AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPTS OF GOOD AND EVIL IN HENRY JAMES'S *THE WINGS OF THE DOVE* AND *THE GOLDEN BOWL*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

HATİCE KESKİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Wolf Konig

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli _____

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz _____

Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer _____

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPTS OF GOOD AND EVIL IN HENRY JAMES'S *THE WINGS OF THE DOVE* AND *THE GOLDEN BOWL*

Keskin, Hatice
M.A., Program in English Literature
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

December 2003, 67 pages

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the concepts of good and evil in Henry James's two novels, *The Wings of the Dove* and *The Golden Bowl*. The main argument, which is supported with evidence from the novels and several articles and books, is that the conceps of good and evil permeate the novels, that Henry James's use of symbolism and imagery reinforces the illustration of these concepts, that the contextual understanding of these terms cannot be separated from the environmental, financial and contextual factors that influence the characters' responses to the world outside themselves and that human relations and the characters' relatedness to the world outside themselves constitute the point where good and evil reside.

Key Words: Good, evil.

ÖZ

HENRY JAMES'İN *THE WINGS OF THE DOVE* VE *THE GOLDEN BOWL* ROMANLARINDA İYİLİK VE KÖTÜLÜK KAVRAMLARININ İNCELENMESİ

Keskin, Hatice
Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Programı
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

Aralık 2003, 67 sayfa

Bu tez Hery James'in *The Wings of the Dove* ve *The Golden Bowl* romanlarında, iyilik ve kötülük kavramlarını incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Henry James'in simgeler ve imgeler yardımıyla bu kavramları nasıl güçlendirdiği, çevresel, ekonomik ve durumsal faktörlerin insanlar arası ilişkilere iyi ve kötü olarak nasıl yansıdığı, iyilik ve kötülük kavramlarının insanlar arası ilişkilerde kaynağını nereden ve nasıl aldığı konularının araştırılması ve bu kavramların ölçütlerinin neler olduğu ve bu ölçütlerin ne derece değişmez olduğunun ortaya çıkarılması amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İyilik, kötülük.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz for her guidance, suggestions and supervision throughout the research. I would also like to thank the members of the examining committee.

I also want to thank my family and my colleagues at Düzce Anatolian Teacher Training High School for their support.

Special thanks to my friend Emilio Sardone for his encouragement from overseas and Fatih for his patience and faith in me.

"I hereby declare that all the information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work".

December 2003 Signature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study aims at analysing the concepts of "good" and "evil" in Henry James's two novels, *The Golden Bowl* and *The Wings of the Dove,* which belong to the third period of his writing career.

James's work as a literary artist or a writer is classified into three main periods. The first period has to do with the works belonging to the international theme that deals with the impact of the New World represented by America upon the Old World represented by Europe. This is the period between 1875 and 1889. The second period stands for the growing realistic phase of James's career including such works as the ones dealing mostly with the English life including the social, political and the artistic areas. He also occupied himself with the problem of the evil existing in the society and this period extends from 1890 to 1900. The third period includes the works which again deal with the international theme. At this time James returns to this topic but with a more mature and embracive imagination. The best of his writings of this period include *The Wings of the Dove (1902), The Ambassadors,* written before *The Wings of the Dove* but published in 1903 and *The Golden Bowl (1904),* after which he stopped writing novels until the year of 1914 but still wrote a few short stories.

Although published before *The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove* was written closer in time to *The Golden Bowl*. So, the selection of the novels to be studied here was not based on closeness in the publication but on James's writing sequence. Although these three works are worth close examination, only the two mentioned above will be the focus of this study because they can be considered to be the two parts of a single unit, which is described by Adeline R. Tintner as

follows: "the pairing of *The Wings of the Dove* and *The Golden Bowl* involves the expulsion from Paradise in *The Wings of the Dove* and the regaining of a true paradise which Adam and Maggie must earn in *The Golden Bowl*" (1987: 59). Thus the ethical concepts to be studied can be viewed and depicted best when the two novels are perceived as the two parts of a whole unit.

George Bishop labels the works of the final phase of James's literary career as the "monumental trio of novels which are the finest achievements of the late phase and the capstone of James's long and distinguished career" (1991:10). Similarly, Edward Wagenknecht contends that "*The Ambassadors* is the most beautifully symmetrical and *The Wings of the Dove* the richest in spiritual beauty and suggestiveness, but *The Golden Bowl* is the most elaborately developed and consummately 'done.' Here is the final reach of James's 'later manner'" (1983: 218). As Pippin has put it, "*The Golden Bowl* is so rich in imagery that many passages read like lyric poetry" (1983: 225) and Henry James is a novelist of manners (3). His writings are analytic and psychologic and he is an expert in "the art of novel" writing. James also attaches importance to the manners of his characters; however, this is not to say that he is a moralist. Henry James does not take sides or support certain moral deeds; however, while depicting the "good" and "evil" deeds of his characters he creates a space for reflection. As previously mentioned by many critics, the international theme is one of James's great contributions to 19th century Western literature. This theme is the one around which James structures his fiction and this provides him with a wide range of scope to point out the evils in the society, which, one can claim, emerge as a result of the presence of good and evil in human nature. James, Sally Sears says,

> utilizes moral constructs for the sake of interest and intensity that result from their juxtaposition with other models of behaviour. He is concerned with rendering the excruciation that results from exposing someone of a trusting, open, innocent nature to someone who, beneath a perfected social manner of grace and charm, hides deadly intents. Fascinated with his villains and with the general human capacity for destructiveness, he is often primarily involved in exploring the peripheral limits of that capacity in his characters. (qtd. in Gargano 1987: 161)

This, exactly, is what happens in *The Golden Bowl* and *The Wings of the Dove.* Depicting the evil intrude upon the lives of his characters and juxtaposing them with alternative patterns of behaviour James centers on the moral issues of character development and while doing this he raises so many questions that sometimes even the author himself seems unable to answer them.

As Catherine Cox Wessel has put it in reference to *The Golden Bowl*, the two novels will prove that they are "the product of an advanced civilization whose purpose is to display the beast-like struggle for survival engaged in by James's deeply involved and immersed and more or less bleeding participants " (1990: 243). The two novels, in which the fittist animals overpower their rivals for survival, are the embodiment of a battlefield in the figurative sense, where "intelligent" survival techniques as required in a materialistic world are applied and the world which is depicted is the one in which "the worker in one connection was the worked in another" (*The Wings of the Dove*:118). Although Henry James does not take sides or impose an ideal in the two novels while depicting his characters' responses to events, there is a sense of cynicism permeating the two novels. As Wessel has also pointed out, rather than "criticise a particular culture", he expresses his "cynicism about human nature itself" (1990: 243).

Edward Wagenknecht draws attention to *The Golden Bowl* suggesting that "The Golden Bowl is so rich in imagery that many passages read like lyric poetry. Gold, wealth, conquest, water, sailing and exploitation, architecture, games and animal...are all drawn upon" (1983: 225). Similarly, as Merle A. Williams asserts

> fictional constitution of *The Golden Bowl* throws light on James's use of the concrete symbol of the bowl itself. The bowl undeniably functions as a structural anchor within the novel, for it acts as the point on convergence for a number of intricate systems of aesthetic, psychological and moral reference. And it has fruitful associations with the imagery of shape and colour throughout the book. (1993: 219)

Similar importance attached to imagery and symbolism by James can also be detected in the very title of *The Wings of the Dove* and references to Milly as the "dove" of the novel associate her with goodness and innocence.

What Chapter 2 of this study is going to focus on is how James uses imagery and symbolism to depict the good and evil in relation to *The Wings of he Dove* (hereafter WD) and then the study is going to examine these concepts with close contextual references to the novel. Chapter 3 is going to focus on how James uses imagery and symbolism in *The Golden Bowl* (hereafter GB) and then the concepts of good and evil are going to be examined with close references to the novel.

As well as the imagery used in the titles, imagery used throughout the novels help to depict, understand and evaluate what is meant by "good" and "evil" in the two novels.

Animal imagery suggests the "prey vs. predator" relationship putting characters in a subservient/dominant state. This power struggle also suggests the changing morality of the characters as their roles change. For example, after Kate says to her father that Aunt Maud wants to "keep" her "on the condition that she will break off all relations with her father", she continues saying that "I'm not so precious a capture. No one has ever wanted to keep me before" (WD:12) and before she started to be "kept" by Aunt Maud "it was perfectly present to Kate that she might be devoured, and she likened herself to a trembling kid, kept apart a day or two till her turn should come, but sure sooner or later to be introduced into the cage of the lioness" (23). Later, Milly is to make her appearance into the society of which Kate is a member and "Milly's anxious companion sat and looked– looked very much as some spectator in an old-time *circus* might have watched the oddity of a Christian maiden, in the arena, mildly, caressingly, martyred. It was the nosing and fumbling not of lions and tigers but of domestic animals let loose as for the joke" [my emphasis] (222) and this is where Milly the dove, the fragile animal, is exposed. Similarly, the world in GB is as animalistic as the other one in that, as Mrs. Assingham says to justify what she has done that "there is no imagination so lively, at once it's started, as that of really agitated lambs. Lions are nothing to them, for lions are sophisticated, are *blasés,* are brought up, from the first, to prowling and mauling" (GB: 321) and this description of Fanny Assingham's is in parallel with the development of Maggie's self-knowledge and knowledge of her environment. Maggie's initial portrait is that of "a small creeping thing" trembling

for its life (108). However, later she becomes "a timid tigress" (249) and this is when we realize a sort of development in Maggie :

> It was not till many days had passed that the princess began to accept the idea of having done, a little, something she was not always doing, or indeed that of having listened to any inward voice that spoke in a new tone (GB: 245).

Imagery of playing and acting has a significant role in the novels as well since every character tries to assume the role that their situation requires and this is always reminded to the reader by the characters' language and actions or non-actions. For instance, when Kate meets Densher to inform him about her being "kept" by her aunt, Lionel Croy advises her to "play the game" because the only way to do so is "to play it" because "there's no limit to what" her "aunt can do for" her (WD: 16). Upon Charlotte and Amerigo's return from their visit to Matcham, suspecting that Amerigo has had an affair with Charlotte, Maggie, at a dinner with the whole family, felt herself as if she were

> an actress who had been studying a part and rehearsing it, but who suddenly, on the stage, before the footlights, had begun to improvise, to speak lines not in the text. It was this very sense of the stage and the footlights that kept her up, made her rise higher; just as it was the sense of action that logically involved some platform- action quite positively for the first time in her life, or, counting the previous afternoon, for the second...preparation and practice had come but a short way; her part opened out, and she invented from moment to moment what to say and to do...there was a card she could play, but there was only one, and to play it would be to end the game. (GB: 263-264)

Games played have no rules the very participants being the only rule-makers.

Thus far the most dominant images have been mentioned. There will be detailed references to these and other types of imagery as well as to symbolism as the study develops.

In his article "Philosophy, Interpretation and *The Golden Bowl*" Peter Jones has allocated a few pages to emphasize his interpretation of *The Golden Bowl* with reference to James's prefaces and his brother William James's philosophical work

(1984: 219). According to William James, “to think is in short the only moral act” (qtd. in Jones: 223) and these are the very lines of which, as it will be clear later, Fanny Assingham will be the mouthpiece. Since most of the characters both in GB and WD act on the basis of their own moral sense and have certain ends to achieve, their tendency becomes that of victimizing and sacrificing others, for they are the constituents of a society which is formed by the interdependency of individuals whose survival in their struggle depends on how well they use the necessary survival strategies that their situation requires. Since the world described in the novels is constituted of individuals depending on each other, when confronted with moral choices, it is inevitable for the characters to affect others for better or worse. So lack of sympathy with others, self-centredness and selfishness are evil acts which find their opposition in sympathy and selflessness which, too, may result in another evil act, which is the restriction of another individual’s experience. For while experimenting with their own potentials for their own freedom a character generally restricts the growth of the other persons. This act has been described by Andreas Osborn in one of his articles titled “Emotional Cannibalism” in his book titled *Henry James and theExpanding Horizon* as “interference by opinion is... one of the vicious forms of emotional cannibalism” (1948: 28) and this is the “mildest-seeming” intervention (23). This critic’s comments centre on the short stories of Henry James and they are highly applicable to the novels to be studied, for emotional cannibalism as described by him “signifies that tendency in human nature to obtain emotional nourishment from indulgence in acts of aggression on other human beings” (22) and this criticism is highly relevant to a novel whose characters constitute the “animals” in a “zoo”. In a parallel fashion, since the novels are novels of interrelationships of all sorts, there will be references to the studies of the psychoanalyst and social philosopher Erich Fromm– especially to his ideas concerning character orientations, interpersonal relationships and love, which may help the better understanding of the characters’s actions and responses to one another and to the world outside themselves.

CHAPTER 2

THE WINGS OF THE DOVE

2.1 Symbolism and Imagery

Both WD and GB are symbolic titles having close relation to the dominant themes of good and evil pervading each novel. James uses some traditional symbols and closely related imagery to strengthen not only the characterization of his characters but also put a special emphasis on the morality of his characters's actions, depict the circumstances that, in a way, characterize their motivations and help to understand their nature.

Wings, as explained in Cooper's *Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols*, suggest,

> divinity...the moving; protecting all pervading power of the deity; the power to transcend the mundane world; the never weary...spontaneous movement...freedom [and] victory. Wings are attributes of swift messenger of gods and denote the power of communication between gods and men. Outspread wings are divine protection and trust. (Cooper 1978: 193-194)

As far as the "dove" is concerned, it represents "The Holy Spirit; purity...A white dove is the saved soul the purified soul as opposed to the black raven of sin"(Cooper: 54). In WD, the use of "dove" as the central symbol for innocence is important in that it is the embodiment of mercy and selflessness and it is very likely, as Wagenknecht suggests, that the basic image of the dove comes from Psalm 55 and 68 (1983:202) and in WD it is Milly Theale whom the name "dove" is attributed to by Kate and later by the other characters.

