in ways consistent with their character. Jennie reacts maternally and Lester reacts selfishly. The Harper excision, however, shifts the emphasizes of the scene to Lester's reaction, thus leading the reader to sympathize with Lester, not Jennie.

The Harper editors cut other passages describing Jennie's and Vesta's love for each other. When Lester leaves because his fortune is threatened, Jennie, though deeply
hurt by Lester's decision, is concerned about how she will explain Lester's decision to Vesta. The Pennsylvania edition describes the event in the following way. The bracketed lines were removed by the Harper editors:

There were so many mean little trying things to adjust also from time to time, for a change of this kind is never made without explanation. The explanation she had to make to Vesta was, of all, the most difficult. This little girl, who was old enough now to see and think for herself, was not without her thoughts and misgivings. [Jennie had been an ideal mother—here was an indissoluble bond of affection between them, just as there had been between Jennie and her own mother—] but Vesta recalled that her mother had been accused of not being married to her father when she was born. She had seen the article about Jennie and Lester in the Sunday paper at the time it had appeared—it had been shown to her at school—though even then she had sense enough to say nothing about it, feeling somehow that Jennie would not like it. Lester's disappearance was a complete surprise to her, but she had learned in the last two or three years that her mother was very sensitive, and that she could hurt her in unexpected ways by talking. Jennie said nothing, but Vesta could see it all in her eyes. [She loved her so that she was beginning to want to shield her, and at fifteen and sixteen she could do it nicely.] Jennie was finally compelled to say to Vesta that Lester's fortune had been dependent on his leaving her, solely because she was not of his station. (P378; H783)

Vesta, then, is much like Jennie. She loves so deeply that she instinctively wants to "shield" those she loves from pain and embarrassment. Although parted from Jennie during her early childhood, like her mother, she has learned to connect with a larger order. Therefore, she understands Jennie better than anyone else. She is not concerned with her mother's past. She only cares that her mother is happy, and therefore she is careful not to hurt her in "unexpected ways." Vesta has grown up to be exceptionally sensitive and loving. Through these excised passages, we understand that, as her mother had done for her, Jennie has taught her child how to love without condition. As a result, Jennie and Vesta enjoy an "indissoluble bond" that cannot be broken even by Lester's cruelty.
When Vesta dies, Jennie is consoled by the love they shared. In an excised passage, the narrator states: "There had been innumerable occasions when [Vesta] had caressed Jennie fondly, hugging her about the neck, kissing her, telling her that she was the dearest mother that ever was" (P385). In these excised passages, Dreiser brings his criticism of society's rigid morality to its proper conclusion. Vesta's life has not been, as society predicted, a "marked example of the result of evildoing" (excised from Harper text P93) but an indication of the power of Jennie's innate connection to a larger order as expressed through her "supreme motherly instincts" (excised from Harper text P94, 97).

In the Pennsylvania edition, with her constant concern for all humans, despite their personal or social failings, Jennie embodies a goodness that is often stifled or perverted by traditional values and rigid morality. It is no surprise, then, that after her mother dies, she becomes the maternal figure in her father's life. Even though he has ostracized her from her home, she accepts him back into her life without question. She seeks him out in the small, dirty room he calls home and coaxes him into returning to Hyde Park with her. At first, he refuses, but Jennie's sensitive handling of the situation makes him change his mind: "He threw his hands after his characteristic manner. The whole decency of it touched him to the quick. 'Yes, I come,' he said and turned, but she saw by his shoulders what was happening. He was crying" (P253; H678).

Jennie knows how to treat her father to make him feel at home. She humors him, puts up with his idiosyncrasies, gives him odd jobs to do around the house so he will feel useful, and even makes some of his clothes. While in her presence, Gerhardt experiences a kind of rebirth. He tells Jennie: "'You know' . . . I feel just like I did when I was a boy. If it wasn't for my bones, I could get out and dance on the grass" (P345;
In an excised passage that follows, the narrator states: "[Jennie] was always anxious that he should be well-dressed and well-fed, and she looked after him much as she did Vesta" (P344).

In these two passages, Dreiser's subtly emphasizes how Jennie changes her father's life. Her love for him and sensitivity toward him change him. He admits to Jennie that he has "been hard and cross" (P344; H749). He realizes that of all his children, she is truly good: "'You're a good girl, Jennie,' he said brokenly. 'You've been good to me . . . . I understand a lot of things I didn't" (P344-345; H749). "He seemed happier and more contented afterward for having told her this, and they spent a number of happy hours together, just talking" (P345; H749-750). Mordecai Marcus states, "when Papa Gerhardt almost silently comes . . . to understand the long-forebearing love which more than makes up for [Jennie's] technical sin, he is really achieving the wisdom he claims for himself" (64). In the end, his death mimics that of his wife's, and he dies with Jennie at his side: "'It's the end,' he said. 'You've been good to me. You're a good woman'" (P346; H750). Jennie's last relation with her father is still touching even in the 1911 edition, but its force is greater in the restored text because Jennie's constancy in goodness and love, even though she bears the burden of the many judgments imposed on her, is fully developed and more keenly drawn.

As emphasized in the restored text, Jennie's maternal senses make her more fully feminine than the other female characters. It is this quality that attracts Brander to her. He is attracted to Jennie from the moment he first sees her on the steps of the Columbus hotel. Her attractive power is, however, heightened when he sees her acting with maternal affection and concern. Several cuts made in the Harper text, however, obscure
the reader's perception of this attraction. The first of these cuts occurs during Jennie and Brander's first extended conversation referred to earlier in this chapter. She has returned wash to his room, and he attempts to keeps her longer by asking her questions about her family. Jennie is worried about Veronica's illness and her parents' anxieties about their poverty. As she expresses these concerns, the narrator states in a passage excised from the Harper text:

Not recognizing the innate potentiality of any creature, however, commonplace, who could make him feel this, [Brander] went glibly on, lured, and in a way, controlled by an unconscious power in her. She was a lodestone of a kind, and he was its metal; but neither she nor he knew it. (P22)

While she is feeling intense emotion raised by her concern for her parents and her sister, Brander feels the power of her presence, which intensifies his own sense of masculinity, power, and financial superiority. Without his knowing what it is, she is manifesting the quality of goodness and the capacity for love that draws him so powerfully to her. He could have any number of wealthy, sophisticated women, yet he finds himself "unconsciously" drawn to Jennie. She does nothing out of the ordinary. She simply appears and acts according to her nature. It is not her physical appearance that draws him. In that regard, he acknowledges she is "commonplace." Nevertheless, some quality in her touches the deepest core of his being. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator states that Brander “thrilled with such pleasure as he had not known in years, ... every word [Jennie] said showed the natural feeling and interest she took in everything in life” (P47). In these excised passages, Dreiser shows that sometimes powerfully spiritual forces are expressed in the simplest of things. Jennie is a simple creature, but her expressions of maternity make her more feminine than any
other woman Brander has every known. He is "lured" to her. She controls him, not vice versa, as one would expect. She is "lodestone" and he is the "metal." It is not until later in their relationship that Brander can even begin to articulate the reason why Jennie has such power over him. In another passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser states:

It was the essence of human comfort in another that he was feeling. How long had it been since the touch of a human hand had the thrill and warmth in it for him that hers did. How cold was the general material of life beside this warm, human factor, a woman dealing sympathetically with him. (P34)

The next excision occurs when Jennie asks Brander for help in freeing Bass from jail. The events of this scene lead to Jennie's pregnancy and eventual ostracism. By this time, Brander has been alone with Jennie on many occasions, yet he has never tried to seduce her. On this night, however, he is so drawn to her that he abandons the "caution of years," and makes love to her. In the Pennsylvania text, it is clear that Jennie is so grateful for Brander's help that she gives into his desires. Her "tears of gratefulness" reveal to Brander the depth of her feeling for Bass. At this moment her femininity is most fully expressed, and Brander is once again "unconsciously" drawn to her. In an excised passage, the narrator describes the power Jennie has over him: "It gripped him like a magnet . . . [and] pulled him firmly" (P73). Again, he cannot articulate Jennie's power over him, but it pulls him to her, and he acts against all counsel of his reason and experience, caution and restraint: "He drew her to him . . . He pulled her to him close and kissed her again and again" (P73; H521). The restored passages help the reader understand why a man like Brander is so attracted to Jennie. If "you were given these things to hold in your arms before the world slipped away, would you give them up?" Dreiser asks (P74). Without the passage intimating the nature of the powerful "grip"
Jennie has on him, the reader must provide some other explanation for why Brander is attracted to her.

In the Pennsylvania edition, Jennie is not a stereotypical, sentimental heroine caught in the grasps of two wealthy lovers, nor is she a Carrie Meeber. Rather, she is a person whose goodness and love defy explanation in terms of conventional economic, social, and moral forces and terms. Many misunderstand her motives and judge her harshly, but some are drawn and even changed by her spiritual power. In the Harper text, though, Dreiser's portrayal of Jennie's goodness is eventually lost completely because the Harper editors removed many of the passages that identify Jennie's maternal feelings, thoughts, and actions for her siblings, her child, and her father. The Harper editors have reduced Dreiser's creation of Jennie as a figure of the romance, guided constantly in her actions by her awareness and participation in the larger, transcendent order of things, to a character essentially sentimental and materialistic. Jennie then becomes an easy target for middle-class morality and sentimental pathos. As Alexander Kern states in his critical analysis of the 1911 edition: "Jennie is 'bad woman,' a type we disapprove of, yet we are deeply moved by her individual plight" (165). The Pennsylvania edition, by restoring the cut passages and undoing the emendations, realign the novel with a larger definition of motherhood, thereby returning richness and texture to Dreiser's portrayal of the title character.
Realigning Jennie

The Harper editors not only weakened Jennie's portrayal as "all-mother," they altered, especially on her side, the dynamics and complexity of her relation with Lester Kane. One effect of all these alterations to Dreiser's original portrayal of Jennie is that the focus is shifted somewhat from Jennie as the thematic and emotional center of the story, to Lester. In the original text, Dreiser characterizes Jennie as superior to Lester because she is more clearly connected to a larger, natural order. Lester, a mechanistic determinist, is drawn to Jennie's spiritual nature in ways that he cannot understand. Consumed by a need to be wealthy, powerful and socially accepted, however, he turns down Jennie's offer of unconditional love only to realize much later that his life has been miserable without her. His recognition of this fact reveals that love and human sympathy are more valuable than wealth and power. Unfortunately, the Harper cuts and emendations alter Dreiser's portrayal of Jennie in her relation with Lester, thus making him the central character. Their story in the Pennsylvania text is fueled by a complexity of emotions. In the Harper text, though, it becomes little more than a sentimental love story in which Jennie figures as Lester's love interest.

In the Pennsylvania edition, Jennie and Lester represent two opposing views of life. Lester is pessimistic and cynical, while Jennie, who is intimately connected to a larger order, is innately spiritual and giving. The tension that exists when these two opposing views attempt to coexist is what informs their love affair and makes the story both complex and moving. The Harper editors, however, eliminated the complexity of their relationship by cutting passages that describe Lester's recognition of and attraction to Jennie's larger spiritual sense. When these cuts are coupled with those made to
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Jennie's innate maternal nature, she is reduced to little more than a stereotypical sentimental protagonist.

The editors cut Jennie's character extensively, but left Lester's intact. In turn, they flattened Jennie's character, displaced her as the central character of the story, and obscured the complexity of her relationship with Lester.¹ Most of the cuts occur in the latter two-thirds of the novel, after Jennie meets Lester. The cuts are made in the following way: First the editors cut a large passage that sets out the differences between Jennie and Lester's views on life. Second, the editors excised several passages that articulate Lester's sense of Jennie's larger nature and his attraction to it. As opposed to the opening chapters where the narrative voice introduces Jennie's character, in the latter part of the novel, we see her "bigness" mainly through Lester's eyes. When these passages are cut, so is Jennie's larger nature. In addition, without these passages we no longer have a clear sense of why Lester loves Jennie, and his internal conflict between her world and Letty's is reduced to little more than a bothersome problem that he works out by leaving Jennie for Letty.