In the novel there are many references to Milly's innocence, purity, good nature and fragility through certain images. To start with, when she makes her first appearance in the Alps, she is with Susan Shepherd Stringham, with whose name "Milly for the most part amused herself...She had now no life to lead; and she honestly believed that she was thus supremely equipped for leading Milly's own" (WD: 76-77). Being Milly's confidante and good-natured friend, who would even risk dying for her (132) and who accompanies her throughout her travel, Susan is Milly's *shepherd* and Milly is the innocent *lamb*. While Milly is standing at the edge of the abyss in the Alps, Susan Stringham's attention is caught by Milly's "liability to slip, to slide, to leap, to be precipitated by a false movement...into whatever was beneath" (84). The fact that Milly "was not meditating a jump" puts Mrs. Stringham in comfort since Milly, suggesting Christ's temptation in the wilderness (Wagenknecht: 214), but was

> looking down the kingdoms of the earth, and though indeed that of itself might well go to the brain, it wouldn't be with a view of renouncing them. Was she choosing among them, or did she want them all? (WD: 84)

What Milly meditates on is not committing suicide, as it occurs to Susan Shepherd Stringham as well. On the contrary, "it would not be for her a question of a flying leap and thereby a quick escape. It would be a question of taking full in the face the whole assault of life" (85). Then Milly comes back from her climb with her plan in mind- that is, to go to London. Milly's standing at the edge of the "abyss" is emblematic of the fragility of her life both, as will be revealed later in the novel, in terms of her having an incurable and unnamed disease and of her awaiting doom, which will be a real abyss in the duplicity of the London circle. What Adeline Tintner contends in *The Book World of Henry James* seems to be relevant and worth mentioning here in the sense that she highlights certain resemblances between WD and the Miltonic epic. She claims that WD "seems to incorporate...the basic design of *Paradise Lost*" and that the title of WD "can be shown to have been drawn not from Psalm 55...but from the opening lines of *Paradise Lost"* (1987: 60), in which "the word 'abyss' appears eighteen times" (61). Furthermore, she associates Milly with the " 'Spirit' of Milton" (61) and the meeting of Kate and Densher in the Underground with Satan's meetings in hell (62) and "abysses" are

"the province of the Devil" (61). Although Tintner's idea concerning the source of the title of the novel is in contrast with that of Wagenknecht and others who claim to have recognized a relationship between related Psalms and the "dove", what she has pointed out is relevant and of great use for the understanding of Lancaster Gate since the Lancaster Gate circle is the embodiment of where the modern "devils" reside.

When Milly makes her entrance into London life for the first time at Lancaster Gate- here "gate" suggests the entry into a new life- she "alighted...taking up her destiny...as if she had been able by a wave or two of her wings to place herself briefly in sight...The image was that of her being, as Lord Mark had declared, a success" (WD: 106). When Kate warns Milly against the mores of London society and says that she "may very well loathe me yet" and after Milly asks the reason why she tells her such things, Kate answers : "Because you're a dove" (184). In Italy, in Palazzo Leporelli, where Milly stays and whose atmosphere Densher describes as "court life", Densher has a conversation with Mrs. Stringham and she agrees with his description of the place saying that it is "such a court as never was: one of the courts of heaven, the court of an angel" (332-333). This description of Mrs. Stringham's is in parallel with that of Densher when he visits Milly and decides to go on a ride: "Her black garments throughout...its folded fabric kept in place by heavy rows of pearls, hung down to her feet like the stole of a priestess" (258) and at another time Milly has "moved slowly to and fro as the priestess of the worship" (284). On another occasion, when Kate and Densher attend a party at Milly's palace, where it for the first time occurs to Kate to use Milly for her aims- that is, to make Densher court her, marry her and inherit her millions to marry him herself, Milly's appearance is that of a "bejewelled dove" as Kate pronounces:

> Kate's face, as she considered them, struck him; the long priceless *chain, wound twice round the neck, hung, heavy and pure, down the front of the wearer's breast...*Milly was indeed a dove; this was the figure, though it most applied to her spirit [my italics]. (337)

The chain around Milly's neck is a striking contrast in terms of the meaning that the chain itself suggests and the image of Milly as the dove represents. Chain has

an “ambivalent” suggestion as “office, dignity, and unity but also bondage and slavery” (Cooper: 32). She may be a “priestess” with a chain representing her palace as an office where religious ceremonies are held but she is also “doomed” and enslaved by the evil workings of her friends and this explanation is in parallel with the former description of Milly’s life as a “caged freedom” (WD: 305). Upon learning from Lord Mark that she has been deceived and acted upon by Kate and Densher, Milly has “turned her face to the wall” (369) folding her “wonderful wings” or rather as Mrs. Lowder says spreading “them the wider” (425). When Densher visits Kate at her sister’s house to show the “sacred letter” that Milly has written him before her death and has sent so as to enable its arrival on Christmas Eve, and gives the letter to Kate wishing her to do with it whatever she likes, Kate throws the letter into the flame without opening it. However, Kate astonishes Densher when she opens the second letter that arrives approximately three months later. Kate understands that Densher is in love with the memory of the dead American girl and says that “I used to call her, in my stupidity- for want of everything better- a dove. Well, she stretched out her wings, and it was to *that* they reached. They cover us” [italics original] (456). However, the second letter in which the amount of Milly’s pledge is mentioned is the “sacred” script sealing the impossibility of a reunion between Kate and Densher since both have learned that they “shall never be as we were!” (457). Densher refuses to touch the second letter and the money promised in it because that money reminds him of the evil acts that they together have done to Milly and by refusing to touch the money, Densher asserts that the game of deceiving Milly should never have begun. Thus, the outspread wings of Milly, which illuminate Kate and Densher by awakening their awareness of their past evil acts and providing them with a huge inheritance, also leave them and their relationship in shadow. Yet, in the light of so many references to “goodness” and the angelic purity of Milly it is highly logical an inference to say, as Samuels has already mentioned, that James “means Milly to be Christ-like” (1971: 64).

The central symbol of “dove” and the related imagery that focus on Milly’s character and have been depicted so far present the young American girl as a “better” character and put her on a different scale when compared to most of the

other characters. However, before going deep into what constitutes the morality of the characters as depicted by James in WD, it is necessary to show how animal imagery relates to the idea of "good" and "evil" that forms the basis of the morality of London society.

Milly's conversation in London with her doctor, Sir Luke Strett, depicts Milly as the "survivor of a general wreck" before her arrival in London. She is as if pronouncing how she is the embodiment of the "survival of the fittist" idea . Yet, the place where she has been able to "survive" is the American world, not London:

> I'm a survivor- a survivor of a general wreck. You see how that's to be taken into account- that everyone else *has* gone. When I was ten years old there were, with my father and my mother, six of us. I'm all that's left. But they died of different things. Still, there it is. And as I told you before, I'm American. Not that I mean that makes me worse. However, you'll probably know what it makes me.(WD: 158)

Milly's speech is ironic in the sense that she is as if pronouncing her "success" in being a rare case. Sir Luke Strett's response is equally ironic: "Yes, I know perfectly what it makes you. It makes you, to begin with, a *capital case*"[my italics] (158). Sir Luke's expression "capital" has the meaning of "punishment by death." Although there is nothing to punish Milly for by death, her being a dove, a fragile animal, in the more carnivorous London circle makes her an excellent prey. It is Densher "who had in a manner invented the *wonderful creature*" and "*caught her in her native jungle*" and it is he who "paved the way for her by his prompt recognition of her rarity" [my italics] (218-219). However, she is a mere dove and a weak "caged Byzantine"(167), who, throughout her appointment with Sir Luke Strett, only wishes with a "sneaking hope" to be called "as to all indispensables, a veritable young lioness!" (164).

As opposed to Milly's more domestic animalistic features, the animalistic features of the other characters are far from being sympathetic. For instance, to depict the extent to which Aunt Maud has an evil nature, James applies a wide range of animal imagery and expressions having animalistic overtones. At the beginning of the novel, she is the "devourer" of Kate; she is the "lioness" and her dwelling Lancaster Gate is the "cage" and a sort of "battlefield" (23). In Kate and

Densher relationship, to which she does not give her consent, she holds the "ropes" in her hand, "giving" them "rope", (43) but not making them indulge in it. She always comes in while Kate and Densher "sat together rather helplessly watching her, as in a coach-in-four; she drove round their prospect as the principal lady at the *circus* drives round the ring" [italics original] (44). She also "fixed" on Kate settling on her "with her wonderful gilded claws" and is described by Densher as a "vulture" but his utterance is corrected by Kate as an "eagle-with a gilded beak" (52), for she does not feed on the dead flesh of certain preys- rather on the ones she has caught herself. When Densher visits Aunt Maud upon her invitation, he finds himself, like Kate, "in the cage of the lioness without his whip- the whip...of a supply of proper retorts" (54). Aunt Maud has also the tendency to "bite" Densher's "head off any day" without opening her mouth (59) and to "swallow" him (129). Aunt Maud is also like a magical beast doubling its strength as she devours weaker ones. E. C. Curtsinger, thinking Lancaster Gate as Gate, adresses Aunt Maud as the "keeper of the Gate", as the "Sphinx", a name which so well befits her character (1987: 106).

Kate, on the other hand, who at the beginning suffers from being a prey, a "precious capture" to Aunt Maud's "cage" (WD: 23), later assumes the role of a pacing "panther" (184) since upon entering the Gate she has definitely learned the workings of the logic that lead the London society and acted in accordance with them. She even teaches the novice Milly that "the monster...loomed large for those born amid forms *less developed*...it might on some side be a strange and dreadful monster, calculated to *devour the unwary, to abase the proud, to scandalize the good*" [my italics] (180). Furthermore, it is Kate who arranges occasions with a view to meeting Densher by using Milly to screen their relationship against Aunt Maud's suspicions and it is again she who puts Densher "in a wondrous silken web" (237), making him do things that she designs for their union. In WD, almost all the relations are the embodiment of a "web" and the schemes that are carried out push the related characters into evil and dangerous acts, as a result of which preys are entrapped. The fact that Densher "was in a silken web" is important in the sense that "web" or "the web of life, fate, and time is woven by divine powers" as illustrated in Cooper's *Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols:*

> The spider in the centre of the web can represent the sun surrounded by its rays reaching in all directions, but it is also lunar as depicting the life and death cycle of the manifest world and the wheel of existence, with death at the centre. It also shares the symbolism of the labyrinth as the dangerous journey of the soul...It denotes the snares of the world of the Devil and human frailty, also the malice of evil-doers. (190)

Cooper's explanation of the "web" symbol fits well the workings of the evil world that James tries to depict since the biggest "spider" who, in a way, weaves others' lives according to her own morality is Aunt Maud. Kate, as exemplified above, is another arranger of lives for personal benefit and Densher constitutes the "frailty" part since he permits himself to be used by Kate as a tool and they are all malicious and evil-doers, as will be more clear in the second part of this study.

In the preceding quotation from Cooper, it has been suggested that "web" shares the symbolism of the dangerous journey of the soul; "labyrinth" goes hand in hand with the image of "abyss" in one of Susan Stringham's conversations with Milly. When Milly asks Susan Stringham whether Kate and Densher love is reciprocal, Susan Stringham answers saying: "My dear child, we move in a labyrinth" and Milly's response is that it is "just the fun of it! Don't tell me that- in this for instance- there are not abysses. I want abysses" (123). If the abyss is where the devil resides, then a multicursal labyrinth is something which

> is designed with the intention of confusing and puzzling and contains blind paths, requiring knowledge of the key or solution to the problem...suggesting the mysteries of life and death; a knot to be untied; danger; difficulty; fate. (Cooper: 92-93)

The relationship between Kate and Densher and that of those others to one another and to Milly, their actions or non-actions become a knot to be untied for the characters throughout the novel.

The reader's first encounter with Milly Theale is in in the third book with the alpine scene and she is seen at the edge of the "abyss" and as can be understood in the preceding quotation which links "abyss" to "labyrinth", Milly is in need of "abysses". Similarly, as the novel progresses, Densher finds himself strolling

"through dusky labyrinthine alleys and empty *campi*, overhung with mouldering palaces, where he paused on disgust at his want of ease and where the sound of a rare footstep on the enclosed pavement was like that of a retarded dancer"(WD: 315) and towards the end Densher asks himself "into what abyss it pushed him", upon learning from Sir Luke Strett the "nearest approach to the utter reference they had hitherto so successfully avoided" (395). Jean Kimball, in "The Abyss and *The Wings of the Dove*: the Image as a revelation", focuses on the image of "abyss", initially making a connection between Milly's exploration in the fourth book of her new circle, and her exploration in the Alps, claiming that it is during the second interview with Sir Luke Strett and her lonely meditation in London streets and Regent Park that Milly understands the meaning of "abyss". The scene with Kate Croy, which follows the previous one, introduces the dove, which symbolizes her hope for salvation (Kimball: 270) and "Milly's idea, expressed in her Venetian palace, of 'never going down' becomes for her an image...of remaining aloft in the divine dustless air, where she would hear but the plash of the water against stone', an image which links in one picture the two integral images in this novel, the abyss and the wings of the dove" (277). Thus, it is without doubt, as she has also pointed out, that the images of abyss and dove "are introduced into the novel in their logical order"- abyss, defining her "'practical problem of life', the dove, with its wonderful wings, is the symbol for her final solution" (268).

The "practical question of life" permeates not only Milly but also most of the other characters as well and this is why they try to solve the basic problems of their lives by using their own means that appeal to them most at particular circumstances. Henry James's use of imagery of "game, playing, and acting" and the depiction of his characters as "actors" and "actresses" are all attempts at depicting the intriguing world and they all add to the "web" , "animal", "labyrinth" and "abyss" imagery.

After Lionel Croy advises Kate to "play the game" because "there's no limit to what your aunt can do for you" (WD: 16), Kate and Densher's "faces were turned to the illumined quarter as soon as he had answered her question in respect to the appearance of their being able to play a waiting game with success" (61). At another time just before Milly's reception of her first lesson from Kate concerning

the “monster” looming in their society, Milly decides, remembering what Aunt Maud has told her at Matcham, she “would do her share of conquering ...for squaring with Aunt Maud’s ideal” and the situation “was what it came to now...in the quiet lamplight [and] had the quality of a rough rehearsal of a big drama” (179). After Milly’s encounter with Kate and Densher at the Gallery, Densher thinks that “in wait for him there on Euston platform and lifting its head as that of a snake in the garden, was the disconcerting sense that ‘respect’, in their game, seemed somehow- he scarce knew what to call it- a fifth wheel to the coach” (198) and for Densher “waiting was the game of dupes” (200). Here, the “snake in the garden” reminds one of the converstaion between Kate and Densher in the Gardens, where Densher “had declared his horror of bringing a premature end [to] her happy relation with her aunt; and they had worked round together to a high level of wisdom and patience” (66) to gain time. The joy of this situation comes “not so much perhaps...[from] our secret in itself” but from “what’s represented and, as we must somehow feel, protected and made deeper and closer by it” (67), for “the way he saw himself was just a precious proof the more of his having tasted of the tree and being thereby prepared to assist her to eat, this gives the happy tone of their talk...” (65). These descriptions of Kate and Densher’s situation in the Gardens remind one of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden with their Fall suggesting a sort of sin and this explanation is in agreement with Tintner’s comment in which she has assumed Kate and Densher’s meeting in the Underground to be one like Satan’s meetings in hell, as previously mentioned. When Kate wants Densher to be “nice” to Milly, to make her see how clever and charming he is, Densher responds saying that “I can be ‘charming’ to her...only by letting her suppose I give you up...It *is* a game” [italics original] (210). As Densher later recognizes, the existence of Kate in Lancaster Gate had “something like the artistic idea, the plastic substance...imposed, in respect to a given character, on a distinguished actress” and Kate has to “dress the part...for the character she had undertaken...to represent”; what’s more, “Aunt Maud’s appreciation of that tonight was...managerial, and Kate’s...contribution fairly that of the faultless soldier on a parade”; Densher, on the other hand, sees himself “in his purchased stall at the play; the watchful manager was in the depths of a box and the poor actress in the glare of the

footlights"; however, "she *passed* the poor actress....but...there was, still further, time among them for him to feel almost too scared to take part in the ovation" and in this drama "the drama...was between *them*", in which "Merton Densher relagated to more spectatorship, a paying place in front, and one of the most expensive" [italics original] (217-218). In Italy, after everyone has left the palace, both Milly and Densher "*saw* each other at the game, she knowing he tried to keep her in tune with his notion, and he knowing she thus knew it...and yet...nothing was spoiled by it", as a result of which one gets "a fair impression of their most completely workable line" (360). On his return from Italy to London Densher announces to Kate, like a member of a team playing away, that they have lost after playing "our dreadful game" (419) and Kate claims that she "did play fair" with Milly (444).