Third, the Harper editors sentimentalized the ending of the story by adding lines to Lester's deathbed scene that make his reunion with Jennie melodramatic. Fourth, the editors weakened Jennie as figure from the romance by cutting passages that describe her ability to connect with nature in the most tragic of circumstances. Most important of

¹ West states that "[Dreiser] described Lester's philosophical orientation in several long passages and did the same for Jennie, in equally long sections. Lester's passages were left alone during the editing process, but nearly all of Jennie's were reduced or removed" ("Historical" 446).
these cuts is the coda, which West also excised in the Pennsylvania edition. In the original manuscript, Jennie, from beginning to end, is able to draw strength from the natural world. This strength is most important in the end when everyone she loves either leaves her or dies. By removing the coda, as well as other passages that describe her ability to connect with nature in times of tragedy, the Harper editors rendered her life tragic, even meaningless, which it is not.

Criticism based on the 1911 edition reveals Jennie's sentimentalization and the way in which Lester becomes the dominant character. Mordecai Marcus states in his essay on 1911 edition that "[t]he greatest weakness in both the novel as a whole and in its psychological texture is the sometimes superficial and sentimentalized portrayal of Jennie" (61). Donald Pizer states that Dreiser's emphasis on (1) the story of Lester and Jennie, and (2) the subsequent emphasis on Lester as the main character, save the novel from becoming overly bathetic:

Dreiser saves the novel . . . [by] shift[ing] its direction. . . . to a slight degree in the second seduction and then completely in the major segment dealing with Lester and Jennie after her second fall . . . . A major cause of this new direction in Jennie Gerhardt is the importance which Lester Kane now assumes in the story. (107, 111)

The novel is also enhanced, he states, by Dreiser's fuller development of Jennie as a type of Carrie Meeber, one who is filled "with the wonder and excitement of an impressionable sensibility as it encounters for the first time the material beauty and splendors of life" (107). Pizer argues that by making Jennie more sensitive to wealth, Dreiser also made her more insecure and needy, which is what attracts the animal-like Lester to her: "Kane's powerful drive to possess and to hold [which is] matched by
Jennie's instinctive desire to be possessed and to be held . . . depict[s] in the love between Jennie and Lester one kind of sexual and temperamental compatibility” (110).

H.L. Mencken, however, wrote to Dreiser in April of 1911 that Jennie Gerhardt was better than Sister Carrie because, unlike Sister Carrie, the central male character does not dominate the story: "You strained (or perhaps even broke) the back of 'Sister Carrie' when you let Hurstwood lead you away from Carrie. In Jennie Gerhardt there is no such running amuck. The two currents of interest, of spiritual unfolding, are deftly managed" (Dreiser-Mencken 68).\(^2\) Mencken's appraisal of the original manuscript attests to the precision with which Dreiser handles Jennie and Lester's relationship in the original text, and the importance of Jennie's fuller development in the novel.

Unfortunately, once the editors got hold of the manuscript, Jennie's character was cut to such an extent that she comes to occupy a minor role in the novel. Robert H. Elias argues that in the 1911 edition, "the crucial choices have been Lester's, not [Jennie's], and that insofar as he is the one needing to come to terms with what he is, the story has been his" ("Janus" 7). West states that the excisions made in the latter portion of the novel, "are most telling on Jennie's character, for they could be said to put the novel out of balance and tip it in favor of Lester" ("Historical" 446). Dreiser biographer Richard Lingeman argues also that "[i]n the Harpers version, Lester's fate becomes the dominant motif, Jennie becomes a passive handmaiden to his destiny . . . . In Dreiser's version there is much more to Jennie" ("Biographical" 14-15).

---

In the Pennsylvania edition, Jennie represents Dreiser's belief that the spirit of a larger order is most perfectly expressed in nature and that a connection to this larger order can be realized through an openness to those qualities in nature that are good and beautiful. In the original manuscript, Jennie, is, from beginning to end, intimately connected to nature, and it is this connection that allows her to maintain her integrity when she is being emotionally abused and socially ostracized. Lester, on the other hand, represents Dreiser's naturalistic tendencies. Lester, unlike Jennie, sees very narrowly. He believes that man is in control of his own destiny and that life is concrete and fully explainable. Wealth, in turn, is the physical expression of man's fitness and strength in this world. Lester fails to realize, however, that he must attend to his emotional and spiritual needs as well as to his material needs if he is to be truly happy. Despite his deep, abiding attraction to Jennie's innate spiritual sense, he is never able to completely give in to her offer of love and commitment because it stands in the way of his desire for social acceptance. In the end, he makes love, compassion, and sacrifice secondary to wealth and power, and thus ends up lonely and unfulfilled.

The first of the extensive cuts appears in chapter twenty-six of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter twenty-eight of the Harper edition. At this point in the story, Jennie and Lester have been living together for three years. The exact nature of their relationship, however, is still unclear to the reader because Jennie has been consumed with providing for her family and keeping her indiscreet lifestyle a secret. At the beginning of the chapter, the narrator explains in an excised passage that

there had grown up between them an understanding which . . . had a number of elements of strength . . . . [Lester] loved . . . Jennie . . . in his way . . . rearing itself through feelings and subtleties of understanding
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and appreciation which were far above the lowest animal desire . . . . She was charming, he knew that— not strong or able in any of the ways the world measures ability, but with something that was better than ability . . . . She came to love him, earnestly, desperately. She had no way of showing it openly, for she could not express herself in words, had no subtlety of gesture, none of the arts of the coquette. Words and phrases were a mystery. She could only look and feel, but she could do that deeply. Her feeling could cut through the hide of this big animal, straight to his heart at times. He sensed what she felt— how, he could not say— but he knew it . . . . And in her silent way she understood him, was big enough for him . . . . He liked to be with her in silence, for there was always the sense of her presence, as one might feel the presence of a flower. (P193-194)

This passage is the first to fully explain Jennie's spirituality within the context of her relationship with Lester, thus articulating why he is so attracted to her. As the passage suggests, Jennie's spirit is so deep that it cannot be articulated, even by the narrator. Jennie's humanity, her capacity for goodness and love, is imbedded "deeply" within her, and as such, is constant, much like nature itself— "a flower," as the narrator states. So perfect is her ability to feel that it not only defies the "measures" set by the world, but it defies even the man-made words that would define it: "He sensed what she felt— how, he could not say." Even Dreiser himself is in awe of this power. For Lester, who believes that he understands the world completely, Jennie's spirit is a "mystery."

This passage also attests to Dreiser's belief that man is not merely an animal, made happy when his physical needs are satisfied (although he has the capacity to be such). Early in both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, Dreiser refers to Lester as a "bear of a man," an "animal man," who "seizes" his prey as an animal might (P124, 126; H569, 571). In the above excised passage, though, he states that man's recognition and participation in a larger, natural order keeps him from being consumed by his own animal-like nature. Jennie represents this potential. Because she can see such beauty and
is willing to give and love unconditionally, she is able to "cut . . . through this big animal" and touch his "heart." Through Jennie, Lester comes to see the beauty in this world and sits in silence, feeling its presence.

This passage also more clearly defines what Lester gives up for Letty's money, and why he ends up an unfulfilled, cynical old man. Although attracted to Jennie's innate spirituality, he is never able to fully embrace it because he is consumed by the wealth and power to which he has grown accustomed. As the narrator explains in a passage excised from the Harper text: "He liked [Jennie] immensely--might truly be said to have loved her, but his family and his social world still had a powerful grip on him" (P258). Without the above excised passages, however, Jennie's spiritual sense is weakened, and the reader finds it difficult to understand why Lester is attracted to her, why he finds it so difficult to leave her, and why he ends up miserable.

Additional passages clarifying Jennie's innate spirituality and Lester's determinism were cut from the Harper text. One larger passage in particular is often cited in essays on the restored text as evidence of the immense differences between the two lovers (P195-196).³ In the Pennsylvania text, Jennie and Lester go out walking, at which time "some played-out-specimen of humanity whom [Lester] had scarcely noticed" catches Jennie's eye. The man is described by Dreiser as wearing "ragged clothes, worn shoes," and having a "care-lined face." Jennie's innate sympathy and

experience with poverty move her to ask Lester if they might "give him something."

Lester refuses, explaining:

'Some of these people are professional beggars . . . . They have been exposed time and again . . . . Fortune is a thing that adjusts itself automatically to a person's capabilities and desires. If you see anybody who wants anything bad and is capable of enjoying it, he is apt to get it. Anyhow, sympathizing and worrying won't help anybody. Action is better.' (P195)

Jennie, although not as well-educated or socially placed as Lester, understands much more about the world than he does: "She looked down, wondering if what he said could be true" (excised from Harper text P195). Lester's sheltered upbringing has made him incapable of seeing that human failure is not always the result of a lack of effort but of circumstances over which one has little control. Jennie has seen this first hand. Her father worked long and hard only to end up living in a tiny, dirty room above a factory. Jennie knows that "fortune" is not "a thing that adjusts itself automatically to a person's capabilities," but an uncontrollable set of circumstances that are sometimes favorable and sometimes not. For Jennie, therefore, the issue is not the man's circumstance, but how he is treated because of his circumstance. Her innate connection to a larger order moves her to help him.

Lester is so narrow minded, however, that even after his own real-estate venture fails through no fault of his own, he still cannot understand this concept. For him, failure means nothing because his money is never in short supply. He has never done without and can therefore not understand what it means to be without. It is not until he must give up Jennie that he begins to comprehend the limits of his own convictions:

"Before the novel is over both Lester and Jennie learn, in their own lives, that people
who want things very badly indeed are not necessarily apt to get them" (West "Historical" 448). Because the above excised passage so clearly sets out Jennie's innate goodness and Lester's pessimistic determinism, its inclusion clarifies the depth and complexity of their personalities. When all the excisions were completed the opening portion of this chapter, so full of philosophical complexity, is reduced to the following sentimental passage:

Jennie had sincerely, deeply, truly learned to love this man. At first when he had swept her off her feet, overawed her soul, and used her necessity as a chain wherewith to bind her to him, she was a little doubtful, a little afraid of him, although she had always liked him . . . He was so big, so vocal, so handsome . . . He used to look at her, holding her chin between the thumb and finger of his big brown hand, and say: 'You're sweet all right, but you need courage and defiance. You haven't enough of those things.' And her eyes would meet his in dumb appeal. (P194; H626)

The second set of excisions made to Jennie's and Lester's complex characterization occurs in chapter thirty-six of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter thirty-eight of the Harper edition. In this short chapter of less than six pages, almost three pages of material was removed (See Appendix E). In this chapter Jennie, Lester, Vesta, and Old Gerhardt have just moved into a large home in the fashionable Hyde Park area of Cincinnati. Jennie and Lester play the role of a married couple, and Jennie is for the first time publicly addressed as Mrs. Kane. Vesta is introduced as her child from a first marriage, adopted by Lester. Jennie finds this deceptive scenario difficult, however, because Lester has always insisted that she remain hidden from the outside world: "It had been easy for Jennie, on the North Side, to shun neighbors and say nothing," the narrator states (P254; H679). In Hyde Park, Jennie enters upper-middle-class society, an experience used by Dreiser to further reveal Jennie's larger nature.
In the first passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser describes the type of society Jennie encounters in her new position as Mrs. Kane: "They were all trying to get along and get up from positions of moderate trust and profit, on the part of the men and budding social connections on the part of the women, to real financial success on the part of the former and real social recognition on the part of the latter" (P257). These pretentious types only associate with Jennie because she is married to Lester Kane, son of the "celebrated Kane family [wherein]... there was an endless supply of cash" (excised from Harper text P259). This above passage sets up the contrast between Jennie and her neighbors and continues Dreiser's criticism of the upper-class.