In WD Milly plays the part of a dove and this role has been given to her by Kate and in Kate and Densher relationship it is again Kate, who mostly has made the distribution of the roles they are supposed to act and up till the game played upon Milly, Densher might have acted the part of Hamlet because he has always acted less than he has thought (385) and the morality of "acting" or "non-acting" is one of the issues that will haunt Densher while trying to justify his treatment of Milly, which will be a point to be mentioned in the following section of the study.

2.2. Contextual analysis of good and evil

Sally Sears comments on the overall picture of life that is represented in the novel contending that "there is something reminiscent of a hellish chess game in the book's presentations of the mathematics of narrowing alternatives, in which the loser of the game not only does not know she is losing, she does not even know she is playing" (1987: 154). The hellish atmosphere that is depicted at the beginning of the novel not only gives an idea concerning what sort of alternatives are available to the characters but also helps one understand the possible sources of the motives behind the characters's actions when they choose the best option available. Henry James's stance in the novel is that of a humanitarian in the sense that he puts his characters in situations where the spheres of duties and obligations are limited to and made to depend on human relations, for human beings have a strong need for

relatedness, which is the necessity to unite with other living beings and the need to find new ties with one's fellow men upon the fulfillment of which man's sanity depends (Fromm 1973: 233). However, the bonds between self and the other in the novel are characterized by preoccupation with money and material benefits and are based on certain bargains, the source of which is self-interest and a lack of compassion. The source of evil in the life of individuals stems from what Fromm has identified as "nonproductive" character orientations that "yield at best pseudo-connection to others and, at worse, destructive relations with others" (qtd. in Allen 1997: 184). This is the condition that is best given in the first two Books of the novel when James depicts the physical circumstances and social character of Kate's family circle that compel Kate to scheme in order to marry the man she loves- that is, Merton Densher, who, like herself, is without means and prospects. As Erich Fromm has claimed, the family is the psychological agency through which a child acquires the social character in a culture: "Parents...represent the social character of their society or class. They transmit to the child what we may call the psychological atmosphere or the spirit of a society just by being as they are- namely representatives of this very spirit" (1942: 245). Thus, it will be useful to have a closer look at the Croy family, through which Kate's individual character is molded and the society's atmosphere and spirit are portrayed.

In Book First James tries to portray the sordid constraints that Kate has to experience in Chirk Street. Kate has a vision of herself "in the glass over the mantel" and moves "from the shabby sofa to the armchair upholstered in a glazed cloth that gave at once...the sense of the slippery and the sticky" (WD: 5). Having experienced "the failure of fortune and of honour...[Kate feels] misery, misery too beaten for blame and chalkmarked by fate like a 'lot' at a common auction" and these are represented "in these merciless signs of mere mean, stale feelings" (5-6). However, Kate's "repeated pause before the mirror and the chimney-place" represents not only an awareness of her limited means in Chirk Street but also "her nearest approach to an escape from them" because as she "stared into the tarnished glass too hard" she might not "be staring at her beauty alone"; her beauty "was not sustained by items and aids" (6). The reflection she gets from the mirror not only makes her see "more things than her face in the dull glass of her father's lodging"

but also makes her think that "she was not herself a fact in the collapse" since she did not "judge herself cheap, she didn't make for misery" (7). She feels resentful when the image in the mirror magnifies the failure and waste of life she is exposed to. She tries "to be sad, so as not to be angry; but it made her angry that she could not be sad" (5). The loss of two brothers, having a widowed sister and the recent death of her mother, when coupled with the "harm her wretched father had done" (7) to the family name, depicts a world of loss and failure. Marian's marriage is a sort of "spiritless turning of the other cheek to fortune: her actual wretchedness and plaintiveness, her greasy children, her impossible claims, her odious visitors- these things completed the proof of the heaviness, for them all, of the hand of fate" (46). One of the reasons for such a failure is Lionel Croy, for there is "no truth in him; he dealt out lies as he might the cards from the greasy old pack for the game of diplomacy" and he was "too inhuman" but his appearance made him "least connected with anything unpleasant" (8). He is aware that Kate is "a sensible value" unlike his other handsome but widowed daughter Marian. Lionel Croy had been "a terrible husband not to live with" (10) and he "wriggles away" (49) like a snake. There is an unknown "evil" permeating Lionel Croy's life and this, as Kate tells Densher, Kate learns from Marian "one cold black Sunday...[that]. Papa has done something wicked" (47) and as if such "wicked" occurences were the habitual, natural course of existence she "believed it on the spot and have believed it ever since, though she [Marian] could tell me nothing more- neither what was the wickedness nor how she knew, nor what would happen to him....but we were used to that" (47). Kate cannot escape from the effect of her father's unpronounced odious and vile doings since, as she mentions to Densher that they – that is, her father's dishonour, are "a part of me" (48). This fact is later pronounced by Milly when she expresses "to Susan Stringham more than once that Kate had some secret, some smothered trouble" (114), which leads Susan Stringham to say "we move in a labyrinth" (123).

In spite of Aunt Maud's offer, which would provide her with material benefits and money, which are the preconditions of freedom, Kate is able to feel compassion as seen from her offer to her father to live together. She declares to him that she will give up her one hundred to Marian and share the rest with him. Yet,

his avarice makes him want to possess the whole sum of the meagre inheritance Kate has received and Kate's offer to her father, as will be more clear, is one of the too few instances when Kate really restrains her egoism in her relations with others. As C.T. Samuels has pointed out, "good, in James, is no more than...the ability to restrain egoism in our relations with others so that they may fulfill their own souls, just as evil is the exploitation of others for personal ends" (1971: 81). This evil is what Lionel Croy embodies and, in a way, forms the basis of Kate's future conduct distorting the family life's natural relations and turning them into a case of "asset", a means of commodity, through which certain ends can be achieved. Lionel Croy reminds Kate that he is not "quite the old dad not to get something *for* giving up [Kate]" to Aunt Maud and gives Kate the lesson that will be the leading principle of her life in the future when he says that

> I am not talking only of what you might, with the right feeling, do *for* me, but of what you might- it's what I call your oppportunity- do *with* me. Unless indeed- they come a good deal to the same thing. Your duty as well as your chance...is to use me. Show family feeling by seeing what I'm good for. (WD:15)

When Kate visits Marian at Chelsea to inform her about what has passed between herself and her father, Kate once again, confronts how being bereft of wealth renders shame and the circumstances in which she and Marian live are not without certain limitations. Kate comes face to face with

> the bond of blood; the consciousness of it was what she seemed most clearly to have "come into" by the death of her mother...Her haunting, harassing father, her menacing, uncompromising aunt, her portionless little nephews and nieces, were figures that caused the chord of natural piety superabundantly to vibrate. Her manner of putting it to herself...was that she saw what you might be brought to by the cultivation of consanguinity....yet, bereaved, disappointed, demoralized, querulous, she [Marian] was all the more sharply and insistently Kate's elder and Kate's own. Kate's most constant feeling about her was that she would make her, Kate, do things....She noticed with profundity that disappointment made people selfish. (25)

Such selfishness is the morality of the small house in Chelsea in the struggle for survival and, "the more one gave oneself the less of one was left. There were always people to snatch at one, and it would never occur to *them* that they were eating one up. They did that without tasting" (25). William R. Macnaughton names this kind of preying upon an individual a sort of "metaphorical cannibalism" (1987: 94), which may be the basis of human relations. Sally Sears points out the cannibalistic overtones that are inherent in the novel commenting that the predator is the Croy family and Aunt Maud "feeding off the younger daughter" (1987: 151). In the same fashion, Osborn Andreas has allocated a good deal of space in his book *Henry James and the Expanding Horizon* under the title of "Emotional Cannibalism" to discuss such human behaviour in the short stories of Henry James. This fact is even more horrifying not only because it is enacted in a family circle but also because it will be the logic that is to lie beneath the leading motto Kate is to possess in Lancaster Gate. In a way, Kate's approval of her family's using of her will be the approval of her "working" others when she learns how to accommodate appropriate strategies to achieve her ends, and this is the principle, the acceptance of which "is the primary distortion of human values" (Sears 1987: 151).

Such dilemmas in the circumstances in which Kate lives push Kate into conflict. She sees better and more promising possibilities than what she has at present and this is what Kate thinks when she meditates on the difference between being and seeing:

> There was no such misfortune, or at any rate no such discomfort...as to be formed at once for being and for seeing [because]. You always saw, in this case, something else than what you were, and you got, in consequence, none of the peace of your condition. (WD:25-26)

The social character of the Croy family, and also of Lancaster Gate circle as will be more clear later, is the one that Fromm identifies as "exploitative" and "marketing" and these types are cast in terms of "assimilation"- that is, according to how people acquire things, and "socialization"- that is, how people relate to others (1966: 66). Both Lionel Croy and Marian are aware that Kate is the only "asset" through which "Aunt Maud should be worked, and nothing mattered less

than what might become of Kate in the process" (WD: 26). Kate, despite all the self-seeking plans of her sister and father, feels ready "to burn her ships...so that Marian should profit" (26), a virtue which she later calls "a small stupid piety" (50). Moreover, she is aware that rather than throwing herself anywhere, she feels "as if, for the present, I have been quite sufficiently thrown" (29). Lionel Croy threatens Kate "with his curse if I leave her [Aunt Maud]" (31) ; however,

> there are times when Kate wonders if Miss Condrips [the sisters of Marian's husband], were offered her by fate as a warning for her own future- to be shaken as showing her what she might become at forty if she let things too recklessly go. (25-26)

Kate knows what sort of choices are present, is able to reflect on the possible outcomes that await her and can foresee how she will end up if she chooses either of them. In spite of her reflections, she proposes to live with Lionel Croy, as she tells Densher, "to save myself- to escape [from Aunt Maud]" (49). Yet, she has the awareness of her own value in the eyes of her family when she tells Densher that her "position's a value, a great value, for them both...the only one they have" (50). She is preoccupied with her "stupid family piety" to such an extent that "it's a perpetual sound" in her ears and she asks herself "if I've any right to personal happiness, overflowing, as smart and shining, as I can be made" (50). However, the fact that the world at Lancaster Gate "gave her the feeling of a wasted past" awakens her consciousness to the fact "how material things spoke to her...she had a dire accessibility to pleasure from such sources" (22). Kate's refusal by Lionel Croy enables Kate to flee from the poverty and restricting conditions of Chirk Street yet suggests a possible danger concerning her conduct. It is because of a sort of evil potential in her that she warns Densher against what she sees as her "danger of doing something base" if not chucking him. It is as if she knew the potential of that "evil" that she has announced as part of her existence. Nevertheless, Kate is able to find in Densher what she is unable to get in such circumstances: "Any deep harmony that might eventually govern them would not be the result of their having much in common- having anything, in fact, but their affection" (36) and he represents for her "what her life had never given her and certainly, without some

such aid as his, never would give her" (36). Besides, "his long looks were the things in the world she could never have enough of" (43). So no matter what happens, "she felt...she must keep them, must make them most completely her possession"; however, it is strange that "she reasoned, or at all events began to act, as if she might work them in with other and alien things, privately cherish them, and yet...pay no price" (43). She wants to have both love and money- the only means for freedom- disregarding the fact that she can not have her cake and eat it.

Like Kate, Densher's need of means is a sort of "ugliness" and "shame" and he privately believes that he will not ever be able to become rich. Thus, for the first time he "weigh[es] his case in scales" having conflicting choices as to

> whether it were more ignoble to ask a woman to take her chance with you, or accept it from one's conscience that her chance could be at the best but one of the degrees of privation; whether, too, otherwise, marrying for money mightn't after all be a smaller cause of shame than the mere dread of marrying without. (45)

Like Kate, who wants both love and money, Densher wants to retain his honour and love as well as possess money. Kate gives Densher her word that "I *shan't* sacrifice you...I shall sacrifice nobody and nothing...I want and ...I shall try for everything" (51) and while doing this both Kate and Densher have to have their own schemes in order not to be affected by the spell that Aunt Maud tries to cast on Kate, for she, like Lionel Croy and Marian, does not approve of Kate's relationship with Densher; she wants "to see her high, high up and in the light" (57) and wants her "to marry a great man" (58). Kate knows that she "was involved in her aunt's designs" (124) because she sees in Lancaster Gate the "general surrender of everything...to Aunt Maud's looming 'personality'" (23). Kate's future danger in Lancaster Gate lies in her acquiring new "roots"- that is, Aunt Maud's replacing Lionel Croy and Marian in relation to Kate's need for relatedness and this should be done without submitting to Aunt Maud's "looming personality" and without losing her individuality and individual freedom. As Robert B. Pippin has suggested "free life" is "material independence, money. If the minimal or negative condition of liberty is the power to avoid (relatively) subjection to the will of others, then what makes that possible in this society is capital" (2000: 174). Thus, unlike Chirk

Street, Lancaster Gate promises wealth and financial success. Yet, there is the danger of Aunt Maud, for despite all the things Lancaster Gate promises, Aunt Maud is "a natural force" (WD: 141) and the main conflict is how monetary freedom could be achieved without sumbitting to this "natural force". Like Lionel Croy, Aunt Maud has a perfect appearance with "majestic, magnificent, high-coloured, all brilliant glass, perpetual satin, twinkling bugles and flashing gems, with a lustre of agate eyes, a sheen of raven hair, a polish of complexion that was like that of a well-kept china" (23), which is incompatible with her corrupted inner self. Not only is she "unscrupulous and immoral" (24) but she is also not blind to what Kate is capable of: "I have been keeping it [Kate's presence] for the comfort of my declining years. I've watched it long; I've been saving up and letting it, as you say of investments, appreciate...I'm likely to consent to treat it with any but a high bidder" (57).