Jennie has little interest in their social affairs, but she tries to fit in because she believes it is what Lester wants. In another passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator explains that she was "really not of this particular social world, not of the so-called higher one in which Lester naturally moved. She belonged to the world of the dreamers who grow slowly and who come to a realization of things as they are only after a long time" (P257). Part of Jennie's problem is clearly her social inexperience and lack of education: "She had no sense of tradition, no family, no intimate knowledge of those various worlds--art, literature, society gossip--which make up the small change of social life" (excised from Harper text P258). Despite Jennie's lack of social graces, however, Dreiser clearly believes that she is superior to her Hyde Park counterparts. Dreiser writes in a passage excised from the Harper text:

But there was a mental and emotional pull to her nevertheless which bigger minds could understand. She thought only of big things in a vague way, formulating any idea or action slowly. But she thought in ways which usually transcended the common, more superficial method, much
as the flow of a river might transcend in importance the hurry of an automobile. (P258)

Jennie's interest in society is not motivated by a need to accumulate wealth or position, but by a desire to engage in meaningful human connections: "When it came to those pleasant things which concern taking an interest in one's neighbor's home, one's neighbor's children, one's neighbor's health and prosperity or sickness and failure, she was a personality to be reckoned with" (excised from Harper text P258).

The above excised passages set out the superficial nature of the upwardly mobile middle-class, the members of which are so eager for social acceptance that they quickly condemn Jennie even though they had once thought her "dignified and worthwhile" (excised from Harper text P257). The pretentiousness of this society is, however, more immoral than anything Jennie has done in the past. The upper-middle class, therefore, joins the poor (Jennie's siblings) and the very wealthy (the Kanes) in clarifying Dreiser's belief that almost everyone has been seduced by the materialism and rigid morality that dominate society. Jennie can never truly be a part of this society because her spirit is so large that she instantly sees through the shallow nature of their existence: "She was not the social type— not even of this middle-class world social type" explains the narrator (excised from Harper text P257). Through these excised passages, we also recognize that Jennie is not like Carrie Meeber or the Hyde Park residents; she cannot rise to the occasion when invited to join a higher social circle. Jennie only desires to be accepted by this society because she thinks it will make Lester happy, that he will see her "as a good wife and an ideal companion," which, in turn, shows the depth of her love for him and the lengths she will go for his acceptance.
Additionally, these excised passages take Jennie out of her smaller existence and place her within a much larger world view, thereby clarifying how "big" she really is. Up to this point, we have only been able to judge her against her family and her two male lovers. These excised passages establish Jennie as not only better than Lester, but better than Lester's society. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator explains: "The women, as a rule, were smart and interesting, but Jennie was better than that. Her queendom was really not of this particular social world, nor of the so-called higher ones in which Lester naturally moved" (P257). Once Jennie's superior place in Lester's society is established, Dreiser then moves her even further outward, into the ancient civilizations of "dead worlds," wherein her actions are judged against the larger context of humanity's past and present. As Jennie already understands, in the scheme of the world's larger order, nothing matters but how we treat each other:

Supposing she had been bad—locally it was important, perhaps, but in the sum of civilizations, in the sum of big forces, what did it all amount to? They would be dead after a little while, she and Lester and all these people. Did anything matter except goodness—goodness of heart. What else was there that was real. (P308; H718)4

Thus, we see Dreiser's careful unfolding of Jennie's character first within the context of her family, then her lovers, then society in general, and then the world at large.

The excision of these passages also distorts our understanding of Lester's feelings toward Jennie. The above excised passages articulate Lester's deep attraction to her "bigness." Additional passages, however, also articulate his dissatisfaction with her inability to perform well in society. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the

4 In the Harper text, the first word "supposing" is emended to "admitting that" (718).
narrator explains: "Lester for his part, and because of his conventional training, was prone to draw conclusions which, while sympathetic, were not wholly favorable to Jennie's social aspirations" (P258). Although Lester believes himself better than those who are "trying to get along and get up," the truth is that he is just like them. By forcing Jennie into Lester's social world through these excised passages, we see that Lester is not the man even he thinks he is. As attracted as he is to Jennie's "bigness" and as much as he recognizes and respects her "silent spirit," he is seduced by the "social brilliance" of his parents' world: "He had refused to marry Jennie solely to avoid the social comments which her presence as his wife would arouse; and now, having watched her here for some time, he figured that hers was the not the temperament for introduction into formal social life" (excised from Harper text P258). Although West argues that the irony of Lester's situation is that he cannot have both Jennie and the money, this scene reveals that he would probably never have married Jennie even if he did have millions of dollars.

In addition, when the above excised material criticizing the middle and upper classes is placed next to the excision of Dreiser's earlier criticism of society's judgement of Jennie's illegitimate pregnancy, Dreiser's critical voice is completely erased from the novel. Moreover, when Dreiser's criticism of society is cut, but society's criticism of Jennie is not, as is seen in the 1911 edition, Jennie becomes a much less sympathetic character, if not simply a fallen woman who gets what she deserves.

This distorted reading can be sustained by examining the passages that remain in this scene after the Harper excisions. In the 1911 edition, the scene begins with the women of Hyde Park being very friendly towards Jennie. They call on her continuously,
making her feel welcome and comfortable. Jennie, in turn, begins to think that such social calls were not "so bad" (P357; H681). The next passage sets up Jennie's illusory existence, "that she had been living on the North side until recently, that her husband, Mr. Kane, had long wanted to have a home in Hyde Park, that her father and daughter were living there, and that Lester was the child's stepfather" (P257; emphasis H681). Jennie's desire to marry Lester follows, and the text picks up with the neighbors' discovery of her real past: "The neighborhood had accepted her perhaps a little too hastily, and now rumors began to fly about" (H681).\footnote{Because the Harper editors left only those passages pertaining to Jennie's lies about her past and her deep desire for marriage, she appears to be a more willing and active participant in the scheme to misrepresent herself and her relationship with Lester in order to get Lester to marry her. A turn-of-the-century audience would have seen her thoughts and actions as justification for condemning her. In turn, they would not have found the eventual actions of the Hyde Park women so offensive.}

A third large passage revealing Lester's attraction to Jennie's spirituality and his futile attempt to reconcile this attraction with his desire for wealth, power, and social acceptance was also excised. This passage occurs only six pages after Lester recognizes that he can never marry Jennie. Because Jennie is unsuitable for "formal social life," Lester begins to seriously question whether or not he should remain with her. As he

\footnote{In the Pennsylvania edition, this passage reads: "the first impressions of this particular neighborhood were subject to some modification, for they had been altogether a little too favorable. Jennie was charming to look at, gracious, but there were rumors that came from here and there" (P259).}
questions himself, he thinks about women of his own social class, whom he now thinks
might be "almost as good as [Jennie]." The following excised passage describes his
thoughts:

Letty Pace . . . Mrs. Bracebridge. . . . Mrs. Knowls . . . . They did not
have what Jennie had, but they had something else—almost as good at
times. He was wont to try to figure out for himself just what it was about
Jennie that appealed to him, and finally he concluded that it was her
attitude toward life in general—simple, kindly, sympathetic, with an
undertone of natural force that was like an organ-tone heard afar off.
There was something there—as sure as he was alive. He knew that he did
not take to or trouble with silly people. Jennie had something—a big,
emotional pull of some kind which held him. (P264)

This excised passage emphasizes Lester's growing desire to reenter his social world and
how Jennie's sympathy and kindliness stand in his way. Although at one time in their
affair Lester was so taken by her spiritual sense that he wanted to "be something like
her" (excised from Harper text P136), his father's will has made it apparent that he
cannot have the best of both worlds. He therefore begins to wrestle with the alternatives,
and in so doing, begins his movement back into the social and financial world he came
from. This is most clearly seen, perhaps, in his sudden interest in women in whom he
had never before shown an interest, women whom he once admitted, were not as "worth
while" as Jennie (P146; H585).

Through passages such as the excised one above, we see that "Lester is a social
coward; that is, he is a moral coward in the face of society's conventions" (Humma
162). To justify his overwhelming desire for wealth, power, and social standing Lester
imagines that a woman such as Letty Gerald can meet his needs in the same way as
Jennie. He cannot deny, however, that Jennie has "a big emotional pull of some kind
which held him." Lester is not attracted to Jennie because she is young and subservient.
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There is something much more compelling to her, something much "bigger," so big in fact that Lester can never really make the decision to leave her. Instead, she must make it for him. Jennie's spiritual sense both attracts Lester to her and pushes him away.

When all of these passages are removed, all we are left with is Jennie's social ostracism and an abrupt scene change to Old Gerhardt and his "multitudinous duties," a sudden and trivial ending to a transitional period in Lester's life (P263; H685).

The fourth set of extensive cuts that weaken Jennie's character and obscure the complex emotions surrounding Jennie and Lester's relationship appears in chapter forty-one of the Pennsylvania edition and chapter forty-two of the Harper edition. The finale of the Hyde Park disaster comes in the form of a newspaper article depicting the affair between Jennie and Lester. Complete with pictures of Jennie, Lester, their Hyde Park home, and the Kane warehouse, the article renders the affair much more sentimental than it really is. The article also reveals their affair to everyone in Lester's social community, which makes it impossible for him to continue hiding it. As a result, his social isolation increases and he begins to more seriously question the ramifications of his decision to live with Jennie. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator explains that "Lester, on his part, was cogitating constantly. The evidence he had received up to now, that he was in a bad position socially, was convincing" (P291). So apparent is his "cogitating" that Jennie,"whose instincts concerning him were . . . keen" (excised from Harper text P268), begins to worry that she is keeping him from a better life. Even in the midst of her doubts, however, she does not question their deep bond. In a passage excised from the Harper text, the narrator states that Jennie believed "[I]t would be . . . better for him . . . if she went away now. Only, he wanted her. He would
not let her go. And she wanted so much to stay. Her love and respect for him swelled at
the thought" (P291). These excised passages not only further clarify Lester's social
concerns but reveal the depth of feeling that Jennie and Lester share: "Lester did not
care for her in the wild way a young lover might, but he loved her, as Jennie well knew,
in his way," the narrator states in a passage excised from the Harper text (P193). Their
relationship is neither simple nor sentimental but complex and full of feeling. Unlike the
women in Lester's social class, Jennie alone "answer[s] . . . the biggest part of his
nature" (P124; H569). In a passage excised from the Harper text, Dreiser writes: "There
were many things in which she came to understand him better than he did himself"
(P268). Lester, in turn, "had learned to respect her intuitive knowledge." a passage
which was emended in the Harper text to read: "He respected her for the sweetness of
her point of view—he had to. . ." (P311; H722).

By removing material that speaks directly to the complexity of Jennie's character
and the range of emotions tied up in their affair, the Harper editors destroyed the
complex nature of their relationship, making it much more sentimental than it is in the
original manuscript. In the Harper edition, Lester is attracted to Jennie because she is
passive, dutiful, pretty, and servant-like. He cannot commit to anything, and so she
makes the perfect mate. Thus, their relationship is neither serious nor permanent. Jennie
is merely the woman Lester plays with until he finds and commits to a better one,
namely Letty. In addition, when Jennie is reduced to a sentimental protagonist, she no
longer represents that part of Dreiser that was so interested in and attracted to a larger
natural order. Therefore, the balance between the two opposing sides of Dreiser's world,
as expressed in the original manuscript, is lost, and Lester takes over the narrative:
"Lester and his point of view come to dominate the novel," states West. "Jennie is still present, but, except for a few passages, she seems not to have a point of view"
("Historical" 447).

This pattern of changes made to Jennie and Lester's relationship continues on to Lester's deathbed scene. Instead of cutting passages, however, the Harper editors added passages to the scene. One of these additions enhances the scene. The others heighten its sentimental tone. In both the Pennsylvania and Harper editions the deathbed scene begins with Lester falling ill while Letty is in Europe. When Lester realizes that his illness is fatal, he calls for Jennie, who comes immediately: "It seemed such a beautiful thing that he should send for her. Her eyes shone with mingled sympathy, affection and gratitude" (P410; H814). Upon seeing her for the first time in months, Lester tells her that he had "wanted to see [her] again," and had intended to come by her home in Sandwood as soon as he could. He admits that leaving her was a mistake and that he has not "been any happier . . . wish[ing] now, for [his] own peace of mind, that [he] hadn't done it" (P410; H814). He then declares his love for her: "I loved you. I love you now. I want to tell you that. It seems strange, but you're the only woman I ever did love truly. We should have never parted" (P410; H815). Jennie sees Lester's declaration as finally giving validity to "[their] spiritual if not material union." Jennie stays with Lester until his death, "her voice soothing . . . him" (P411; H815). Lester's declaration of love, however, was not in the original manuscript. Instead, Lester apologizes to Jennie, and admits that what he did "wasn't right." The Harper editors added Lester's declaration of love. West chose to retain it in the Pennsylvania edition because, he states, the language and rhetorical marks "all seem to piece with Dreiser's style during this period of his
career" ("Historical" 492). In "Double Quotes and Double Meanings in Jennie Gerhardt," he adds that

My reasoning may fall into this pattern: I discern a pattern in the text: therefore Dreiser intended to create this pattern; therefore any revisions that he made which help to create this pattern must be his 'active' or 'final' or 'best' intentions because they help to create the pattern I have discerned. (10)

West asserts that although Dreiser's original ending is more "consistent with the characterization and philosophical argument of the novel than is the scene in the revised forms," he included it in the restored text because it is consistent with his "style" ("Historical" 493). Textual evidence suggests, however, that the revised ending, rather than the original ending, is more telling of Lester's feelings toward Jennie. Additional declarations of love do exist in the original manuscript, although some were excised or emended by the Harper editors. When Jennie attempts to leave Lester the first time, Lester states, "I love you, you know that. What would I be doing running around with you for the past four years if I didn't" (P247; H672). The second part of this passage was omitted from the Harper text, but the first part remains. In addition, Lester's deathbed declaration of love is indicative of what Jennie's intuition knows to be true about his feelings for her. Jennie, whose instincts are perfect, "understands [Lester] better than he understands himself," and knows that even though he desires to be a part of the social world, his deepest needs are met by her. His verbal declaration, therefore, validates what she has known all along: "With Jennie he had really been happy, he had truly lived. She was necessary to him. The more he stayed away from her the more he wanted her" (P214; H642). In a more poignant passage excised from the original manuscript, Dreiser writes, that "[Lester] loved her, as Jennie well knew, in his way" (P193).
The inclusion of Lester's declaration also reveals that he finally recognizes the importance of the spiritual in his life, although this revelation comes when it cannot benefit either him or Jennie. As Kucharski explains,

Dreiser presents Lester's choices as real; he could, Dreiser implies, have chosen differently. Much of the novel's pathos therefore arises from his deathbed realization that he has chosen wrongly—according to material, not spiritual values. (20)⁶

Lester has not lived well, and his recognition of this fact on his deathbed makes the moment all that much more tragic. To live a balanced existence is the closest we can come to happiness. Lester was offered the best of both worlds: ten thousand dollars a year and Jennie, but he refused, and therefore he must look back upon his life with regret and remorse, unlike Jennie, who sees only that "love had been added to her life—a real love," a passage which was also excised from the original manuscript (P196).

The power of the Pennsylvania edition's version of the deathbed scene comes from the way it draws together the thoughts and feelings that have simultaneously brought Jennie and Lester together and torn them apart. Jennie's love for Lester is as strong as ever, and Dreiser's use of the terms "sympathy, affection, and gratitude," sum up the range of feelings she has for him. This portrayal of their reunion emphasizes the strength of their relationship, rather than its weakness. It also clarifies Jennie's place as the center of the novel. In death, Lester is finally given the opportunity to choose freely because he is no longer constrained by society's morality, traditions, and values.

Without hesitation, he chooses Jennie. Lester's choice shows us that understanding, sympathy, kindness, and love are more valuable than money, prestige, and power.

The Harper editors, however, in an effort to make the affair seem more sentimental added several other passages that make the deathbed scene in the 1911 version more melodramatic than Dreiser's original writing suggests. For instance, when Jennie arrives at Lester's deathbed, the editors wrote in that "fear gripped her. How ill he looked." The Harper editors then added: "'I couldn't go, Jennie, without seeing you again,' [Lester] observed, 'when the slightest twinge ceased and he was free to think again.' Once Lester declares his love for Jennie, she, in the Harper text, "stopped, for it was hard for her to speak. She was choking with affection and sympathy" (H815).

Although the Harper editors added depth to Jennie and Lester's reunion by including Lester's declaration of love, the addition of the above passages makes the scene sentimental rather than sympathetic. The attraction between Jennie and Lester has never been as heartstoppingly emotional as these passages suggest. Rather, it has grown slowly and endured much. In the restored text, the complexity of their emotion for each other is not built on passionate moments expressed in purple epitaphs such as Lester's, "I couldn't go without seeing you again." Jennie knows that Lester could very well go without seeing her again. After all, even though he thought that "he might come out and see her occasionally," he had only come to visit her at Sandwood five times in five years. Despite their painful history together, though, they have a love for each other that touches the deepest chords of their being. It is so deep that even they cannot articulate it. Jennie's silent reaction to Lester's death says it best: "She could not feel the emotion that could express itself in tears—only a dull ache, a numbness which seemed to make her
insensible to pain. Jennie withdrew to her home; she could do nothing more" (P412; H817). The deathbed scene, as portrayed in the Pennsylvania edition is, therefore, a more realistic portrait of the complex and very deep feelings Jennie and Lester have for each other.

There are additional changes to the story's ending that further weaken the novel in general and Jennie's spiritual character in particular. In the original manuscript Dreiser included a coda that (1) reminds the reader that Jennie's intimate connection to nature will allow her to move forward even though Lester is dead and (2) criticizes anyone who would judge Jennie by worldly standards. The coda is as follows:

It is useless to apostrophize a soul such as this which has reached the full measure of its being. Shall you say to the blown rose—well done! or to the battered, wind-riven, lightening-scarred pine, thou failure! In the chemic drift and flow of things, how little we know of that which is either failure or success. Is there either? To this daughter of the poor, born into the rush and hurry of a clamant world—a civilization, so called, eager to possess itself of shows and chattels—what a sorry figure! Not to be possessed of the power to strike and destroy; not to be able, because of an absence of lust and hunger, to run as a troubled current; not to be able to seize upon your fellow being, tearing that which is momentarily desirable from his grasp, only to drop it and run wildly toward that which for another brief moment seems more worthy of pursuit. Not to be bitter, angry, brutal, feverish—what a loss!

And then how strange that there should be born into a soul a sense of its own fitness and place—that one should say to himself, in a spirit of deep understanding, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' Behold there are hierarchies and powers above and below the measure of our perception. It is given to us to see in part and to believe in part. But of that which is perfect who shall prophesy? Only this daughter of the poor felt something—the beauty of the trees, the wonder of the rains, the color of existence. Marveling at these, feeling the call of the artistry of spirit, how could it be that she should hurry—that she seek? Was it not all with her from the beginning?

Those days of her earliest youth, when she felt that life was perfect; those hours of stress, when it seemed that life could not be wholly bad; those
moments of prosperity, when she realized in her own soul that she held them lightly and they would pass, leaving in their place the simplicities and the necessities only—were not these the hours of truest insight? Jennie loved and, loving, gave. Is there a superior wisdom? Are its signs and monuments in evidence? Of whom, then, have we life and all good things—and why?7

The coda appeared in the first printing of the novel in 1911 but disappeared from all subsequent printings. West does not publish the coda as a part of the story proper, but does include it in an appendix, along with the original writing of the deathbed scene. West states that because Dreiser was still alive when the coda was removed, he was probably responsible for its excision ("Historical" 574). Scholars, however, are not certain who removed the coda or why it was removed, and "no document or testimony confirms [Dreiser's] responsibility for the act" (493). In both the Harper and Pennsylvania editions, the novel ends with the following passage: "Now what? [Jennie] was not so old yet. There were these two orphaned children to raise. They would marry and leave after a while, and then what? Days and days, an endless reiteration of days, and then—?" (P418; H822). The extremely bleak ending has led scholars to some confused readings of the novel's purpose as a whole and Jennie's place within that purpose. Peter Cassagrande, for instance, states that the ending indicates that although Jennie, like Carrie, survives adversity, she "has no traditional order on which to lean and so her future holds no prospect of happiness or deepened understanding" (199). Pizer asserts that "the conclusion of Jennie Gerhardt thus has much of the emotional tension of a tragedy, though the principle figures of the novel cannot be described as
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conventional tragic heroes" (129). In his essay on the restored text, Richard Lingeman states, "For all their gropings and thrashing, we sense that [the characters] are, as Lester observes, pawns of circumstance—but also, as Jennie exemplifies, possibly redeemed by love, by the life force. And yet, in the end, what does all this shadow play mean?" (13).

If the ending is confusing, it is because Jennie's life in the original text is not a tragedy. Neither does she live the type of naturalistic existence so many critics try to place her in. She is, from beginning to end, a figure of the romance. Throughout the original manuscript, Dreiser emphasizes that Jennie can survive, even thrive, amidst adversity, pain, humiliation, rejection, and loneliness because she has the capacity to see the world within its larger context. Kucharski explains that "[a]s great as Jennie's need is to gather around her those whom she can nurture and care for, it is nature that sustains her" (20). Throughout the original text, Dreiser links Jennie's ability to move past the difficulties in her life with her ability to sense the beauty and goodness inherent in a larger natural world. Thus the coda, with its emphasis on Jennie's connection to nature, is the logical conclusion to her portrayal. The reader cannot see this linking in the Harper edition because in addition to cutting the coda, the editors also cut out material that links Jennie to the natural world, and so makes it difficult to justify the coda as the final word on her story.

The Harper editors did not cut all passages describing Jennie's larger nature. Because the passages that remain are only fragmentary, however, they further distort Jennie's character and make the text seem, at times, unnecessarily wordy. The most substantial passage that the Harper editors retained was Dreiser's introduction to Jennie in chapter two of the Pennsylvania and Harper editions. In this two and a half page
chapter, Jennie is described in specific romance terms. Her intimate connection to nature and her intense feeling for the beauty of the world around her reveal her as different from the other members in her family: "In the world of the actual, Jennie was such a spirit . . . . Nature's fine curves and shadows touched her as a song itself . . . . The wonderful radiance which fills the western sky at evening, touched and unburdened her heart" (P16, 17; H471, 472). Dreiser places this lengthy introduction to "[t]he spirit of Jennie" early in the text to lay the foundation for her later acts of love and sacrifice. By the end of the story, it is clear that Jennie acts sacrificially, not because she is passive or because she desires better things for herself, but because she recognizes that the petty morals and traditions of humans are less important than the health and happiness of those she loves. She sees the world in its larger context and therefore despite the scorn of men, she "wander[s] radiantly forth, singing the song which all the earth may some day hope to hear. It is the song of goodness" (P16; H471).

This chapter is also the first of a number of passages that juxtapose Jennie's most painful experiences against the strength, peace, and beauty of nature. In this early chapter, we see that despite the fact that her family can barely feed itself, Jennie still "delighted to wonder at the pattern of [nature], to walk where it was most golden, and follow with instinctive appreciation the holy corridors of the trees" (P18; H472). Her strength comes not from the world of people, but from the "[t]rees, flowers, the world of sound and the world of color" (P16; H471). Its beauty so touches her soul that even after she has worked all day at the Columbus hotel, nature was "still welcome to her because of its beauty" (P17; H472).
Her ability to find delight and rest in this natural order helps her through the most desperate of situations, such as, for instance, when she finds out that she is pregnant with Brander's child. Even though her pregnancy must eventually humiliate her family in front of their German neighbors, Jennie still sees something beautiful in her experience. In both editions, Jennie felt "no fear and no favor: the open fields and the lights upon the hills, noon, night; stars, the bird-calls, the water's purl--these are the natural inheritance of the mind of the child" (P77-78; H526). When her father finds out about her pregnancy and ostracizes her, Dreiser adds:

In nature there is no outside. When cast from a group or a condition, we have still the companionship of all that is. Nature is not ungenerous. Its winds and stars are fellows with you. Let the soul be but gentle and receptive, this vast truth will come home; not in set phrases, perhaps, but as a feeling, a comfort, which, after all, is the last essence of knowledge. In the universe, peace is wisdom. (P88; H536)

Further into the text, when Jennie finally gives birth to Vesta, Dreiser refers to the experience as "this other flower of womanhood." Although alone with little money and no husband, Jennie can see the beauty inherent in the birth of a new life rather than the social humiliation and shame that comes with the label of "illegitimacy." For Jennie, writes Dreiser, "Life at worst or best was beautiful--had always been so" (P94; H541).