Up to this point, James lets the reader see the level of personal, social and cultural degeneration of the European society depicting the displacement of social values, falsehood and moral decay in the family circle of Kate Croy, which is to continue in Lancaster Gate and the "refinements" (69) that Kate talks to Densher about "consciousness, sensation, appreciation" will be a mere perversion of motives that occur in the process of refinement and the Lancaster Gate labyrinth, where refinement is the key note, is the place where individual relations become subservient to materialism and greed. Henry James's depiction of Chirk Street that surrounds Kate is important in the sense that it portrays "whether the social forms presented in the novel can, in fact accommodate and stimulate the ambitious young woman's striving for advancement" (Williams 1993:92). It also gives the reader a foretaste of what the innocent and partly gullible American Milly Theale will experience when she enters into the Lancaster Gate society.

The initial experiences that Milly is likely to have are implied in Kate's utterances concerning the intricate social relations in Lancaster Gate:

> Everyone who had anything to give- it was true they were the fewest- made the sharpest bargain for it, got at least its value in return. The strongest thing furthermore, was that this might be in case a happy understanding. The worker in one connection was the worked in another; it was as broad as it was long- with the wheels of the system, as might be seen, wonderfully oiled. People could quite like each other in the midst of it. (WD:118)

In this depiction, Henry James implies how self-interest has replaced compassion and interestingly the difference between the "worker" and the "worked" is shown as mingled or vanished. As Williams has pointed out, the rules that govern Lancaster Gate society

> are advanced as the chief law of group's survival, that the necessary and familiar exchange of benefits within any community is here converted into a celebration of personal benefit. Sophisticated acceptance becomes a type of surreptuous justification of this attitude, an evasion of any careful questioning of the basis of social existence (1993: 94-95),

and quoting Merleau-Ponty he sees the lack in Lancaster Gate as what Merleau-Ponty considers the precondition for any humanistic approach- that is, the confrontation of the "relationship of man to man and the constitution of a common situation and a common history between men as a problem" (qtd. in Williams 1993: 95). When Milly and Kate are left alone at Milly's hotel in Aunt Maud's and Susan Stringham's absence, Kate has the capacity to denounce the exploitative features of Lancaster Gate and warn Milly against this fact:

> We're of no use to you- it's decent to tell you. You'd be of use to us, but that's a different matter. My honest advice to you would be to drop us while you can. It would be funny if you didn't soon see how awfully better you can do. We've not really done for you the least thing worth speaking of- nothing you mightn't easily have had in some other way....You won't want us next year; we shall only continue to want *you.* But that's no reason for you, and you mustn't pay too dreadfully for Mrs. Stringham's having let you in. (WD: 183)

The subject "we" that Kate uses is very important in the sense that she assumes herself as one of those whom she now denounces, as if foreshadowing the doom

that awaits Milly. It is apparent that Kate has already assumed the role that the social character of Lancaster Gate has given her and it is Aunt Maud, who, being the embodiment of this society, moulds Kate's social role as Densher realizes:

> That was the story– that she was always, for the beneficient dragon, under arms; living up every hour, but especially at festal hours, to the 'value' Mrs. Lowder had attached to her. High and fixed, this estimate ruled on each occasion at Lancaster Gate the social scene; so that [Densher] now recognised in it something like the artistic idea, the plastic substance, imposed by tradition, by genius, by criticism, in respect to a given character, on a distinguished actress. As such a person was to dress the part, to walk, to speak in every way to express, the part, so all this was what Kate was to do for the character she had undertaken, under her aunt's roof, to represent. (217)

Kate is depicted in complete conformity to her aunt's design and estimations and this prevents her from fulfilling her existential needs. Aunt Maud is doing the evil act which Osborn Andreas has explained as an "incalculable evil by determining the course of other people's lives without consulting the deepest needs of the people coerced" (1948: 40). Kate, at this stage, is the coerced– to use the expression in the novel, "worked" rather than the "worker". What Kate learns in this society is that one cannot survive unless she "works" as well wearing appropriate masks to achieve one's ends. She has already learned from her family circle that to live necessitates the adoption of certain roles. On her first entrance to Lancaster Gate upon her mother's death Kate realizes:

> It would not be the first time she had seen herself obliged to accept with smothered irony other people's interpretation of her conduct. She often ended by giving up to them– it seemed really the way to live– the version that met their convenience. (WD: 20)

Fromm maintains that "we must abandon 'being' the roles that we play or 'being'as others desire us. Instead we must devote ourselves to 'being' separate entities who can relate to others without dissolving into them" (qtd. in Allen: 180). However, in Lancaster Gate this seems to be impossible and this is one of the ills that the whole Lancaster Gate suffers from. For James depicts through the

Lancaster Gate circle how relations among individuals mould the personality according to its own standards preventing it from fulfilling its needs. Although there is an evocation of good faith in Kate's warning of Milly, she, as Williams claims, "nonetheless preserves the full scope of her manipulative power"; it is "safe for Kate to explain the complexities of the social situation as she realizes that Milly will never harm her" (1993: 101) because she is a "dove". It may also be because of the fact that Kate's yearning for social advancement to achieve her personal happiness has directed her feelings so much that she grows resentful, as when she views herself in front of the mirror in her father's house at Chirk Street, when the social success and individual freedom that Milly cherishes because of her financial freedom serve to magnify her own failure and financial dependence on Aunt Maud. Williams's interpretation of Kate's condition goes a step further in emphasizing not only Kate's "desperate urge to succeed" and her constricted life because of limited means but also [her jealousy of] "Milly's privileged ignorance of the routine strains and demands of social existence", which leads to "the galling sense of inequality" (1993: 101) putting her into a position that makes her pace like a "panther" as opposed to Milly's status as a "dove". There is nothing Milly cannot have or do (WD: 149), as Kate pronounces.

The leading principle of Lancaster Gate , which Sally Sears names "ravenous mutual parasitism (not symbiosis)" (1987: 56) is sounded by Lord Mark and Kate two more times. At Milly's first London dinner party, where Milly triumphs as a "success", Lord Mark remarks that "nobody here, you know, does anything for nothing" (WD: 106). Kate tells Milly that Lord Mark is "working Lancaster Gate for all it was worth: just as it was, no doubt, working *him*, and just as the working and the worked were in London, as one might explain, the parties to every relation" (118). In making Kate and Lord Mark talk in this way, James identifies the society of Lancaster Gate with what Fromm has identified as marketing types and the frame of orientation and object of devotion in this society are summarized through their utterances. Initiated by such logic of commodification, every relation is understood in terms of their monetary or material value. Thus, individuals are not treated according to their intrinsic value.

The moulding power of Lancaster Gate is depicted even better when people at a party are shown as a

> numberless foolish flock, [with] gregarious movements as inscrutable as ocean-currents.The huddled herd had drifted to her blindly- it might as blindly have drifted away. There had been of course a signal, but the great reason was probably the absence at the moment of a larger lion. (223)

Martin Heidegger has identified this aspect of human existence as one of the characteristic stages of "'inauthentic existence'. Until the individual willingly accepts the challenge posed by his personal situation, and begins creatively to shape his own future, he falls under the influence exerted by *das Man* or the 'they', the faceless majority of mankind which swamps all originality, and imposes as its law a uniform standard of mediocrity, or 'averageness'" (Williams 1993: 93-94). Erich Fromm, on the other hand, has identified such unintelligent communal activity as one of the mechanisms of escape- that is, a sort of strategy that is used by people to escape from freedom. People can escape from their feelings of loneliness and alienation through unconditional conformity, [which Fromm calls automaton conformity], to social norms that govern behaviour. The person who uses this mechanism tries to become like everyone else by behaving in a very conventional manner. In short "The individual ceases to be himself; he adopts entirely the kind of personality offered to him by cultural patterns; and he therefore becomes exactly as all others are and as they expect him to be" (1942: 160). Such symbiotic unions in the Lancaster Gate society necessitate the individuals's "active" and "passive" fusion in the symbiosis. In the passive symbiotic relationship, submission takes the form of masochism

> The masochistic person escapes from the unbearable feeling of isolation and separateness by making himself part of and parcel of another person who directs him, guides him, protects him....The masochistic person does not have to make decisions, does not have to take any risks...he has no integrity...[submission can be] to fate, to sickness, to rhythmic music, to the orgiastic state produced by drugs or under hypnotic trance– in all these instances the individual renounces his integrity, makes himself the instrument of somebody or something outside of himself....in the active symbiotic union [the union takes the form of domination or] to use the psychological term corresponding to masochism, *sadism*. Sadistic person wants to escape from his aloneness and his sense of imprisonment making another peson part and parcel of himself. He inflates and enhances himself by incorporating another person, who worships him...neither can live without the other. The difference is only that the sadistic person commands, exploits, hurts, humiliates, and that the masochistic person is commanded, exploited, hurt, humiliated . (Fromm 1989: 18-19)

While the sadist and the masochist are different, they also are the same since they have fused with each other at the sacrifice of their personal integrity. This explanation clarifies how the "worker" and the "worked" type of relationship works in Lancaster Gate, where everyone benefits from one another while satisfying one's needs– especially that of financial and emotional needs. In this symbiosis, rather than parasitism, relationships in Lancaster Gate are based on this sort of symbiotic union.

In the Alpine scene, where Milly is in deep contemplation whether to have "everything" or not (WD: 88), she ends up with the idea to go straight to London since what she needs is "people" (90) for she has an intense need for relatedness, for as she pronounces to Sir Luke Strett at an interview, she is rootless– that is, she has lost all her family members and feels as if she is the only survivor of a general wreck; however, when she arrives in London, she cannot have an insight into the difference between the moral language she has acquired and the one she is to learn through Lancaster Gate if she is to survive. Thus Milly's perseverance for people, in a way, makes her the object of cornering, like Kate's being cornered before her by Lionel Croy and Aunt Maud and Aunt Maud's being cornered by Kate and Densher when they get engaged and try to keep their engagement secret from Aunt Maud until Kate inherits her money so that they can marry. However, when Kate and Densher realise that waiting slows down the process, they turn over to the quicker one, which is Milly, and with the appearance of Milly, the object of

devotion of Kate switches from love to a sort of greed, for from then on Kate uses not only Milly but also Densher as an instrument thus making love her instrument. Kate uses Densher, as she claims she does, to make things pleasant for Milly and "I use, for the purpose, what I have. You are what I have of most precious, and you're therefore what I use most", to which Densher responds saying: "I wish I could use *you* a little more" (229). Michael S. Martin, in his article "The Portrait without a subject: German Re-Visioning, the self , Nature, and the Jamesian Novel", has some points concerning James's *The Portrait of a Lady* that are also applicable to this context. He suggests that "the other world [world of means] reduces the elevated state of the moral to marketable means; in essence, the individual is commodified to a state of objectification" and quoting Tony Tanner, he further contends that, people see "other people only as things or instruments", and "they work to appropriate them as suits their own ambition" (Internet 3). Reduced to the world of means, what Kate is trying to do is to resolve the incompatibility between the felt determinism in her condition and free-will trying to make the "best" of given circumstances. As Millicent Bell makes clear, "in Kate James created a representative of that modern pragmatic consciousness in which the distinction between the dictated and the freely chosen course has begun to disappear" (1991: 305).

After Milly's arrival, it is Kate who proposes to Densher to make up to Milly to be able to meet Densher more comfortably behind Milly's screen. She realizes that she has to pay a price to gain her ends. Thus she does not hesitate to leave Densher to Milly, for she is the kind of person who, although she does not like the idea, "can do what I don't like"- a speech after which Densher senses "a kind of heroic ring, a note of character that belittle[s] his own incapacity for action" (WD: 343). This point is where Kate makes Densher a mere instrument of her love and using people as instruments, disregarding their worth as self and thus disabling a real reciprocity, is what shadows the goodness inherent in human nature. Turning on the way to her personal advancement both Densher and Milly into instruments, she not only sacrifices them but also her own morality. Densher, in "do[ing] what she liked" is stupid (214), for this is not the first time he allows himself to be used as a tool. Kate, on the other hand, is everything but stupid, for as Densher says "all

women but you are stupid" (236) since Kate immediately detects Milly's "possibilities" and "fixes on" her, as Aunt Maud was previously shown doing on Kate, imagining Milly to be "an angel with a thumping bank-account" (229) and "smooth[ing]" the way for Densher (236), which puts him in a "wondrous silken web" and "spoil[s]" him (237). His situation is even worsened when Aunt Maud considers him bribable: "I *can*- I can smooth your path. She is charming, she's clever, and she's good. And her fortune's a real fortune" (239). Susan Stringham wants Aunt Maud to put Densher in the way since she has "him, one feels, in your hand....You handle everyone" (270) and this is to make Milly happy.