At this point in the text, the Harper editors interrupt Dreiser's pattern of balancing Jennie's most adverse conditions with a notice of her capacity to apprehend the beauty and wisdom of a larger natural order. These cuts occur just prior to her introduction to Lester Kane, and therefore divest Jennie of that spiritual element that attracts Lester to her in the original text. These excisions also strip the coda of its original sense and force. Most of these cuts appear towards the end of the text. The first
of these cuts occurs toward the end of Jennie's and Lester's trip abroad. Lester's attraction to Letty's social grace and intelligence has already become obvious to Jennie, who has just recently been ostracized by her Hyde Park neighbors because she lacks an acceptable social background. As Jennie watches Lester and Letty dance together, she feels again inferior and inadequate, and she wishes she were dead. In an excised passage, Dreiser writes: "As she sat here, she thought of these things and then curiously, she wished she might die" (P318). In the same excised passage, however, the narrator also states: "She really didn't care enough about society. She preferred large, simple things—the fields, the trees, the large aspects of nature in sun and rain. Natural beauty was calling to her. It was finer, much more appealing than people . . ." (P318). In this passage, Dreiser does not sentimentalize Jennie's pain by insinuating that nature's beauty can change her feelings and make everything all right. Rather, he indicates that despite her sorrow, she finds beauty in this world, and that her ability to recognize and appreciate it will help her get through moments so painful that death seems the only alternative.

Lester's reunion with Letty marks the beginning of the end of Lester and Jennie's relationship. Eventually, Jennie finds out that Lester will lose his millions if he stays with her and she insists that he leave. This is a crucial emotional time for Jennie because she realizes that for her, "the home and the dream were a ruin" (P366; H772). When she moves to her new house in Sandwood, she once again thinks "that she would die" (P367; H772). This line is followed, however, by an excised passage that reads: "The blue waters of the lake were spread out before her. The fresh green grass of the spring was showing itself beautifully. No cloud was in the sky, and Vesta, by her side, had
kissed her stepfather affectionately farewell" (P367). As Jennie looks out onto this scene, she is strengthened, and despite her intense pain, she is able not only to accept Lester's departure but to sincerely wish him happiness without her: "Jennie had kissed Lester goodby and had wished him joy, prosperity [and] peace" (P367; H772). Even in the end, when Lester has married Letty and Vesta has died, Jennie is still capable of seeing the beauty inherent in the natural world. Dreiser writes in the Pennsylvania text:

For her part she felt there must be something—a guiding intelligence which produced all the beautiful things—the flowers, the stars, the trees, the grass. Nature was so beautiful. If at times certain events were cruel, yet there was this beauty persisting. And color, tones, feelings, laughter, the joy of character, the beauty of youth—how these softened in between the harsh faces of hunger, cold, indifference, greed. She could not understand what it was all about, but still, as in her youth, it was beautiful. One could live, somehow, under any circumstances. (P396)

In the Harper text, the same passage reads:

Almost in spite of herself she felt there must be something—a higher power which produced all the beautiful things—the flowers, the stars, the trees, the grass. Nature was so beautiful! If at times life seemed cruel, yet this beauty still persisted. The thought comforted her; she fed upon it in the hours of her secret loneliness. (H801)

Although the Harper version maintains the general idea of the passage, much of the detail has been removed. For instance, Dreiser's use of the term "cruelty" is ambiguous when left by itself. When it is coupled with the words "hunger, cold, indifference, and greed," however, it is specifically connected to the human condition in general and the experiences of Jennie and Dreiser in particular. Both have been the victim of all of these cruelties. Again, though, Dreiser does not want to sound trite; an appreciation of nature is not a cure-all. It cannot take away pain or right the wrongs of the world. It can only guide and strengthen; it merely "softens . . . harsh faces." The above excised passage
also reminds us that Jennie has not suddenly become open to these experiences. Rather, she is as consoled by nature now as she was "in her youth." Like nature itself, she is constant and immutable. Nature's goodness and beauty have comforted and strengthened her through every desperate, humiliating, even tragic circumstance in her life. Its constant, sustaining, subtly effective force gives her the strength to move forward despite her pain and loneliness, to "live, somehow, under any circumstances .. .."

Dreiser's inspiration for this particular aspect of Jennie's character stems from his own experiences with pain and adversity, and his own capacity to find strength in the natural beauty and goodness that surrounded him. Although often plagued by tragedies such as poverty, depression, anxiety, impotence, suicidal thoughts, and even insanity, he always found nature consoling. As a child, he writes that even though his conditions were "wholly depressing," he remembers finding delight in "the morning sun," and "a tall tree trunk ornamented in part with the healing foliage of a climbing vine" (Dawn 57). To Dreiser "a wide field of clover . . . was always a small lake or sea of color" (57). One of his favorite past-times was to roam the "leafy dells . . ." for "exaggerated periods of time . . . wanting nothing more than to be alone with [nature]" (57, 58). He was so in love with the natural world that many times he would get up as early as four o'clock in the morning so that he might enjoy the peace and tranquility around him:

Certain aspects of the morning and evening sky; faint shreds of cirrus or stratus clouds; small pools in the woods in which leaves and trees were reflected; the swooping down of the house martens and swallows; the sudden upward rush of a meadow lark; birds' nests in the bushes or
trees—these were enough to suffuse me with a rich emotional mood, tremulous, thrilling. (60)

As an adult, Dreiser's dependence on nature as a source of "rich emotion" in times of adversity continued. In the midst of a nervous breakdown after the failure of *Sister Carrie*, Dreiser writes that although he was penniless, unable to write, and suffering from a debilitating nervous disorder, a walk amongst nature "delighted" him, and "the world," despite his problems, "seemed young and beautiful" (92). In a later entry marked February 12, 1903, he states:

During the afternoon I took a walk . . . . Truly it was beautiful. I do not know how I can feel so when Jug is away and I am not quite well and almost entirely without money, but somehow the contemplation of nature is sufficient for me. I looked at the trees and the river murmuring along and the stones and my heart was glad. (103-106)

In another version of this episode that appears in *An Amateur Laborer*, he adds: "I can respond to the sky and the waters and the clouds when these are beautiful. I can love and rejoice in a perfect day" (58).

For Dreiser, nature was a fixed and plenteous reminder that beauty and goodness exist despite the uncertainty, ill-will, greed, sickness, poverty, and loneliness he endured. He could always "sense . . . something of the glittering scintillations of a world or universe or mystery which could not be dark" (62). Dreiser gave to Jennie this same affinity to nature so that she, too, can find strength and even joy amidst a world in which happiness and fulfillment are almost always elusive.

When we consider both Dreiser's and Jennie's ability to find strength in nature, we can see why Dreiser wrote the coda into this novel. It is consistent with how Dreiser has developed her character throughout the story. Jennie, as always, will not only
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survive but live a fulfilled life because she can find meaning and pleasure outside of
Lester. Certainly, there will be "days and days, an endless reiteration of days," but there
will also be, for Jennie, days when she feels "something--the beauty of the trees, the
wonder of the rain, the color of existence. Marveling at these, feeling the call of the
artistry of spirit," as the coda states (P575). Warwick Wadlington argues that the dismal
ending reveals Jennie's life to be one of stagnancy and confinement because she is
"caged" in a world she can never partake in (422). The restored text shows, however,
that Jennie is anything but confined. As a matter of fact, her ability to find comfort in
nature liberates her from society's stifling morality and social laws. As the coda states,
"And then how strange that there should be born into a soul a sense of its own fitness
and place--that one should say to himself in a spirit of deep understanding, 'My
kingdom is not of this world.'" From Dreiser's introduction to Jennie in chapter two as a
"spirit" to his description of her in the coda as a "soul . . . which has reached the full
measure of its being," Jennie is, from beginning to end, a figure from the romance. She
alone survives because she has always been defined and guided by the beauty she sees
in the world, not by its ugliness. It is a gift that has been "with her from the beginning"
(P575). Although circumstances have ultimately controlled her destiny, she can remain
hopeful, unlike others, such as Lester, who are so weighted down by the circumstances
that surround them that ultimately they are destroyed by them. Because Jennie
understands her "fitness and place," she alone has "a spirit of deep understanding." In
the end, her clarity of awareness and spirit enable her to rise above her own isolation
and pain. The coda states:
those hours of stress, when it seemed that life could not be wholly bad; those moments of prosperity, when she realized in her own soul that she held them lightly and they would pass, leaving in their place the simplicities and the necessities only—were not these the hours of truest insight?

Because Jennie's experience does not fit into our accepted notions of success, we tend to see her life as tragic, even pathetic. The coda, however, reinforces the original textual emphasis on Jennie's worthiness and rarity as a human being. Not only is she better than every other character in the story, but she knows better than they about what it means to be human. For Dreiser there is no "superior wisdom" beyond Jennie's. Her life is good and worthy because despite her pain, she gives and receives love freely and without condition. For Dreiser, this was all that mattered. In *An Amateur Laborer* he writes,

Standing by the window, I looked out onto the street and wondered. Here I had suffered, here I had been hungry, here I had been hopeless. If it had not been for human sympathy here I might have been even now, only worse, but tenderness, that great doubted mooted quality had rescued me. It had lifted me out of the slough of despond. It had made me see that it was existent. (63)

The coda, then, with its emphasis on Jennie's consistent, innate connection to nature is the logical conclusion to the story of Jennie Gerhardt. Already, Jennie has adopted two children, revealing that there will always be those who need and are given her energy and affection. This continuation is most clearly seen in one of her adopted children's name--Rose Perpetua: "The process of Jennie's life, her continually renewed effort to adapt to new circumstances, and the positive and life affirming act of adopting children (one significantly named Rose Perpetua) inform the novel with an element of hope and faith with which it is rarely credited" (Kucharski 22).
In the original manuscript, Jennie's connection to a larger, natural order attracts Lester to her and stands in opposition to his materialistic pessimism. For Dreiser, the pursuit of the material must be balanced with attention to the spiritual, and the spiritual must be physically maintained by an attention to the material. Because Lester refuses to nurture his spiritual side, however, he is never able to find complete personal happiness, although he moves closest to it while living with Jennie. As Kucharski states, "Lester's failure to learn from Jennie . . . dooms him to cynicism and a pathetic, untimely death" (20). His choices are wrong because, unlike Jennie who cares for all of humanity, Lester cannot see past his created materialism, and therefore, he ends up miserable.

In addition, the cuts made to the philosophical content of Jennie's and Lester's relationship allow the more sentimental parts of their love story to control the narrative. The result is that Jennie Gerhardt becomes little more than "a love story merely set against a social background" (West "Historical" 442). West states that Dreiser emphasized Jennie's "unreasoning mysticism" to offset Lester's view of life. The resulting balance between Jennie and Lester's opposing views reflects Dreiser's own state of mind at the time he wrote the novel. Although Dreiser is almost always associated with the naturalist movement, several authors have noted that during the years he was working on Jennie Gerhardt, he had not yet fully embraced any one worldview. West states that throughout his life Dreiser was "simultaneously a pessimistic determinist and a religious mystic" ("Historical"447). Dreiser himself states in Dawn that "I seem, to my self-analyzing eyes, somewhat more of a romantic than a realist" (198). "It might therefore be said," West states, "that Lester and Jennie are representatives of the two sides of their creator's artistic consciousness" (447).
It is these two opposing points of view that Dreiser grapples with in the original text, and which are personified in the characters of Lester and Jennie. The tension that results when these two opposing ideas attempt to coexist is what informs their love affair and makes the novel a work of import, rather than just a sentimental love story made interesting by the electrifying sexual tension between a possessive man and his needy lover. As Kucharski states, "Jennie is compelling . . . because of the unresolved tension between the philosophical skepticism of Lester and the spirituality and natural grounding of Jennie" (19). The clear distinction between Jennie and Lester's ways of viewing the world is considerably muddied, however, by cuts and emendations made to passages defining Jennie's view, which in turn obscures the complexity of her character and the reasons why Lester is so attracted to her. Through Jennie, we see that there is goodness in this world and that we can be a part of it if we so choose.
Conclusion

The changes made to Dreiser's original version of *Jennie Gerhardt* altered the novel substantially enough to demand a restored version. The Pennsylvania edition is a stronger and clearer representation of Dreiser's artistic vision for the novel as a whole and for the characters in particular. Most importantly, the Pennsylvania edition restores Jennie to her proper position as the central character of the story. Her ability to connect with a larger natural order enables her to express love for all. Through such expressions of love, she alters, if not defines, the life of every character in the story. Her innate goodness is unchangeable and transcendent, much like nature itself. By her presence, we become aware that there is more to this world than what we see before us. We recognize that "[i]n the chemic drift and flow of things" there is little that is "either failure or success" (coda). For Dreiser, who spent much of his life amid anxiety, poverty, depression, and yearning, the greatest peace was the sensitivity which others showed him: "Is there a superior wisdom? . . . Are its signs and monuments in evidence? Of whom, then, have we life and all good things—and why?" (coda).

The Harper editors, however, failed to see Jennie's larger place in the novel. Their reason for cutting her character so drastically will probably never be known but the result is evident. In the Harper edition, Jennie's essential nature, her connection to a larger natural order, is so weakened that it is barely recognizable, and she loses her place as the focus of the novel. When the Harper editors altered her character, they also altered her relationship with others, including her parents, her siblings, and Lester. Thus weakened, Jennie is no longer strong enough to change lives. Instead, she becomes secondary to her lovers and a participant in her own moral downfall. Her lover leaves
her for a better, moral woman of his own class, and she is left to contemplate "[d]ays and days, an endless reiteration of days . . . (P418; H822). Readers come away from the 1911 edition not having learned what is most important in man's larger existence, but how to live better and more comfortably in the man-made world of organized religion, social hierarchies, and rigid morality.

In addition to weakening Jennie, the Harper editors also altered every other major character in the novel, especially the Gerhardts and the Kanes. In the Pennsylvania edition, the Gerhardts stand in opposition to the Kanes. Although William Gerhardt treats Jennie harshly, his actions are consistent with his ethnic and religious background. Sometimes tyrannical, he, also in the original text, exhibits moments of kindness and love toward his family, even Jennie. In the end, he, like Lester and even Brander, is changed by her and is able to forgive and receive Jennie's love. Jennie's mother, too, although naive and socially awkward, always has the best interest of her children at heart. Like her daughter, she willingly sacrifices her time and her money so that her children might have a better future. The Gerhardts, then, represent man's capacity for goodness, love, forgiveness, and sacrifice. In the 1911 edition, however, the Gerhardts are, like Jennie, flat and stereotypical. William Gerhardt is taken out of his ethnic context and his love and sympathy toward his family, although sporadic, are almost completely eliminated. As a result, he is easily seen in the 1911 edition as little more than an intolerant religious fanatic. Mrs. Gerhardt, too, becomes a different character. No longer naive and dreamy, she is, in the 1911 edition, a passive participant in her daughter's moral downfall. Together, the Gerhardts, in the Harper version, cease to represent anything positive about the world they live in.
Dreiser's original portrayal of the Kanes and of Letty Gerald was also severely altered. Dreiser originally portrayed the Kanes as examples of the greed and human disconnection that pervaded the capitalist society he lived in. In their effort to become the wealthiest, the most powerful, and the most affluent, the Kanes consciously walk over any one who stands in their way, including their own children and siblings. Letty, too, manipulates and deceives Lester so that she can get what she wants. In the 1911 text, however, Archibald, Robert, Mrs. Kane, and Letty were rewritten to such an extent that they not only become less greedy and less socially aggressive but they also become less wealthy. In the Harper version, the Kanes and Letty are likeable characters. We look up to them as examples of what is positive about the American dream. When the sharp distinction between the Gerhardts and the Kanes is obscured, readers are no longer able to clearly identify which family is sympathetic and which is not.

By restoring the material cut or emended from Dreiser's original manuscript, West restored Dreiser artistic vision for the novel, and therefore it is the edition that should be used. The story of Jennie Gerhardt is not sentimental, nor is it a justification for society's rigid, oppressive morality and senseless traditions. Rather, it is a moving portrait of the variety of personalities that make up the world they live in. For Dreiser, the world was a chaotic, indeterminable, and often lonely place. What made it bearable was not money, social place, power, traditional religion, or even family. It was honest, loving human connection, the kind that Jennie offers: "human sympathy . . . .. Without it I would have been helpless--without it unhappy. In so hard and stony a world what else was important?" he writes (Dreiser *Amateur* 63).
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Appendix B

dining-room on the ground floor. Robert was coming tonight, though, and a Mr. and Mrs. Burnett, old friends of his father and mother, and so Lester decided to dress. He knew that his father was around somewhere, but he did not trouble to look him up now. He was thinking of his last two days in Cleveland and wondering when he would see Jennie again.

CHAPTER XVIII

This dinner, his conversation with his father, his visit to the Knowles’ coming-out party still further emphasized the distinctive nature of his home life, so different from the quality of the liaison he had fallen on in Cleveland. As Lester came downstairs after making his toilet, he found his father in the library reading, as was the old gentleman’s wont when waiting for his late dinner.

“Hello, Lester,” he said, looking up from his paper over the top of his glasses and extending his hand. “Where do you come from?”

“Cleveland,” replied his son, gripping his father’s hand firmly and smiling.

“Robert tells me you’ve been to New York.”

“Yes, I was there.”

“How did you find my old friend Arnold?”

“Just about the same,” returned Lester. “He doesn’t look any older.”

“I suppose not,” said Archibald genially, as if the report were a compliment to his own hardy condition. “He’s been a temperate man. A fine old gentleman.”

He led the way back to the sitting-room where they browsed over interesting social and home news until the chime of the clock in the hall warned the guests upstairs that it was time to dine.

When they came in, Lester met Robert again, and Louise, and these old friends of the family. There was a late arrival in the shape of Amy, who came back to announce that she was going with Louise to the Knowles homestead. Her own house was only a little way down the street.
Lester sat down in great comfort amid this estimable company. He liked this home atmosphere—his mother and father and his sisters. It was grateful to his senses to be with them, to be here. So he smiled and was exceedingly genial.

Amy announced that the Leverings were going to give a dance on Tuesday and inquired whether he intended to go.

“You know I don’t dance,” he returned dryly. “Why should I go?”

“Don’t dance? Won’t dance, you mean. You’re getting too lazy to move. If Robert is willing to dance occasionally, I think you might.”

“Robert’s got it on me in lightness,” Lester replied airily.

“And politeness,” put in Louise.

“Be that as it may,” said Lester.

“Don’t try to stir up a fight, Louise,” observed Robert sagely.

After dinner they adjourned to the library, and Lester talked with his brother a little on business. There were some contracts coming up for revision. He wanted to see what suggestions his brother had to make. Louise and Amy were already leaving in a carriage. “Are you coming now?” asked Louise, putting her head in at the door.

“A little later on I think. You can tell ’em I’ll be there.”

“Letty Pace asked about you the other night,” she called back from the door.

“Kind,” replied Lester. “I’m greatly obliged.”

“She’s a nice girl, Lester,” put in his father, who was standing near the open fire close by. “I only wish you would marry her and settle down. You’d have a good wife in her.”

“She’s charming,” testified Mrs. Kane.

“What is this?” asked Lester jocularly—“a conspiracy? You know I’m not strong on the matrimonial business.”

“And well I know it,” replied his mother semi-seriously. “I wish you were.”

Lester changed the subject.

At ten he left for the Knowles’ for a few minutes’ stay. This was one of those exclusive society homes which make up the inner circle of a city like Cincinnati. And of course the Kanes were closely identified with it. Lester was most heartily welcome, as could be seen by the attitude of the hostess, who exclaimed at sight of him: “Why, Lester Kane! How do you do? I’m so glad to
see you. I was really afraid you wouldn't come, and George would have been so disappointed. He asked particularly after you. How have you been?"

"You know me," smiled Lester easily.

"Indeed I do, sir. It's high time you were bestirring yourself to find a wife. You're rapidly becoming an old bachelor."

"The most interesting men in the world," he returned. "But don't you begin this matrimonial badgering. I got enough of that at home tonight. I just left one group that wants me to get married. Won't you try to want me to stay single?"

"What a question, you imp! No, I won't. Now you go right over there and find a nice girl and propose to her. I'm just going to give you six more months, and then I'm going to pick one for you myself."

"Easy! Easy!" was his retort. "Make it ten years. I'd rather have a long sentence."

"Six months, and not a day longer," and she waved him along.

He went, smiling. This society world amused him a little. He met some interesting women but, better yet, he met interesting men. He liked men. He liked to play billiards and poker and shoot ducks and drive fast horses. In society he found a few men who liked the same thing, and then they told him funny stories. When he had time, which was not so often, he liked to get with these fellows.

Tonight, for some reason, he seemed doomed to be teased about his matrimonial possibilities. He had hardly left Mrs. Knowles when a Mrs. Windom, another of the clever matrons of the city, buttonholed him. "Now Lester," she said, "I have something nice to tell you. I want you to come over here and let me explain. It's something fine."

"What is it?" he asked suspiciously, as they reached a nearby window.

"I have a wife picked out for you."

"What, another!" he exclaimed. "Oh, Lord."

"Why do you act like that?" she asked. "I think it's very impolite, not so say unkind. Why, the very idea."

"I refuse to explain," he said wearily.

"Well then, now listen," she went on, when he appeared subdued. "She's just the kind of girl you would have picked for
"Glory be!" exclaimed Lester with an imitation of enthusiasm. "Who is she?"

"I'm not going to tell you her name—only that she's young, beautiful, has a fortune in her own right, and is altogether charming. Now don't you think I'm just the best friend you ever had?"

"Well, fairly so," he replied. "Anyhow, that's a combination that ought to produce a mild imitation of friendship. Where is the body?"

"Lester Kane!" she exclaimed. "Aren't you ashamed of yourself? Now you come right over here, and I'll introduce you."

"Don't I know her?" he inquired.

"No, you don't. You know her family only. She just made her début last fall."

"This isn't to be a matrimonial tête-à-tête between me and sweet sixteen, is it?" He dreaded callow youth.

"Nothing so lucky, kind sir. You'll sue for her hand. Now you pick her out of those five over there by the window."

"Never. I'd rather get out a writ of attachment," said Lester as he turned and gazed: "Five," he added. "That's a good hand to draw to; I hope I know an heiress when I see one."

"Attention, sir," she ordered. He looked, turning suddenly with a mock light of inquiry in his eye to ask:

"An heiress, did you say?"

"I did."

"Trust me," he said, gaily. "I am what is known as the human lodestone for heiresses. I can close my eyes and pick them. Thus—the one with the aigrette in her hair."

"Right!" exclaimed his guide. Then, with a hysterical little rise in her voice, "I do believe I have made a match."

"Give it to me," he said, holding out his hand. "My pipe's gone out."

She looked at him with a puzzled twinkle in her eye.

"Now you wait right here until I return," she said. "I'll be back in a moment."

"On this spot?"

"This very spot."
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"I'm afraid she'll spot me."

"Oh, Lester Kane! Don't be silly. Now, you wait."

She fluttered away, and he strolled off in another direction, coming back, after a conversation with another woman, to find her very eager to get hold of him.

"As I live," she exclaimed, "she expressed a partiality for you! Now, come with me and let me introduce you to her."

"With pleasure," he said.

"Then you talk with her."

"What are you?" he inquired. "A matrimonial agent?"

"Aren't you ashamed of yourself? When you want another wife, now you shan't have her."

"Heaven be—" he started to say, but as they came before the young lady in question he paused and bowed. "I was saying how much I owed to her for bringing me over to you and giving me the pleasure of this introduction."

The young lady, who was one of those ambitious flowers of the many newly grown rich of our country—ruddy with the ruddiness of roses, innocent with innocence that is instructed to guard and that still desires without knowing quite how to attain, fashionable with the well-groomed fashions not only of dresses but of ideas, looked at him with eyes that were not stars but mirrors only—and smiled.