Aunt Maud's motive does not stem from compassion, though. For using Densher as an instrument and Milly as a decoy, she plans to divert Kate's attention from Densher so as to pave the way for more wealthy and profitable suitors such as Lord Mark. In this case, the only one who does not know anything about Kate's genuine affections for Densher is Milly, for everyone except for Milly is on the same boat to quiet her suspicions. Densher, in Italy, kept "afloat with them as if demonstrating their conspiracy against Milly" (308). However, in this ship, Densher blindly and with his "stupidity" follows the route that is designed for him. In Venice, for instance, Densher feels he is "perpetually bent to [Kate's] will"; he feels he has surrendered to "her pure talent for life":

> The proof of a decent reaction in him against so much passivity was, with no great richness, that he at least knew- knew that is, how he was, and how little he liked it as a thing accepted in mere helplessness....His question connected itself, even while he stood, with his sense almost of shame: and the soreness and the shame were less as he let himself, with the help of the conditions about him, regard it as serious....His question, as we have called it, was the interesting question whether he really had no will left...whereas he had done absolutely everything that Kate had wanted, she had done nothing whatsoever that he had. (310-311)

Kate has given him nothing in return for what he has done for her. This is the reflection after which Densher brings his bargain forth telling Kate that he will stay in Venice to make up to Milly "on my honour if you'll come to me. On *your* honour" (346). Thus, like everything else, the love between Kate and Densher

becomes the object of self-interest losing its affectionate mutuality and through this bargain Milly's fate is sealed when the essence of Kate's design becomes clear to Densher at a strike at a party in Venice : "Since she's to die I'm to marry her?" (342). Kate's design makes him feel "himself shrink from the complications involved in judging it"; also, "loyalty was of course sovereignly prescribed in presence of any design on her part, however roundabout, to do one nothing but good" (245-246). Thus his total submission to Kate is a convenience for him to keep himself off from the pangs of conscience. When Milly tells him that she would "do anything for Kate" (251), his reply ironically expresses his intensity of pressure: "Oh, I know what one would do for Kate!" (251). In a parallel fashion, when Kate visits Milly before her ride with Densher, in Milly's absence, Densher puts the responsibility of his making up to Milly on Kate when he says that "It's not I who am responsible for her, my dear. It seems to me it is you" (255). And to soothe his suspicions and to ensure Kate's love he wants Kate to swear that she loves him "since it's all for that, you know that I'm letting you do- well, God knows what with me" (256) adding that "I'll do all you wish" (258). Besides, when Kate tells him to continue his role since "we've told too many lies" he replies that "I...have told none!" (325). Such logic that governs Densher's thought and conduct is the means through which, as Adrian Poole has stated , he "wishes to believe in his own purity, his exemption from the guilt of working others, as he worries about his role in Kate's design" (1991: 116). Densher's "passive" symbiotic relationship with Kate makes him renounce his integrity and in a parallel fashion, Kate's "active" fusion makes her somebody else for she makes Densher a part of her "self". Since Densher exists in Kate, if Densher fails her "it would kill" her (WD: 236). They cannot achieve what Fromm has called "productive" orientation in love because mature love as Fromm claims, is "*union under the condition of preserving one's integrity*, one's individuality....[and love is] becom[ing] one and yet remain[ing] two [italics original]" (1989 :19). Densher, like Kate, cannot preserve his integrity and is overwhelmed with his role in Kate's design: "The sharp point was...in the difference between acting and not acting: this difference in fact it was that made the point case of conscience" (WD: 245). Densher thinks that evil resides not in intention but in action. However, he becomes aware that "everything was

acting that was not speaking the particular word" (245). Although he thinks that to tell the truth to Milly would be "indelicate" and a sort of "brutality" while she is enjoying his company, this is not so convincing since he "was the kind of man wise enough to mark the case in which chucking might be the minor evil and the least cruelty" (242). Thus it is not, as Sally Sears has maintained, because of the fact that Densher's "code of chivalry becomes the Law" (1987: 164) that he obeys. Rather, he cannot act on his own account because in his submission to Kate he has alienated himself from his self and from his own power and responsiveness so as to avoid responsibility for his evil acts. As Fromm has pointed out, "people whose self has been weakened compensate for this deficiency by resorting to the generation of 'pseudo-realities'" (Internet 5). He tries to create pseudo-justifications. For him "the single thing that was clear in complications was that, whatever happened, one was to behave as a gentleman....The law was not to be a brute- in return for amiabilities" (WD: 315-316). He is trying to justify his refusal to take responsibility by hiding behind gentilmenly conduct. Thus, although public appearances of characters provide them with a temporary harmony, they cannot achieve it inside. Despite these reflections and depictions, like Lionel Croy, Aunt Maud and Kate Croy, Densher, too, depicts the social milieu where the social value is placed on material acquisition, the outward beauty and glamour which screens the inner decay and is emphasized to the detriment of the inner and moral beauty. Thus a genuine reciprocity is made to be impossible in the characters' relationships.

Fromm has maintained that love of joy, energy and happiness depends on "the *degree to which we are related, to which we are concerned*- and that is to say (the degree) to which we are in touch with the reality of our feelings, with the reality of other people, not experiencing them as abstractions which we can look at like commodities at the market" (Internet 4). Seeing individuals as things- that is, as commodities, is one of the ills inherent in relations between man and man, which renders the satisfaction of such needs as relatedness, identity, unity, transcendence, love, joy, growth and happiness impossible because such logic stems from the individual's rejection of his freedom and this is what has been shown thus far. What is more pathetic is that it is into this society that Milly has made an entrance

and it is in these circumstances that she, as Sir Luke Strett has advised her to do, takes the "trouble" to live (WD: 161).

At a dinner party at Lancaster Gate , Milly feels "how she was justified of her plea for people and her love of life....It was easy to get near – if they *were* near; and yet the elements were different enough from any of her old elements" (97). She gets a sense of joy in being a "success" when she tells Lord Mark that Aunt Maud "idealizes us, my friend and me...She sees us in a light. That's all I've got to hold on by. So don't deprive me of it" (106-107). Yearning for a sense of relatedness, Milly thinks she can go deep into the Lancaster Gate circle. However, she is immediately corrected by Lord Mark, who says "as to our knowing all about each other....There are cases where we break down" (110). What she becomes sure of is to what extent they are all obsessed with money (129). What afflicts the relationships in Lancaster Gate is that the relationships are based on to what extent somebody has something, not to what extent he/she expresses his/her real self. Almost all the people in Lancaster Gate perceive Milly with what she "has". However, from Sir Luke Strett she demands that he see her "just as I am" (156). Upon seeing her as she is, the only thing he can advise is for her to "accept any form in which happiness may come", to which she responds saying that "Oh, I'll accept any whatever!" (158). After her visit to Sir Luke Strett, "living" becomes a sort of act of volition for Milly as will "death" later be when she "turns her face to the wall" (369) after Lord Mark denounces the real relationship between Kate and Densher, thus awakening Milly from her self-delusion.

Like Kate before her, Milly, too, is given her role in her new life sphere. Milly enjoys the role of the "dove" that Kate attaches to her. She "found herself accepting as the right one...the name so given her" (184) and that is why she immediately tells Aunt Maud that Densher is not back and this is to help Kate. Such enactment of her role "gave her straightway the measure of the success she could have as a dove" and "she studied again the dovelike and so set her companion [Susan Stringham] to mere rich reporting that she averted all inquiry into her own case" (185). Even after seeing Densher and Kate at the National Gallery, Milly acts her role. Although she sees Densher and Kate together, although "they had made such a success of what they didn't say....[Milly] said

things in the air, and yet flattered herself that she struck him as saying them not in the tone of agitation but in the tone of New York" (192-193). She wants to "supply the rest" (194) of the reality as she likes. She wants to believe that it is Densher who is in love and that Kate cannot help it. Thus she creates a pseudo-reality for herself to cover the actual reality, on which Williams comments preferring to use the the existentialist term "bad faith" which, he considers, Milly cherishes. The true understanding of the ties between Kate and Densher is as the individual's "play for escaping from seemingly unbearable facts or situations, of trying to be what [he] is not and not to be what [he] is" (Williams 1993: 114). Williams further claims that,

> Milly...begins to exercise her *bad faith* when she reduces herself, at a stroke, to the convenient status of her 'self-for-others.' There are undoubtedly elements of the 'American girl' in her personality, just as she possesses characteristics of the 'dove'; but she cannot sink her rounded identity in either of these roles. By attempting this, she distorts her sense of being a private individual, who may also command a grand public presence within the context of accepted manners. (1993: 116)

Assuming her "American" and "dove" roles, Milly, like the other members of her new society, is unable to realize a "productive", to use Fromm's concept, sort of relationship with Densher, for she not only deludes herself but her most intimate relations by not being open with them, Lord Mark being an exception since she does not have strong feelings for him. Like all the other members of Lancaster Gate, Milly, too, tries to act her role, which is that of a healthy young woman and this is out of compassion for the others. That is why, when Lord Mark visits her in Italy and asks whether she is well or not, she

> knew that her silence was itself too straight an answer, but it was beyond her now to say that she saw her way. She would have made the question itself impossible to others– impossible, for example, to such a man as Merton Densher; and she could wonder even on the spot what it was a sign of in her feeling for Lord Mark that, from his lips, it almost tempted her to break down. This was doubtless really because she cared for him so little ; to let herself go with him thus, suffer his touch to make her cup overflow, would be the relief– since it was actually, for her nerves, a question of relief– that would cost her least. (WD: 293)

Milly has made herself believe in her self-created reality to such an extent that when reality comes from Lord Mark in the form of a confession causing Milly to "turn her face to the wall", Milly gives up her will to live. It also needs to be remembered that although Densher calls this act a sort of brutality and Lord Mark a brute, the only one to tell the truth is Lord Mark despite the fact that his motive partly stems from his having been rejected by Milly as a suitor. Nevertheless, the "brutal" act of Lord Mark's telling the truth cannot be the verification of Densher's and Kate's "gentlemanly" conduct in hiding it or being the initiators of it, for what is done or not done has been done for the sake of attaining Milly's fortune, not for her happiness alone. What is important is the fact that Milly's gullibility which stems from her yearning for people renders her a victim not only of others but of herself through the exercise of her *bad faith.* Having awakened from her delusion, Milly, at the moment of death, realises a sense of transcendence, one of the existential needs pointed out by Fromm. With her final act in leaving Densher a fortune she transforms her passive role as a "creature" into that of an active "creator" (Fromm 1989:46). Milly's benevolent act, though it separates Kate and Densher, creates in them both the realization that they can "never be again as we were" (WD: 457) and what separates them is their own awareness of the vile acts they have done rather than Milly's turning her face to the wall. Thus they are able to achieve what they have not been able to so far– that is, they are able to perceive one another not through what they had and have but what they have been and are.

CHAPTER 3

THE GOLDEN BOWL

3.1. Symbolism and Imagery

The symbolic title of GB, as WD, has important implications for the understanding of what constitutes the "good" and "evil" in a Jamesian world. As depicted in WD, GB can find its meaning in Christian symbolism. Cooper's *Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols* explains that "bowl", having similar associations with "cup", "vase" and "chalice", suggests "the Holy of Holies" and that "gold" implies "illumination [and] the quality of sacredness; incorruptibility [and] wisdom" (1978: 76). Besides, yellow as "golden" suggests "sacredness; divinity; revealed truth" (42). Furthermore, the bowl is "crystal" representing "purity; spiritual perfection and knowledge [and] the self-luminous" (48). However, the bowl is "cracked"; it is flawed, which destroys all the perfections represented so far. Edward Wagenknecht claims that James "could hardly have written *The Golden Bowl* without thinking of Ecclesiastes 12:6- 'Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern'" (1983: 221). What is written in Ecclesiastes 12:6 is the culmination of Solomon's exhortation to his audience that he began at 12:1. The previous verses from 12:1 to 12:5 presents the audience with the inevitability of old age, showing the decaying state of man. The desolation and emptiness that go hand in hand with the transient life and its pursuits are portrayed to the audience. He concludes his exhortation by emphasizing that a life pursued independent of a theocentric focus is the height of vanity (12:8) and wanting his audience to centre their intellects, hearts and will on God, as a result of which they may say when

the Judgment Day comes: "You and Your judgments are more desirable to my mouth than honey" (Psa.19:10). The choronological context of Solomon's urgent exhortation in which he urges his audience to remember God before death overtakes them is given to the audience with three pairs of images for death, the two of which are closely relevant to the topic being discussed.

The first image is the golden bowl, which is a reservoir for oil and serves as a lamp, that is suspended in the air by a fine silver cord. The audience is urged to remember God before the silver cord which suspends the golden lamp bowl is removed and the bowl comes crashing down to the ground, shattering into many pieces. The cord and the bowl portray something precious that has been destroyed. Since the cord has been snapped and the bowl smashed, the light of the lamp is unavailable and darkness prevails.

The second image is a pitcher lying broken beside the well with the wheel of a pulley that has fallen into the cistern. Solomon urges the audience to remember God before the clay pitcher is broken by the well, as a result of which the water below will become unavailable and inaccessible. So, like the light mentioned in the previous imagery, water here is unavailable and unattainable. Thus, Solomon wants the audience to remember God before their clay vessel lies shattered on the ground and the water of life gradually flows away beyond reach (Internet 2).

The emptiness and vanity in their pursuits and evil acts that are followed by ultimate desolation when the Judgment Day comes, as represented by Charlotte's being goaded by Adam by the silken rope and Adam and Charlotte's exile to the American City in return for the evil deeds done, and the decay or lack in the morality of the characters as opposed to the physical decay mentioned in the Ecclesiastes, all suggest what is expressed by the related Ecclesiastes and although the aim of this study is not to depict the novel as a culmination of biblical references and read it in this fashion, it is obvious that such religious images strengthen the themes that are the focus of this study and it is again clear from the ending of the novel that evil does not go unpunished, the nature and degree of which will be one of the points to be mentioned in the next chapter.

Adeline Tintner, on the other hand, in her Miltonic study of GB, contends that, "although the reference to the golden bowl comes from the Bible (Eccl. 12:6),

it is the Bible refracted through Milton's literary epic, in turn based of course on the King James version of the Bible, which Milton read among many other versions" (1987: 64). The important thing here is that the flawed gilded crystal bowl, which is discovered by Charlotte and Amerigo while they are shopping in an antique shop for a wedding present for Maggie, becomes the very item through which the imperfection of Maggie and Amerigo's marriage is revealed since like the flawed bowl her marriage is flawed no matter how perfect or incorruptible it looks, especially to Maggie in her ignorance. Golden gild covers the crystal bowl making the crack invisible to the naked eye, and this is the way Maggie considers her marriage before getting the necessary knowledge for true happiness. Similarly, the present that is firstly thought to be for Maggie and later pronounced as a *"ricordo"* (GB: 65) for the Prince by Charlotte and the Prince's instinctive rejection of the bowl– since it bears the sinister implications of a bad omen, are all indications of the impossibility of a true happiness in their relation.

Jeremy Tambling associates "the golden bowl's exterior" with the "ghastly power of repression, which can be covered over, but which remains none the less" (2000: 196) and in the second book he gives the time when Maggie has "the sense that she might break out and say something in public about the adultery, which would destroy all the polish and decorum" as an example:

> There reigned for her, absolutely, during these vertiginous moments that fascination of the monstrous that temptation of the horribly possible, which we so often trace by its breaking out suddenly, lest it should go further, in unexplained retreats and reactions. (GB: 383)

Adrian Poole, on the other hand, sees the bowl as "the works of art Adam Verver seeks out that look authentic even if they are in fact forgeries", adding that the golden bowl is "the symbol for the ethos that the Ververs promote and by which English high society is ruled, the ethos of a more or less innocent or calculated faith in appearances" (1991: 132). There is an opposition between the flaw that the golden bowl has and the perfect appearance that that it seems to have, so the golden bowl becomes the central focus which epitomizes all sorts of oppositions in the novel in terms of appearance and reality.

In the novel there are various references to “golden bowl”, “crystal”, “splits” , “cracks” or “flaws” in some way or other and James makes his characters use these expressions either to emphasize the contrast, as mentioned above, between perfect appearances and real flaws for ironic effect or make them use such expressions deliberately.