"I do believe she is one woman who has my real interests at heart," he added, gayly.

"How so?" asked the young débutante, with a little pinch at her red lips with her white teeth.

He looked at her with one of those searching glances for intellect which he was inclined more frequently to give in these days, and found instead a sort of coquettish barrenness, which, at his experienced stage of life, was but slightly calculated to engage. He was soon anxious to get away.

"When you are a way-worn bachelor, like your humble servant, with more embonpoint than wit, you will feel the kindliness of such services as she has just rendered me," he went on jocularly. "Real bachelors always crave introductions to young ladies."

He wandered out into a path of more or less complimentary badinage, to which the young lady replied with ease, but he was at
the point where he found that he was talking down rather than up to a certain standard, and realized the old feeling that youthful interests were beyond his ken. When he was getting a little worried as to how he should escape, he was relieved by a young bachelor friend. He immediately strolled out of the drawing room and upstairs to the billiard room, where he proposed to have a quiet smoke.

He really could not stand for this sort of thing any more, he told himself. It was a bore. Such youth. It was silly. While he thought, his mind wandered back to Jennie and her peculiar "Oh, no, no!" There was someone who appealed to him. That was a type of womanhood worth while. Not sophisticated, not self-seeking, not watched over and set like a man-trap in the path of men, but a sweet little girl—sweet as a flower, who was without anybody, apparently, to watch over her. That night in his room he composed a letter, which he dated a week later because he did not want to appear too urgent and because he could not again leave Cincinnati for two weeks anyhow.

My dear Jennie:

Although it has been a week and I have said nothing, I have not forgotten you—believe me. Was the impression I gave of myself very bad? I will make it better from now on, for I love you, little girl—I really do. There is a flower on my table which reminds me of you very much—white, delicate, beautiful. Your personality, lingering with me, is just that. You are the essence of many things beautiful to me. It is in your power to strew flowers in my path if you will.

But what I want to say here is that I shall be in Cleveland on the 18th, and I shall expect to see you. I arrive Thursday night, and I want you to meet me in the ladies' parlor of the Dormton at noon Friday. Will you? You can lunch with me.

You see, I respect your suggestion that I should not call. (I will not—on condition.) These separations are dangerous to good friendship. Write me that you will. You see, I throw myself on your generosity. But I can't take no for an answer, not now.

With a world of affection,
Lester Kane.

He sealed that and addressed it. "She's a remarkable girl in her way," he thought. "She really is."
Appendix C

for himself, he was saying that there was one solution that he would probably never accept; but it was a solution. Why had he not seen this years before?

"And yet she wasn't as beautiful then as she is now, nor as wise, nor as wealthy." Maybe! Maybe! But he couldn't be unfaithful to Jennie nor wish her any bad luck. She had had enough without his willing and had stood it bravely.

The trip home did bring another week with Mrs. Gerald, for after consideration she had decided to go to America for awhile anyhow. Chicago and Cincinnati were her destinations, and she hoped to see more of Lester. Her presence was considerable of a surprise to Jennie, who had not expected her, and it started her thinking again. Lester had cooled off a little since he had come out of Egypt and strolled about Europe, but the opportunity this lovely creature presented could not but remain uppermost in his mind.

On the way home Jennie had more leisure in which to observe this woman, and in her quiet, observing, introspective way she could see what the point was. If she were not here, Mrs. Gerald would take Lester. She could not help liking her at that, for of all the society people she had met this one was the nicest to her. Letty went out of her way to do Jennie little services, to bring her delicacies, to make pleasant suggestions of things to do and so on. She made no attempt to monopolize Lester, but Jennie gave her ample opportunity to talk, for she wanted them to have a good time if they wished to. If Lester liked her, why shouldn't he talk to her? Basically she realized that she would have a hard time forcing him to neglect her or to turn entirely away from her. He was so considerate and fair that only a thing like death—her death—would straighten matters out for him. And she felt also that basically he liked her best—some of the emotional things about her anyhow. He had said so, and it was probably true. When they reached Chicago Mrs. Gerald went her way, and Jennie and Lester took up the customary thread of their living.

CHAPTER XLVI

On his return from Europe, Lester set to work in earnest to find a business opening. He was not sounded out, as he had hoped, by any of the big companies for the single reason, prin-
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incipially, that he was considered a strong man who was looking for control in anything he touched. The nature of his altered fortunes had not been made public. All the little companies that he investigated were having a hand-to-mouth existence, manufacturing a product which was not satisfactory to him. ([Or coupled with individuals who were arbitrary or unsuited to his moods] He did find one company in a small town in northern Indiana, near Chicago, which looked as though it might have a future. It was controlled by a practical builder of wagons and carriages such as his father had been in his day—a man of about forty, who, however, was not a business man in the best sense of the word. He was making some small money on a past investment of about fifteen thousand dollars and a plant worth, say, twenty-five thousand. Lester foresaw that something could be made here if proper methods were pursued and business acumen exercised. It would be slow work. There would never be a great fortune in it—not in his life-time. He was thinking of investing here when the first rumors of the carriage trust reached him.

It appeared that in the short time after Robert had made himself president of the Kane Company, he had moved swiftly. Armed with the voting power of the entire stock of the company, and therefore with the privilege of hypothecating its securities, he laid before several of his intimate friends in the financial world his scheme of uniting the principal carriage companies and controlling the trade. It would not be a difficult matter, he argued, to persuade the two principal rivals of the Kane Company to cease their rivalry, to take three shares of stock in the new holding company for each share of stock they might hold in a constituent company, and to join in that work of economy—which meant six per cent on three shares where that sum had only been paid on one before. It could be done. He showed them how. He showed them where. Shrewd investors surveying his record and observing his present progress were inclined to agree. They promised him any necessary financial assistance within reason. So armed, he was prepared to visit the various carriage manufacturers, and while Lester was travelling in Europe he was busy perfecting a tentative organization.

The principal rival was the Lyman-Winthrop Company of New York, an old, established concern ante-dating the Kane Company but suffering in recent years from the growth of ultra-conservatism in its methods. Old Henry Lyman, the founder,
was dead. Henry and Wilson Winthrop, the two sons of the original Samuel Winthrop, were in charge, but of these Henry was really the only important figure. Wilson was more or less of a society figure, interested in art and belles lettres and inclined to live on his income. Henry was handling the concern after the stable methods of his father. He was concerned to stick to the line of exclusive vehicles which his father had manufactured before him and leave to other companies the ruder vehicles that were so widely made. Wagons, trucks, wheelbarrows such as some companies went in for were not for him. Robert showed him in very short order, however, where thousands of dollars could be added to his income without affecting his private business in the least.

Briefly Robert's scheme was to transform the various carriage- and wagon-manufacturing companies into the United Carriage & Wagon Manufacturers Association, all the stock of the constituent companies to be transferred into the general treasury and new six per cent gold interest-bearing bonds issued in their place, at the rate of three for one. The private interests of the different manufactories were not to be interfered with in any way, except as the owners were willing to comply with.

The Kane Company, as the largest and parent company, was to be the centre of activities, but only in the sense that it would act as a clearing house for all the others. The trade orders of all the companies were to be filed there each week and immediately reported in bulletin form to all the others. There was to be a redivision of the work where possible, plants which were exceptional at making wagons and poor at making carriages being given all the wagons they could manufacture and being persuaded to turn over to the carriage companies all the orders for carriages which they received. Where possible, duplication of effort was to be eliminated, and salesmen, buyers, laborers to be cut down to the minimum necessary to do the actual work. Useless plants would be eliminated or run on part-time only. "If necessary, and if it will save money, we will shut up the Kane Company," said Robert, "and let the other plants do the work."

Mr. Henry Winthrop liked this. He liked Robert. He liked his letters of approval from financiers, and he liked, most of all, his business judgement, standing and acumen. If the others would come in, he would come in certainly—why not? He was in
business to make money. They shook hands warmly, and Robert went his way.

His next call was at the Myers-Brooks Manufacturing Company of Buffalo, and with these people he was equally successful. It was not as large a concern as the Lyman-Winthrop Company, not as old, and was doing a much cheaper type of business, but it was thoroughly successful. Robert ingratiated himself as quickly as possible into the favor of Mr. Jacob Myers. He talked about the hard, cold facts of the situation. He showed where a parent company, acting as a clearing house, with the owners of the old companies as directors in the new, and with the facilities which a central financial organization would give them, could open up markets hitherto untouched for wagons and carriages. Wagons and carriages could be manufactured in America and sold in Russia, Australia, India and South America cheaper than they could be manufactured locally in these countries and sold. There could be supplies of lumber brought in from foreign countries, a move which would cut the cost of manufacture by nearly seven per cent. A great central organization could afford to, and would, look after the tariffs here and abroad so that they would be right. He was on fire with his ideas, and his hearers caught fire also. In six weeks he was able to call a meeting of all the carriage and wagon manufacturers whom it was deemed advisable to include at this time at the Evarts House in Indianapolis, and to persuade them to organize according to his plan. A charter for the new corporation was taken out in the State of New Jersey. Mr. Robert Kane, of Cincinnati, was elected president; Mr. Henry Winthrop of New York, vice-president; Mr. Jacob Myers, of Buffalo, treasurer; and Mr. Henry S. Woods, of St. Louis, secretary. In the due course of time, the stock-transfer scheme, as originally planned, was carried out. Robert found himself president of the United Carriage & Wagon Manufacturers Association, with a capital stock of ten million dollars, and with assets aggregating nearly three-fourths of that sum at a forced sale. He was a happy man.

While all this was going forward, Lester was completely in the dark. His trip to Europe prevented him from seeing three or four minor notices in the newspapers of some of the efforts that were being made to unite the various carriage and wagon manufactories. He returned to Chicago to learn that Jefferson Midgely, Imogene's husband, was still in full charge of the branch and
nephews and nieces, in merry and comforting array, all seemed to be gathered round some people, but he—he was alone.

"Fifty!" he often thought to himself. "Alone—absolutely alone."

Sitting in his chamber that Saturday afternoon, he was aroused by a rap at his door. He had been speculating upon the futility of all of his political energy, in the light of the impermanence of life and fame.

"What a great fight we make to sustain ourselves," he thought. "How little difference it will make to me a few years hence."

He arose, and opening wide his door, perceived Jennie. She had come, as she had suggested to her mother, at this time, instead of on Monday, in order to give a more favorable impression of promptness.

"Come right in," said the senator, and, as on the first occasion, graciously made way for her.

Jennie passed in, momentarily expecting some comment upon the brevity of time in which the washing had been done. The senator never noticed it at all.

"Well, my young lady," he said when she had put the bundle down, "how do you find yourself this evening?"

"Very well," replied Jennie. "We thought we'd better bring your clothes today instead of Monday."

"Oh, that would not have made any difference," replied Brander, who thus lightly waved aside what to her seemed so important. "Just leave them on the chair."

Jennie stood up a moment, and considering that not even the fact of having received no recompense was an excuse for lingering, would have gone out, had not the senator detained her.

"How is your mother?" he asked pleasantly, the whole condition of the family distinctly coming back to him.

"She's very well," said Jennie simply.

"And your little sister? Is she any better?"

"The doctor thinks so," replied Jennie, who was greatly concerned over the youngest.

"Sit down," he went on entertainingly. "I want to talk to you."

Stepping to a nearby chair, the young girl seated herself.
"Hem!" he went on, clearing his throat lightly. "What seems to be the matter with her?"

"She has the measles," returned Jennie. "We thought once that she was going to die."

Brander studied her face as she said this, and he thought he saw something exceedingly pathetic there. The girl's poor clothes and her wondering admiration for his state affected him. He felt again that thing which she had made him feel before — the far way he had come along the path of comfort. How high up he was in the world, indeed!

Not recognizing the innate potentiality of any creature, however commonplace, who could make him feel this, he went glibly on, lured, and in a way, controlled by an unconscious power in her. She was a lodestone of a kind, and he was its metal; but neither she nor he knew it.

"Well," he said after a moment or two of reflection, "that's too bad, isn't it."