The reader’s first encounter with the central imagery of the golden bowl is when Charlotte and Amerigo look for a present for Maggie. The item is a “drinking vessel” bigger than a “common cup” and “formed, to appearance, either of old fine gold or of some material once richly gilt” (GB: 67). The gold has been put on so well that even if one scraped it off, it couldn’t be removed since it has been “too well put on...by some very fine old worker and by some beautiful old process” (68) and it will require a long and delicate process for Charlotte and Amerigo to cover their calendestine love affair and for Maggie to discover and solve it to rescue her marriage. It is only after Maggie wants to buy a birthday present for her father and goes to the same Bloomsbury antique shop to buy the same golden bowl for him that Maggie’s suspicions begin to crystallize, for the Jewish seller, who overcharges her in her ignorance, feels remorse and comes to Maggie for a restitution. When he comes he sees Charlotte’s and Amerigo’s pictures and immediately recognizes them- that is, recalls Charlotte’s wanting to make the bowl a present for the gentleman near her, who is Amerigo.

Edward Wagenknecht thinks it odd for the shopkeeper to go to Maggie’s house upon overcharging her and to see the photographs of Charlotte and Amerigo. It is “melodramatically unbelievable....The melodrama begins with Maggie’s inadvertently visiting the same shop where Charlotte and Amerigo had been and hitting upon the same article, and it ends when he walks in upon the shattered bowl” (1983: 226). Besides,

> Mrs. Assingham being the cautious worrior she is, and her relationship to the Ververs being what it is, it is simply unbelievable that she should take it upon herself to destroy Maggie’s property for the sake of a theatrical gesture...Moreover, even if we are willing to waive all such considerations, the scene does not work as a symbolism. Whatever the flaw in Maggie’s marriage, to destroy it would be the last thing Fanny could desire. (226)

The Prince's coming upon the smashed bowl may seem to be a mere coincidence. The other points make sense, though. First of all, the Jewish seller behaves the way that he once advised Charlotte to do concerning the flaw in an item to be bought as a present for someone else. When Charlotte wonders if it is right for her to make a present of a flawed bowl, he suggests that one could share the knowledge of the flaw because "if one knows of it one has only to mention it. The good faith is always there" (GB: 69). The seller acts in "good faith" because he feels remorse since the antique dealer's "having led [Maggie] to act in ignorance was what he should have been ashamed of" (378). As far as Fanny Assingham's symbolic act is concerned- that is, her smashing the cracked bowl, one can say that the flawed bowl not only symbolizes the flawed marriage of Maggie and the Prince but also the flawed marriage "design" that Fanny herself initiated. So with this act Fanny acknowledges her evil share in Maggie's deception initially by "arranging" Maggie's marriage, subsequently by keeping silent. When Fanny smashes the bowl, the bowl splits into three pieces; however, "she could carry but two of the fragments at once" (355) as if she were showing the Prince that their marriage should not be interfered with by the existence of a third party- that is, either Adam or Charlotte. Thomas F. Bertonneau's explanation of the melodramatic act that Fanny Assingham performs has a more illuminating commentary, though. Bertonneau asserts that, Fanny attempts to unknow what she knows and

> through so melodramatically smashing the object-catalyst of Magie's new consciousness, to efface the knowledge around which that consciousness has so implacably crystallized; it is as if Fanny would suppress the revelation of perfidy so superimposing an arbitrary knowledge into its own scenic abruptness: the act, so Fanny must intend, will permanently divert Maggie's attention from the troubling discovery. In its audacious transgression of every bourgeois canon, the act certainly invokes a type of sublime in the Burkean sense of an abrupt enormity producing "astonishment" so that "the mind is so entirely filled with its object, that it cannot entertain any other, nor by consequence reason on that object which employs it". (Internet 1)

Thus, in her sudden act, which Bortenneau considers as "self-serving", Fanny Assingham acts "as though guilt and complicity" could be made up for by the destruction of "the fetish that represents them" (Bortenneau, Internet 1).

Mrs. Assingham tells the Prince that he is "*in* port. The port of the Golden Isles" (GB:15), for marrying into the Verver family means the Prince's arrival in "the golden isles" with all the shining prospects it offers to an impoverished noble Italian prince and "to rifle the Golden Isles had...become the business of his [Adam's] future, and with the sweetness of it- what was most wondrous of all- still more even in the thought than in the act" (82). At a party which Adam Verver has not been able to attend because of not feeling well and which Maggie has left early to attend to him, Charlotte "turned to meet the Ambassador and the Prince, who...were now at hand and had already...addressed her a remark that failed to penetrate the golden glow in which her intelligence was temporarily bathed" (156). When Charlotte visits the Prince at Portland place in Maggie's absence, the impression that the Prince feels is conveyed as follows: it "put them, it kept them together, through the vain show of their separation, made the two other faces [that of Adam and Maggie] made the whole lapse of the evening...the lights, the pretended talk...a mystic golden bridge between them, strongly swaying and sometimes vertiginous" (194). While staying at Matcham at Lady Castledean's, Charlotte and the Prince state their purpose to visit a cathedral but set off for Gloucester, where they probably plan to be together (217). Both Charlotte and the Prince feel "the day like a great gold cup that we must somehow drain together" (215). When Charlotte reminds the Prince of the golden bowl in the little Bloomsbury shop, the Prince expresses his amazement, saying that he hopes that Charlotte does not mean "that *as* an occasion it's also cracked" (215), to which Charlotte responds saying that he thinks too much of cracks and that she risks the cracks (215), which shows the enjoyment and pleasure she gets from her guilty state. Maggie, unlike Charlotte, tells Fanny Assingham after a party at the Fawns that she wants "a happiness without a hole in it big enough for you to poke in your finger... The golden bowl- as it was to have been. The bowl without the crack" (373).

To represent the value that Maggie attaches to the Prince, Maggie uses the term *"marceau de musée"* in the first chapter calling him a "rarity" and an object of "beauty", an object of "price" (6) and in chapter seven Adam calls the Prince a "pure and perfect crystal" (81), which reminds one of the point that the antique

dealer made concerning the Golden Bowl: "it's just a perfect crystal", to which the Prince responds consciously and making an allusion to the bowl in the Bloomsbury shop: "Oh, if I'm a crystal, I'm delighted that I'm a perfect one, for I believe that they sometimes have cracks and flaws – in which case they're to be had very cheap" (81). Such association of precious decorative items with people gives not only an idea concerning the value of that person in the eyes of the opposite party but also the moral values of the onlooker. In the final scene of the novel Adam looks at a Florentine picture that he gave Maggie on her marriage. Maggie asks Adam: "It's all right, eh" and Adam answers: "Oh, my dear- rather" (458) and their words concerning their Florentine picture symbolize another truth extending its meaning to the general picturesque atmosphere in the room:

> She had passed her arm into his, and the other objects in the room, the other pictures, the sofas, the chairs, the tables, the cabinets, the 'important' pieces, supreme in their way, stood out, round them, consciously, for recognition and applause...Their eyes moved together from piece to piece, taking in the whole nobleness- quite as if for him to measure the wisdom of old ideas...Mrs. Verver and the Prince fairly 'placed' themselves...as high expressions of the kind of human furniture, aesthetically, by such a scene. The fusion of their presence with the decorative elements, their contribution to the triumph of selection, was complete and admirable. (459)

The scene makes Adam Verver say to Maggie: "You've got some good things" (459). Merle A.Williams suggests that "while the novelist's description seems to concentrate upon the details of physical objects and works of art- pictures, sofas, cabinets, even the fine lines of the human figures- the aesthetic has obviously become a metaphor for other sorts of value" and making a connection between Maggie's early appreciation of the Prince as a rare object in the opening chapter and the description of the room in the final scene, he further illustrates that "the symmetry and decorum of the drawing room express the resolution of conflict and saving power of generous concern" (1993: 209).

Henry James makes references not only to precious items with perfectness or flaws and cracks but also to the Paradiasical life that Maggie and Adam lead at Fawns in order to enrich his representation of "good" and "evil" that are indispensable in human motives and actions. For instance, on her arrival at Mrs.

Assingham's, Charlotte and the Prince talk about Maggie and the Prince says that "the blessed Virgin and all the saints have her [Maggie] in their keeping" (GB: 31) and Adam, after her marriage, considers Maggie "capable" [and thinks] "Maggie herself at this season, was, exquisitely, divinely, the maximum" (87). Adam and Maggie are shown in the Garden of Eden when their

> necessity so worked for in them as to bear them out of the house, in a quarter hidden from that in which their friends were gathered, and cause them to wander, unseen...along a covered walk in the 'old' garden...old with an antiquity of formal things...a door that had a slab with a date...and then had before them a small white gate intensely white and clean amid all the greenness.' (94)

Then they choose a quiet place to sit under and that tree is an oak tree. Here the colour "green" and "white" and the image of "gate" together with the "oak" tree suggest a Garden-of-Eden atmosphere. However, the "green" in the garden has not the tone that the Bronzino Portrait, in WD, has since in that case Milly knows what her doom is by acknowledging that she "shall never be better than this [both the lady in the portrait and her present situation]" (WD: 214) and that her complexion is "greener" than that of the Bronzino lady. Having ambivalent associations "as both life and death in the vernal green of life and the livid green of death", green in Milly's case suggests "death"; however, in Maggie's and Adam Verver's case, it is "hope, the growth of the Holy Spirit in man" suggesting "the colour of the Trinity" in Medieval times (Cooper 1978: 40). According to Cooper, "oak" represents "strength [and] protection"; it is a symbol "of Christ as strength in adversity...The oak...[is] said to be the tree of the cross" (121). These descriptions make more sense when another reference to Maggie and Adam is pointed out as well. Adam and Maggie know "nothing on earth worth speaking of" and "knowledge wasn't one of their needs"; what is more, they "were...constitutionally insaccessible to it" since "they were good children, bless their hearts, and the children of good children...Principino himself...might figure to the fancy as the ripest genius of the trio" (GB: 199). The decision that they take under the oak tree- that is, to invite Charlotte to Fawns for Adam Verver to get better acquainted with her as a possible wife, will be the source of doom that awaits Maggie and Adam, for it is after

Charlotte's appearance that they realize the evil hidden in their lives– like Adam and Eve eating the fruit of the Fall and acquiring the knowledge of evil. Besides, the "tree of cross", suggesting the crucifixion not only of Adam but also of Charlotte and Maggie, who as Fanny Assingham tells her husband "will carry the whole weight of us" (229), depicts Maggie as a scapegoat. Although such representations reinforce the innocence and paradiasical state that Adam Verver and Maggie possess when compared to what the Prince and Charlotte have done to them, nothing is purely "good", for Maggie, like Adam Verver, who is "an angel with a human curiosity" (112), must use the tactics of Satan, the father of lies, and of Satan's daughter, Charlotte Stant' (Tintner 1987: 59).

Adeline Tintner claims that James's originality lies in making Maggie, "win back Paradise, borrow the ploys and strategies of the Devil" (64) and even before that, as will be seen in the second section of this study, her suggestion of Charlotte as a wife cannot wholly be based on selfless motives, for she not only sacrifices Charlotte to insure Adam Verver's happiness but Adam and Charlotte to guarantee her own happiness and marriage. Tintner also draws attention to the Satanic elements in Charlotte's character by pointing out that Stant may be a loose anagram for "Satan". Depicting how Mrs. Assingham perceives Charlotte as when she does not know "what perversity rides her" and further emphasizing Charlotte's being a "liar, the true child of Satan" when she tells Amerigo that the antique dealer has asked for five pounds although he asked for fifteen pounds, Tintner tries to strengthen her associations. What is more, "Charlotte repeats Satan's desires" (Tintner 1987: 65) when she says "I've wanted everything" (GB: 218).

As in WD, the animal imagery in GB, is richly used and relates itself to power and character development, during the process of which one's conception of "good" and "evil" as the cause and outcome of human motive and action take different turns.

While talking to Maggie before their marriage, which the Prince calls a "monster", the Prince calls himself a chicken "chopped up and smothered in sauce; cooked down as a *creme de volaille*, with the half parts left out" and from Fanny Assingham's point of view Amerigo "didn't need a jailor...for a domesticated lamb tied up with pink ribbon [because] this was not an animal to be controlled it was an

animal to be, at the most, educated" (GB: 96) and towards the end of the novel the Prince is in "prison" recognizing "the virtual identity of his condition with that aspect of Charlotte's situation...the similitude of the locked cage. He struck her caged" (446); but the difference between Amerigo's and Charlotte's captivity lies in the fact that Amerigo "lurks there by his own act and his own choice" (446). While talking to Maggie, the Prince calls Adam "the natural fowl running about the *bassecaur*. His feathers, movements, his sounds- those are the parts that, with me, are left out" (4). Being a rich widow, Adam is also a good hunt for Mrs. Rance, who is a widow herself and a "snake" (90); he must convert the circumstances "into an obstacle" by causing himself "as in some childish game or unbecoming ramp, to be pursued, to be genially hunted" (77) but this occasion should not take this turn on any account. When the Prince encounters Charlotte at Mrs. Assingham's before his marriage, he sees "her hair was...brown , but there was a shade of tawny autumn leaf in it...a colour indescribable...something that gave her at moments the sylvan head of a huntress" (27). Yet, when Maggie and AdamVerver talk about Adam's necessity to marry and then decide to invite Charlotte, they talk as if she were a rare pet, like Kate in WD, to be "kept":

> –"But Charlotte-on other visits- never used to cost me anything."
> –"No- only her 'keep.'"
> –"Then I don't think I mind her keep if that's all."
> –"Well, it may not be quite all. If I think of its being pleasant to have her, it's because she *will* make a difference."(108)

and the two are as excited as children who are to receive a pet to entertain them. However, in her relationship with the Prince, Charlotte "works like a horse" (240) as Fanny Assingham tells her husband and this represents Charlotte's "instinctual animal nature" and when the horse is "ridden by the Devil", it becomes "phallic" and "lust" (Cooper 1978: 85), which parallels Charlotte's Satanic features and Judas-like nature as represented by the "kiss" that she gives Maggie, which strengthens Maggie's role as the scapegoat and Charlotte's Judas kiss has been pointed out both by Merle A.Williams (1993: 203) and Dorothea Krook (1963: 300,305).

Maggie, on the other hand, while talking about Charlotte's brevity and cleverness with Adam Verver, says that she does, "by nature- tremble for my life" because "I live in terror [and] I'm a small creeping thing" (GB:108). While waiting for the Prince to return home from his visit with Charlotte to Matcham, Maggie has already started to realize that there is something odd in her marriage and she is promoted from being a "small creeping thing" to a "timid tigress" (249) and in an occasion when she visits Charlotte and Adam at Fawns after the return of Charlotte and the Prince from Matcham, she "had flapped her little wings as a symbol of desired flight, not merely as a plea for a more gilded cage and an extra allowance of lumps of sugar" (269). Maggie's transformation continues when "the effect of the violence she was willing to let it go for, was exactly in their *being* the people in question, people she had seemed to be rather shy of before and for whom she suddenly opened her mouth so wide" (275). Here, Maggie resembles Aunt Maud and her metamorphosis also depicts and supports the idea that Maggie must use the necessary means to survive and think of every possibility and strategy not to lose and to gain her true paradise. When Adam and Maggie are at Regent's Park, Maggie's strategy to carry out her plan is very cautious:

> It made her but feel the more sharply how the specific... was utterly forbidden her- how the use of it would be...like undoing the leash of a dog eager to follow up a scent. It would come out, the specific, where the dog would come out; would run to earth...the truth for she was believing herself in relation to truth! (294)

As Maggie advances in the completion of her transformation she becomes more and more aware of the situation of others and even feels sympathetic to their sufferings, seeing her rivals as confined and subjugated. Maggie's sense is "open as to the sight of gilt wires and bruised wings [of Charlotte] the spacious but suspended cage, the home of eternal unrest, of pacings, shakings, all so vain...The cage was the deluded condition, and Maggie, as having known delusion- rather!- understood the nature of cages" (381). Thus, she

> walked round Charlotte's [cage] – cautiously and in a very wide circle...saw her companion's face as that of a prisoner looking through bars. So it was that through bars richly gilt...Charlotte finally struck her as making a grim attempt; from which...the Princess drew back as instinctively as if the door of the cage had suddenly been opened from within. (381)

As time goes by, Maggie's cautious confrontation and even retreat from her attacker turns into a strategy for a counter-attack. When Charlotte pursues Maggie like an animal chasing its prey, it is as if "the splendid shining supple creature was out of the cage" and now the question for Maggie is not only the confrontation but also the elimination of danger "by some art"; the question is "whether she mightn't...be hemmed in and secured" (387). Towards the end of the novel Charlotte is represented in total submission to Adam's power in Maggie's imagination. She imagines her hanging behind Adam and stopping when he stops, their relation being like that of an animal owner pulling a dog holding its collar. Adam, in Maggie's imagination, is "holding in one of his pocketed hands the end of a long silken halter looped round her beautiful neck. He didn't twitch, yet it was there; he didn't drag her, but she came...but the smile was the soft shake of the twisted silken rope" (415-416), which leads her by the neck to her doom that is unknown to her since its designer is Maggie. Charlotte, in this scene in the gallery, is "like the shriek of a soul in pain" and its high voice and "its quaver was doubtless for conscious ears" (418).

At the beginning of the novel, upon learning of the arrival of Charlotte, the Prince's main concern is whether Charlotte has "come with designs upon me" (23) and whether Fanny Assingham's affection lies in her "bringing them [Maggie and Amerigo], with her design, together" (12). In the last scene before Part Six, when Charlotte informs Maggie about her decision to leave Fawns with Adam for America, Maggie knows that Charlotte is "doomed, doomed to a separation that was like a knife in her heart" (434) and admits to having failed when in Charlotte's presence, yet secretly enjoying her triumph: "Yes, she had done all" (434). Although she is accused by Charlotte of working against her, Maggie admits failure; however, her pretence is full of consideration for what Charlotte might be feeling. Nevertheless, her consideration for another person's feeling is not devoid of consideration for her self. After Amerigo's coming upon the smashed bowl,

Maggie thinks that "helping him, helping him to help himself...she should help him to help *her*. Hadn't she...got into his labyrinth with him- wasn't she...in the very act of placing herself there...at its centre and core, whence, on that definite orientation and by an instinct...she might...guide him out of it?" (357-358). However, while doing this, despite her being "on her guard" not to sacrifice others "as if she felt the great trap of life mainly to be set for one's doing so, now found herself attaching her fancy to that side of the situation of the exposed pair which involved, for them at least, the sacrifice of the least fortunate" (380) and in this case the least fortunate is Charlotte, for she has been assured and deceived by Amerigo at Maggie's request that Maggie knows nothing about the betrayal. This occupies one of the great necessities that Maggie's "design" requires and the atmosphere as depicted at the gallery at Fawns is the epitome of all the evil inherent in human relations. The scene at Adam's gallery takes

> on finally the likeness of some spacious central chamber in a haunted house, a great overarched and overglazed rotunda, where gaity might reign, but the doors of which opened into sinister circular passages...here they closed numerous doors carefully behind them all save the door that connected the place, as by a straight tented corridor, with the outer world...[and] imitated the aperture through which the bedizened performers of the circus are poured into the ring. (416-417)

Almost all the characters in GB, as in WD, are actors and actresses; yet their ability to find their ways depends on how well they play since getting out of such labyrinthine circumstances necessitates skill to "act" and to "play"certain "games".

Mrs. Assingham's physical features are like those of an actress because she was covered and surrounded with "things, which were frankly toys and shams, a part of the amusement with which she rejoiced to supply her friends. Those friends were in the game- that of playing with disparity between her aspect and her character" (20). Adam Verver, on the other hand, is of "the back of the stage, of almost visibly conscious want of affinity with the footlights. He would have figured less than anything the stage manager or the author of the play who must occupy the foreground; he might be at best, the financial 'backer'" (101); and Adam and Maggie, in Charlotte's consciousness, like nothing "better than these...little parties, long talks, with 'I'll come to you to-morrow' and 'No, I'll

come to you' make-believe renewals of their old life. They were...like children playing at paying visits, playing at 'Mr. Thompson' and 'Mrs. Fane,' each hoping that the other would really stay to tea" (149).What Adam and Maggie are guilty of is their not including Charlotte and the Prince in their games. The game that Maggie should play with Amerigo and the one that Adam should play with Charlotte as husband and wife have been replaced by the father and daughter relationship, which is one of the "flaws" that precipitates Charlotte and Amerigo's infidelity. What is more, as Fanny Assingham tells Bob, Maggie makes Adam "accept the tolerably obvious oddity of their relation...for part of the game. Behind her there...he has safely and serenely enough suffered the conditions of his life" (239). Their relationship is not only that of playmates but that of a protective mother and frightened child seeking refuge behind his mother. Thus, the two prevent their marital lives from flowering. Furthermore, Maggie "makes it [the marriage to Charlotte] seem to him all so flourishingly to fit, Charlotte does her part not less. And her part is very large" (240) since she works like a horse. Fanny Assingham draws a distinction between the Prince's working like a prince and playing like a prince and she is in favour of the word "play" rather than "work" and this is probably because of the fact that a prince does not have to "work" to obtain something, and the Prince "plays" just for pleasure which will be a point to be mentioned in the next section in relation to the Prince's justification of his treatment of Charlotte, whereas Charlotte "works" by trying hard and making an effort to "arrange" occasions in order to spend time together. Charlotte tells Mrs. Assingham that she has to "act as it demands of me" (154), which is her advantageous state as the wife of Adam Verver and stepmother of Maggie. Fanny Assingham, while talking to her husband, tries to find out at what stage Charlotte and Amerigo's relation is and this "she can't ask her" because she has to do it all as if "playing some game with its rules drawn up" or she must do it "in three guesses-like forfeits on Christmas eve" (167). During Charlotte's visit to Portland place in Maggie's absence, both Charlotte and Amerigo feel the need "to do the same thing" and to "act in concert" in order "not to be absurd" (184).

As Maggie becomes more sure about the implications of the oddity of her situation concerning her marriage, she starts using more mature and effective

strategies and playthings. While waiting for Amerigo's return from Matcham, she "was no longer playing with blunt and idle tools, with weapons that didn't cut" (249). At an instance, she feels herself her father's playmate and partner and "what it...came back to...was that for her to ask a question, to raise a doubt, to reflect in any degree on the plays of the others, would be to break the charm" (264). Realizing that Fanny Assingham has had a hand in their fortunes, it is as if Maggie were "a mischievous child, playing on the floor...pil[ing] up blocks, skillfully and dizzily, with an eye on the face of a covertly-watching elder" and when the blocks collapse, she knows that "the hour would come for their rising so high that the structure would have to be noticed and admired" (305) and this happens only when she realizes that "it was her father's wonderful act that had tipped the house [of cards] and made the sum wrong" (291) since she knows that Adam married Charlotte to free Maggie from the idea that he is left alone by her marriage- an act the goodness of which is questionable. After succeeding in "humbugging" her father, Maggie's role becomes crucial, for she feels like a player who "engaged for a minor part in the play and having mastered her cues with anxious effort, should find herself suddenly promoted to leading lady and expected to appear in every act of the five" (368) and she is aware of the dramatic irony in the play in which Charlotte is an actress as well; for Charlotte "believes [and] *knows*, that I'm [Maggie] not in possession of anything. And, that, somehow, for my own help seems to me immense" (372). In the very theatrical bridge-game scene, though, all the "players were serious and silent" and the Princess had "the mood of a tired actress who has the good fortune to be "off, while her mates are on" and she is struck mostly by the "fact of relation of the whole group, individually and collectively, to herself" and she knows that she is the focus of their attention rather than the card to be played (382). They all are the embodiment of "evil seated, at all its ease, where she had only dreamed of good" since "with the secret behind every face, they had alike tried to look at her *through* it and in denial of it" (384). In this bridge game scene in which she is excluded from the game itself, Maggie imagines other characters as the figures rehearsing the play that she herself has written and the place as a stage that she can people "either with serenities and dignities and decencies, or with terrors and shames and ruins, things as ugly as those formless

fragments of her golden bowl she was trying so hard to pick up" (385). In her drama, Maggie foreshadows the forthcoming "bad" scene when she pronounces a few lines just before the confrontation between Charlotte and Maggie in the scene on the terrace: "The air's heavy as if with thunder- I think there will be a storm" (389) and this scene is where Maggie gets her Judas kiss from Charlotte. While facing her foil she covers herself with her shawl as if protecting herself; however, she lets it fall just before the "prodigious kiss" (394). When Maggie informs Fanny Assingham about Charlotte and Adam's departure for America and about their final visit that is to take place for the last time before that, it seems odd to Fanny's mind that Maggie will leave Amerigo and Charlotte alone in their final visit, to which Maggie reacts saying and repeating Polonius's lines concerning Hamlet's disposition (Act II, Scene II) that "there's a method in our madness" (GB: 437) in staying at Portland place. Besides, like Densher in WD, it is Maggie's nature "to think too much", which is the fact that hasn't ever occurred to Charlotte and Amerigo.

3.2. Contextual analysis of good and evil

> But it was at the same time precisely why even much initiation left one at given moments so puzzled as to the elements of staleness in all the freshness and of freshness in all the staleness, of innocence in the guilt and of guilt in the innocence. (GB: 212)

The paradox lying behind the commentary of the Prince not only beautifully expresses what the title of the book suggests– that is, perfect appearance of the bowl with a crack and the general atmosphere in the novel but also conveys the life that the reader is exposed to at Fawns, which the Verver family is depicted to be leading. In the previous chapter the Paradiasical life that the Ververs lead was depicted quite in detail with references to the imagery and symbolism Henry James makes use of, so it will not be repeated here.

In parallel with the Prince's interior monologue, "evil in James is not something that has crawled out of the pit. It wears the best clothes and moves in the best society; it may even fail to recognize itself as evil" (Wagenknecht 1983: 261). The familial ties of the Ververs are a good example of this.

The fact that Adam Verver has provided Maggie with a secure Paradise has been made clear in the previous chapter, unlike Kate Croy's relationship with her father, Lionel Croy in WD. Maggie has never taken any risks and she is never alone. Her father's material well-being has kept her away from all sorts of dilemmas of life. "She wasn't born to know evil," says Mrs Assingham, "She must never know it" (GB: 46). Yet she is not independent. Neither is she fully born. Her ties to her father block her reason and her critical capacities. Her tie blocks her development as a free, self-determining and productive individual. She lacks what Fromm names "spontaneous activity" (1942: 223), which will be mentioned later. She does not "solve the problem of living by productive activity" (1989: 18) and this is closely related to Adam Verver's personality orientation, which Fromm identifies as "hoarding" and "marketing" types.

Adam Verver's most outstanding peculiarity is his habit of collecting precious items for the museum which he intends to construct in the future so as to exhibit them. He is flawed in his inability to distinguish between people as real selves and as commodified objects and to treat them accordingly. In him, "the instinct, the particular sharpened appetite of the collector had fairly served as a basis for his acceptance of the Prince's suit" (GB: 82). Adam has chosen the Prince as a suitor for his daughter as he chooses precious items for his prospective museum. Even worse, the courtship of Adam and Charlotte in the subsequent chapters is depicted as "queer," for Adam applies "the same measure of value to such different pieces of property as old persian carpets, say, and new human acquisitions" (117). The relationship between the father and daughter is likened to that of a pair of pirates because they are "the sort who wink at each other and say 'Ha-ha!' when they come to where their treasure is buried" and they arrange the small pieces "to make the hotels we stay at and the houses we hire a little less ugly" (7). There is even not a small item that they have lost yet. Maggie also classifies the Prince as a small but a precious item and both the father and the daughter's mistaking a real self for an object and as a consequence of this their withdrawal from a genuine human relationship are the real "ugliness" that they try to cover over by such a trivial sort of relatedness to the world. Certain images that Maggie

and Adam apply in their relationships and exchanges are commercial, and views conveyed through such images

> signify an attitude simultaneously *detached* and *possessive*; and since both the detachment and possessiveness are of the kind with which we normally view things other than persons, they are as such inimical to a real involvement in the person who is being thus viewed as a thing. (Krook 1963: 296)

The reason for Maggie's accepting the Prince as a suitor depends partly on such an attitude. As Fanny tells Bob,

> Maggie happened to learn by some other man's greeting of him [the Prince], in the bright Roman way, from a street-corner as we passed, that one of the Prince's baptismal names, the one always used for him among his relations, was Amerigo: which was the name, four hundred years ago...of the pushing man who folowed, across the sea, in the wake of Columbus and succeeded, where Columbus had failed, in becoming godfather, or name-father, to the new Continent (GB: 147),

and the relationship immediately became romantic for Maggie. It was not the Prince's "particular self" (5) that she was impressed by but the romantic history the name Amerigo suggests. Maggie is the daughter of her father for whom "a work of art of price should 'look like' the master to whom it might perhaps be attributed; but he had ceased on the whole to know any matter of the rest of life by its looks" (86). One of the reasons for this is that Adam and Maggie are disinterested in the world outside themselves because they do not consider knowledge one of their needs, as mentioned in the first chapter and it will be clear throughout this chapter that this constitutes one of the sources of immorality in such a family circle.

The father and daughter's dependence on and care for each other assume a new and different sort of meaning when the time comes for their and especially Maggie's sealed imagination to open "To what's called Evil–with a very big E: for the first time in her life. To the discovery of it, to the knowledge of it, to the crude experience of it....To the harsh, bewildering brush, the daily chilling breath of it" (232) and this is when Charlotte Stant makes her appearance, as a consequence of which the paradiasical illusion at Fawns proves to be a false one from then on.