The spirit in which he said this was entirely conventional. He did not, by a hundredth part, feel the quality which it conveyed to her. Somehow, it brought to Jennie a general picture of her mother and father, and of all the stress and worry they were undergoing at present. She hardened herself intensely against the emotion, lurking so closely behind the surface in her, and silently let the comment pass. It was not lost on him, however. He put his hand to his chin, and in a cheery, legal way said:

"She is better now, though, of course. How old is your father?"

"Fifty-seven," she replied.

"And is he any better?"

"Oh, yes sir. He's around now, although he can't go out just yet."

"I believe your mother said he was a glass-blower by trade?"

"Yes sir."

Brander well knew the depressed local conditions in this branch of manufacture. It had been part of the political issue in the last campaign. They must be in a bad way truly.

"Do all of the children go to school?" he inquired.

"Why, yes sir," returned Jennie, stammering. She was too shamefaced to own that one was left out for the lack of shoes. The utterance of the falsehood troubled her.
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CHAPTER XXXVI

The progress of the general situation in regard to Lester, Jennie, and the home, after Gerhardt's arrival, was considerable. Gerhardt, having been duly installed, a rather emaciated old figure, bestirred himself at once about the labors which he felt instinctively concerned him. The furnace and the yard he took charge of, outraged at the thought that good money should be paid to any outsider when he himself had nothing to do. The trees, he declared to Jennie, were in a dreadful condition. If Lester would get him a pruning knife and a saw, he would fix these things in the spring. In Germany they knew how to do these things right, but these shiftless Americans knew nothing. Then he wanted tools and nails, and in time all the closets and shelves were put in order. He found himself a Lutheran church almost two miles away and declared that it was better than the one in Cleveland. The pastor, of course, was a heaven-sent son of divinity. And nothing would do but that Vesta must go to church with him regularly, and he was scandalized to see that Jennie did not go. It was partially Lester's fault, he saw that, for Lester was a wretched son of earth who had no religion in him and would lie abed Sundays. But as for Jennie—no good could result eventually from neglecting the church.

As for Jennie and Lester, they settled into the new order of living, enjoying the surrounding atmosphere very much. For him it meant establishment on a more pretentious basis and, as such, was more comfortable than was the old method, though in a way it was fraught with greater dangers and difficulties. For her it meant an opportunity to justify her claim to wifehood—to strengthen the bonds of affection which bound them, to appear more conspicuously, if not legally, in the role she so much craved. She did not anticipate all the difficulties, however, for the atmosphere here was different. He had introduced her so long as "Miss Gerhardt" and kept her so much in the background that now, owing to the conspicuous placement of the home, when he was compelled to acknowledge her before their neighbors, at least, as his wife, he felt a little strange and nonplussed. It had been so easy for Jennie, on the North Side, to shun neighbors and say nothing. Here, because things were so much more dignified and respectable, their
immediate neighbors felt it their duty to call, and she had to play
the part of an experienced hostess. She and Lester had talked this
situation over. Neighbors were sure to come in and try to make
friends. Lester and Jennie knew this would be the case. It might as
well be understood here, he said, that they were husband and
wife—it was necessary. Callers were to be received kindly, tea
served if they wished, any story she saw fit told about her own early
life, if it was told at all, only it must be the same story. Vesta was to
be introduced as her daughter by her first marriage—her husband,
a Mr. Stover (her mother's maiden name), having died imme-
diately after the child's birth, Lester, of course, was the stepfather.
Then they were to admit they had lived on the North Side—Hyde
Park was so far from the fashionable heart of Chicago that Lester
did not expect to run into many of his friends. He explained to her
all the usages of entertainment, so that when the first visitor called
Jennie was prepared to receive her, sure she was acting within the
limits of what Lester desired and what was best for herself and all
concerned."

They had not been in the house a week before this personage
arrived in the shape of Mrs. Jacob Stendhal, a woman of consider-
able importance in this section, who, seeing that the house was
ultra-respectable in its atmosphere and refined and tasteful, de-
cided to call. She lived five doors from Jennie—the houses of the
neighborhood were all set in spacious lawns—and drove up in her
carriage on her return from her shopping one afternoon.

"Is Mrs. Kane in?" she asked of Jeannette, the new maid,
whom Jennie had secured.

[The girl, seeing the carriage, opened the door wide for
entrance] "I think so, ma'am. Won't you let me have your card?"
The same was given and taken to Jennie, who looked at it
curiously.

When she came into the entrance hall, which was in its way
a reception room, Mrs. Stendhal, a tall, dark, inquiring-looking
woman, greeted her most cordially.

"I thought I would take the liberty of intruding on you," she
said most winningly. "I am one of your neighbors. I live on the
other side of the street, some few doors up. Perhaps you have seen
the house—the one with the white stone gate-posts."

"Oh, yes, indeed," replied Jennie, "I know it well. Mr. Kane
and I were admiring it the first day we came out here."
"I know of your husband, of course, by reputation. My husband is connected with the Wilkes Frog and Switch Company."

Jennie bowed her head. She knew that the latter concern must be something important and profitable from the way in which Mrs. Stendhal spoke of it.

"We have lived here quite a number of years and admire this section of the city very much. I know how you must feel, coming as a total stranger to a new section of the city. I hope you will find time to come in and see me some afternoon. I shall be most pleased. My regular reception day is Thursday."

"Indeed I shall," answered Jennie, a little nervously, for she was on her mettle. (This was a part of the social ordeal she knew she would have to become accustomed to) "I appreciate your goodness in calling. Mr. Kane is very busy as a rule, but when he is here I am sure he would be most pleased to meet both you and your husband."

"You must both come over some evening," replied Mrs. Stendhal. "We lead a very quiet life. My husband is not much for social gatherings. But we enjoy our neighborhood friends."

Jennie smiled her assurances of goodwill. She accompanied Mrs. Stendhal to the door and shook hands with her. "I'm so glad to find you so charming," observed Mrs. Stendhal frankly.

"Oh, thank you," said Jennie flushing a little. "I'm sure I don't deserve so much praise."

"Well, now I will expect you some afternoon. Goodbye," and she waved her a gracious farewell.

"That wasn't so bad," thought Jennie as she watched Mrs. Stendhal drive away. "She is very nice, I think. I'll tell Lester about her." And she thought of the others who would come now, and what they would be like, and how she would get along with them. It wasn't so very hard after all, was it?

Among the other callers were a Mr. and Mrs. Carmichael Burke, who called a little later, a Mrs. Hanson Field, a Mrs. Timothy Ballinger and several others, all of whom left cards or stayed to chat a few minutes. Jennie found herself being taken quite seriously as a woman of importance—being the wife of so able a man, and she did her best to live up to it. Indeed, for the (wife of so forceful and distinguished a person as Lester—as she now appeared to be,) she did exceptionally well. She was most hospitable and gracious. She had a kindly smile and manner
wholly natural, and she succeeded in making a most favorable impression. She was nervous at first, but her nervousness was not of the kind which showed itself in any visible tremor or any undue uselessness of motion. It made her chill and a little pale, but somehow, to her guests, she seemed all the more dignified and worthwhile for it. She explained to all in the pleasantest possible way that she had been living on the North Side until recently, that her husband, Mr. Kane, had long wanted to have a home in Hyde Park, that her father and daughter were living here, and that Lester was the child's stepfather. She said she hoped to repay all these nice attentions and to be a good neighbor.

Lester only heard about these calls in the evening, for he did not care to meet these people. If any of them came after eight, he made it a point to appear to be absent or working; but since most of the calling was done by the wives during the day, he was not greatly disturbed. Jennie came to enjoy it in a mild way. She liked people, and she was hoping that something definite could be worked out here which would make Lester see her as a good wife and an ideal companion. If she did this well enough, who knows—he might really someday want to marry her.

The trouble with this situation in so far as Jennie was concerned was that it had no real stability in point of character or possibility. As has been said, she was not of the social type—not even of this middle-world social type, which concerned itself here, in this neighborhood, with the affairs of well-to-do, aspiring, middle-class people. Every family resident here had some growing social and commercial connections. They were all trying to get along and get up, from positions of moderate trust and profit on the part of the men and budding social connections on the part of the women, to real financial success on the part of the former and real social recognition on the part of the latter. They would not long remain here, and most of them would not have remained any great length of time anyhow. Things were in a state of flux. Chicago was growing. The women, as a rule, were smart and interesting, but Jennie was better than that. Her queendom was really not of this particular social world, nor of the so-called higher one in which Lester naturally moved. She belonged to the world of dreamers who grow slowly and who come to a realization of things as they are only after a long time. Even when she did see, if she ever did, she would not have cared for these people. She was
interested in nature and the drift of life. Because she loved Lester and was anxious to make a showing which would cause him to see that she was suited to his world, she worked hard at what might be called social affairs. She tried to make friends, to be nice and winning, and she did succeed in a way. These women liked her, but they were not big enough to like anything outside the conventional lines of living—or if they were, fear held them back.

Lester, for his part, and because of his conventional training, was prone to draw conclusions which, while sympathetic, were not wholly favorable to Jennie's social aspirations. He liked her immensely—might truly be said to have loved her, but his family and his social world still had a powerful grip on him. He had refused to marry Jennie solely to avoid that social comment which her presence as his wife would arouse; and now, having watched her here for some time, he figured that hers was not the temperament for introduction into formal social life, even if she had wanted to enter it, which he thought she did not. She did not care for it, he thought; could not make believe. She had none of the gayety and sparkle of the privileged figures of The Four Hundred, young and old. She had no sense of tradition, no family, no intimate knowledge of those various worlds—art, literature, society gossip—which make up the small change of social life. She would not have shone at a dinner. Many people might have found her tiresome, particularly those who are restless and eager for information concerning the little things which make up social brilliancy. But there was a mental and emotional pull to her nevertheless which bigger minds could understand. She thought only of big things in a vague way, formulating any idea or action slowly. But she thought in ways which usually transcended the common, more superficial method, much as the flow of a river might transcend in importance the hurry of an automobile.

But she liked social life of another kind, he saw—that quiet interchange of neighborly ideas and feelings which go to make up the substance and backbone of true social life. When it came to those pleasant things which concern taking an interest in one's neighbor's home, one's neighbor's children, one's neighbor's health and prosperity or sickness and failure, she was a personality to be reckoned with. Not that she did much in the way of talking and running—hers was a silent spirit—but she drew to herself those elements which, to a greater or less extent, felt right to her.
By degrees, those who lived in the immediate neighborhood, and there were not any who were social figures in any large sense, but all of whom had money and much comfort, came to see and feel that this was rather an exceptional home atmosphere which had been established here, and over which she presided. They saw Lester leaving in the morning, carried by a rather lively-stepping team of bays toward the city, and they saw Vesta emerge sometimes a little earlier, sometimes a little later, sometimes with her stepfather, who carried her to the school where her budding educational career had begun. His was a figure suited to impress any respectable home neighborhood, for he was strong, well set-up, handsome, conservatively dressed and with an air of distance and superiority which made any one note him as a personage. Vesta was sweet and gay, a lightsome, butterfly-type of child, always dressed in some extremely appropriate or childish novelty which set her off to perfection. She was seen to appear in quaint little dresses, big bows of ribbon, a flowered bag for her books, and to go hopping and skipping down the walk to the gate and down the side-walk, her mother looking smilingly after her. Jennie herself was seen to enter the family carriage with her husband and her young daughter, sometimes of an evening, sometimes of a Sunday afternoon, for a drive, or to stroll about the yard at times when the flowers were in season. There was a gay sleigh, which appeared with the first heavy snow, in which Jennie and Vesta were driven by Lester, the bells of the harness jingling merrily as they disappeared. It was quickly rumored, of course, that this was one of the sons of the celebrated Kane family, and that there was an endless supply of cash back of this rather charming social appearance.

CHAPTER XXXVII

The first impressions of a neighborhood are seldom enduring, as we all know well enough, and the first impressions of this particular neighborhood were subject to some modification, for they had been altogether a little too favorable. Jennie was charming to look at, gracious, but there were rumors which came from here and there. A Mrs. Sommerville, calling on Mrs. Craig, one
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