When Charlotte comes and meets the Prince at Fanny Assingham's house after years, it becomes clear that the Prince and Charlotte are old acquaintances

with a romantic background and in the past they fell in love with each other but not having the necessary means to marry, they decided to give each other up (41). It is revealed through what Maggie tells Adam that Charlotte "has loved–and she has lost" (110). What is more, Cahrlotte is "great in nature, in character, in spirit. Great in life....brave and bright....She hadn't a creature in the world really...belonging to her. Only acquaintances who...make use of her" (108), as Maggie describes to Adam. From the Prince's point of view she suggests "a rare, a special product," though, "her singleness, her solitude, her want of means...and other advantages, contributed to enrich her somehow with an odd, precious neutrality, to constitute for her....a sort of small social capital" (32). Yet, she is of the kind, like the Prince, that is "easily spoiled" (61). When viewed thus, Charlotte and the Prince make a dangerous and destructive combination, especially when the moral sense that the Prince has, or rather the lack of it, is taken into consideration. Neither does his moral deficiency go without his own realization. In one of his conversations with Fanny Assingham he says that he has something that passes for what one calls the moral sense. However, it is not like that of theirs: "Your moral sense works by steam– it sends you up like a rocket," he says, "Ours is slow and steep and unlighted, with so many of the steps missing that– well, that it's as short, in almost any case, to turn round and come down again" (17-18). His leading principle in life that constitutes his "moral sense" with its missing "steps" is at its best "doing the best for one's self one can– without any injury to others" (34); however, although "he liked all signs that things were well," he did not care much "*why* they were" (81). That is why Fanny Assingham considers him an animal to be educated (96), for he should fill in the missing steps.

There are lots of things that the Prince has to learn on the way to his transformation and one of these is that his "moral sense" is managed by his aesthetic taste and that constitutes the source of evil in his life experiences, for aesthetics is not the equivalent of morals. "Taste" in him is the "touchstone" (450). Dorothea Krook relates the taint in Charlotte and the Prince's relationship to three aspects, which are aesthetic, erotic and utilitarian (1963: 295) and almost in all the characters's relationships one or two of these aspects can easily be detected. In the relationship between the Prince and Charlotte the essence of the relationship seems

to be lust rather than love (Krook 1963: 298-299), because the bond between them lacks such components of love as care, responsibility, respect and knowledge (Fromm 1989: 24). One may claim that what the two persons experience is love, for if they had had the life conditions that they presently have, they would have been able to marry and lead a decent life. Nevertheless, there are enough clues and references for the contrary idea. It is clear that the things shared by the two people did not and do not go beyond a superficial relationship and this can easily be observed through the Prince's eyes when he sees Charlotte at Mrs. Assingham's just before his wedding. The description is important in the sense that it has aesthetic, erotic and utilitarian overtones that even depict her as an object:

> He saw the sleeves of her jacket drawn to her wrists, but he again made out the free arms within them to be of the completely rounded, the polished slimness that Florentine sculptors, in the great time, had loved, and of which the apparent firmness is expressed in their old silver and old bronze. He knew her norrow hands...long finger-nails...special beauty of movement and the line when she turned her back, and the perfect working of all her main attachments, that of some wonderful finished instrument, something intently made for exhibition, for a prize. He knew above all the extraordinary fineness of her flexible waist, the stem of an expanded flower, which gave her a likeness also to some long, loose silk purse, well filled with gold pieces, but having been passed , empty through a finger-ring that held it together. It was as if, before she turned to him, he had weighed the whole thing in his open palm and even heard a little chink of the metal. (GB: 28)

The memories he remembers are only aesthetic, erotic and materialistic relics of what they had experienced before their falling apart. They do not refer to deeper feelings. The descriptions show that what was shared and is to be shared do not and will not penetrate to the core but stayed and will stay at the periphery. What is more, the fact that the Prince does not care for Charlotte is implied by Fanny Assingham in one of her conversations with Bob. She tells him that "it has all been too easy [men do not care for women]. That's how, in nine cases out of ten, a woman *is* treated who has risked her life" (240) and Charlotte is a woman who "risks" cracks, as referred to in the previous section of this chapter. In the Matcham episode the Prince has justifications for his conduct concerning his treatment of Charlotte:

> He knew why, from the first of his marriage, he had tried with such patience for such conformity; he knew why he had given up so much and bored himself so much ....It had all been just in order that his – well, what on earth should he call it but his freedom?– should at present be as perfect and rounded and lustrous as some huge precious pearl. He hadn't struggled nor snatched; he was taking but what had been given him; the pearl dropped itself, with its exquisite quality and rarity straight into his hand. Here, precisely, it was, incarnate; its value grew as Mrs. Verver appeared, afar off, in one of the smaller doorways. (GB: 214-214)

The Prince releases himself from any responsibility by his treatment of Charlotte– that is, by putting the blame on Charlotte for allowing herself to be used by him, thus, approving of his conduct. Charlotte, then, is "stupid" and this moral stupidity is partly responsible for the Prince's treatment of her.

GB is a novel of interrelationships and all the characters' relationships are instrumental to one another and to a great extent shaped by selfish motives. Throughout the novel it has been made clear that the motive behind Adam's acceptance of Charlotte as a spouse and Maggie's suggestion of Charlotte as a suitable wife for Adam are as selfish as one of Charlotte's motives in accepting Adam's proposal, which is the fact she tells the Prince– that is, "I would marry...to have something from you [the Prince] in all freedom" (72). The ties between the father and the daughter, on the other hand, are too strong and even after Maggie's marriage this relationship continues increasing its strength to such an extent that Maggie blames herself for her father's loneliness for she believes her marriage is the reason for this. To free herself from any such responsibility she suggests to Adam that he should marry and that Charlotte is a suitable match for him. Adam, though, marries Charlotte to secure Maggie's happiness, with little consideration for Charlotte: "The way in which it might be met was by putting his child at peace....He had seen that Charlotte could contribute" (124). Charlotte would have another function, too, if she were to be "kept". It is pleasant to have Charlotte because Ververs "didn't know," as Fanny Assingham tells Bob, "how to live" (234). If it is pleasant to have Charlotte, "it's because she *will* make a difference" (107) in their lives, and she will "give us life" (300). Ironically, the moment Adam gets married to Charlotte to ease her daughter, it produces the very opposite effect– that is, it is her father's marriage that precipitated the clandestine love affair between Charlotte and the Prince, which results in Maggie's learning about

suffering and pain as a human feeling. At a later stage, though, Adam realizes "a kind of wicked selfish prosperity" (298) in their lives and warns Maggie against the immorality of it.

Adam suggests that they are selfish together because they "move as a selfish mass...we want always the same thing...and that holds us that binds us, together. We want each other.....only wanting it, each time *for* each other. That's what I call the happy spell; but it's also, a little possibly, the immorality" (298). Maggie on the other hand, thinks that her selfishness is based on her husband because "he's my motive– in everything", (400). Yet, it is not jealousy, either: "When you love in the most abysmal and unutterable way of all...you're beyond everything and nothing can pull you down" and Maggie feels "beyond everything" (400), as a consequence of which she does not "know quite *where* I am" (401) but feels "frozen stiff with selfishness," for her father's marriage arrangements serve her best (402) and she is not the same simple-minded girl as the one who once fell in love with a precious item that was worth her father's museum. It was Maggie's simplicity and extreme goodness that had begun the "vicious circle" and it is Adam and Maggie's "mutual consideration...that has made it the bottomless gulf," (237). Although their consideration for each other is good for them, it does not have the same effect on their spouses since the more the father and daughter come closer the more they isolate themselves from their spouses and push them to one another. That is why good is also the source of vice. Adam's function in opening Maggie's eyes to the selfishness and ugliness in their relationship is important and the same fact is also noticed and pronounced by Charlotte to Fanny Assingham. She, too, has "felt in it at times...too great and too strange, an ugliness" (433).

Maggie's success lies in her awareness of this ugliness and her taking the initiative for "spontaneous" activity. Spontaneous activity is

> Free activity of the self and implies, psychologically, what the Latin root of the word, *sponte*, means literally: of one's free will. By activity we do not mean "doing something", but the quality of creative activity that can operate in one's emotional, intellectual and sensuous experiences and in one's will as well....Spontaneous activity is the one way in which man can overcome the terror of aloneness without sacrificing the integrity of his self; for in the spontaneous realization of the self man unites himself anew with the world– with man, nature and himself. (Fromm 1942: 223,225)

Maggie, after learning about the clandestine love affair between her husband and Charlotte does not violate the forms, for what she wants is not the separation of the "smashed pieces" but the bringing together the necessary parts to their correct places and that is why she keeps silent about how much she knows and does not give out any hint. She learns how to act creatively and this can be observed in her emotional, intellectual and sensuous experiences. The affair has taught her and enabled her to make out for herself that

> any deep-seated passion has its pangs as well as its joys, and that we are made by its aches and its anxieties most richly conscious of it. She had never doubted of the force of the feeling that bound her to her husband; but to become aware, almost suddenly, that it had begun to vibrate with a violence that had some of the effect of a strain would, rightly looked at, after all but show that she was, like thousands of women, every day, acting up to the full privilege of passion. (GB: 247-248)

She feels strong enough to bear anything for love (313). Maggie learns from her life experiences that love is not something that can so easily be gained. On the contrary, she realizes that one has to struggle for it. She realizes, too, that one must have some imagination of the states of others– that is, "of what they may feel deprived of...Kitty and Dotty [Maggie and Adam] couldn't imagine we were deprived of anything. And now, and now–!" (398). After Fanny Assingham's smashing the bowl, instead of making a scene or pressing the Prince, she keeps "quiet" for everyone (374). In the scene on the terrace "she was there...just *as* she was, with it as the scapegoat of old, of whom she had once seen a terrible picture, had been charged with the sins of the people and had gone forth into the desert to sink under his burden and die" (384). She knows that "any of the...assuaging ways usually open to innocence outraged and generosity betrayed" (386) would mean giving them up and this is not to be thought of under any circumstances. What is more, when the Prince wants to know whether anyone else knows about the affair and to what extent they know anything, Maggie's response to her husband is very intelligent: "Find out for yourself!" (367). The intelligence Maggie demonstrates through this response is in parallel with the idea that Fanny once expresses– that is, "stupidity pushed to a certain point *is*...immorality. Just so what is morality but

high intelligence?" (52). In the second half of the novel where Maggie becomes aware of her real situation, Charlotte grows "stupid," to use the Prince's final address to his former mistress, since she does not realize that Maggie is aware of at what stage her marriage is and Charlotte's failure in acknowledging this fact and realizing Maggie's capacity to "think" (442) are the real stupidity. As the Prince tells Maggie, Charlotte "ought to have *known* you....She ought to have understood you better....And she didn't really know you at all" (451).

Maggie's success lies in her ability to use her human faculties with great consideration for others and this can be observed in such circumstances as when she imagines Charlotte telling her "You don't know what it is to be loved and broken with":

> You haven't broken with, because in *your* relation what there can have been worth speaking of to break? *Ours* was everything a relation could be, filled to the brim with the wine of consciousness....why condemned after a couple of short years to find the golden flame- oh the golden flame !- a mere handful of black ashes. (GB: 440).

Before her departure with Adam to the American city, Maggie knows that Charlotte is "doomed to a separation that was like a knife in her heart" and she has wondered around in her "uncontrollable, her blinded physical quest for a piece not to be grasped" (430) and feels sympathy for Charlotte since she herself has enough memories as to how "it's always terrible for women" (452). Although Charlotte can't put herself into Maggie's skin and she "shouldn't be able to breathe in it" (186), Maggie, having a much better sense of compassion for those around her, follows Charlotte into the garden "to make somehow, for her [Charlotte's] support, the last demonstration" (428) to "allow her...fairly to produce in her, the sense of highly choosing" (429), which is the sense of choosing to go to America, in fact, her being forced to do it.

On the other hand, in the final scene in which Maggie, in a way, identifies herself with the power figure, Adam, there are sadistic overtones in what Maggie imagines to be happening. The fact that Adam Verver's wealth provides him with power and strength and a Paradiasical life make him appear like a god-figure when

these facts add to his shadow-like, yet highly felt existence in the novel. In the final scene Maggie gains strength and the sort of dependency between the father and the daughter, which sometimes takes the form of what Fromm labels as "rational authority" (Fromm 1942: 142), dissolves itself. In the end Maggie more and more becomes like her father. Although Charlotte is depicted heading for her new destination with a rope around her neck, which is carried by Adam, this punishment does not lack in its redeeming quality. Maggie does not disregard the fact that Charlotte experiences loss and suffering. She conveys through her utterances that Charlotte's unhappiness is a prerequisite for her real attachment to her husband (GB: 450). She is careful that Charlotte's "gifts, her variety, her power" will be used in her father's plan and she emphasizes that she is "great for the world that was before her," (462) and she would not be wasted in the application of Adam's plan. Maggie's plan succeeds in being both a punishment and a salvation for Charlotte. The quality of Maggie's assessment of that punishment remains questionable, though.

Maggie thinks that "they [the Prince and Charlotte] are the ones who are saved...We're the ones who are lost....to each other" and that "for them it's just, it's right, it's deserved, while for us it's only sad and strange and not caused by our fault" (442). Careful and compassionate though she is, Maggie's evaluation seems to be one-sided. Her limitation is not non-human, though. It keeps Maggie within the boundaries of human capacity and reflects all the paradoxes and conflicts of life as represented at the beginning of this chapter through the Prince's interior monologue. In fact, the description in the final scene not only illustrates the resolution of conflict and redemptive power of generous concern but also foreshadows the redemptive quality of the punishment as well, for the plan, although it punishes, does not waste. The strength Maggie represents in the final scene, also, illustrates the fact that "there is not genuine power or strength in possession as such, neither of material property nor of mental qualities like emotions or thoughts" (Fromm 1942: 225). Similarly, what one has is not hers simply because she has it. The Prince was not Maggie's because he was her husband and they were tied with their marriage with Fanny Assingham's design and Adam Verver's wealth. Hers is that to which she is genuinely related by her

own creative activity. The final scene depicts that it is only one's spontaneous activity that gives strength to the self. That is why in the end the Prince sees nothing but Maggie (GB: 464). The security that results from this activity is different from the security Maggie used to get through her filial ties. The new security is not rooted in the god-like Adam's material wealth. On the contrary, it comes from within through the individual's relatedness to her surroundings and this security is not based on illusions since all the conditions Maggie and Adam's lives used to necessitate have been eliminated through the knowledge they attained as a consequence of their relatedness to the world outside themselves.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

In this thesis the concepts of good and evil in relation to *The Wings of the Dove* and *The Golden Bowl* have been studied, for although Henry James is not considered to be a moralist, he has been attracted by the manners and the interrelationships of his characters and it is through such relationships that James expresses his cynicism about human nature and this is illustrated when the readers are exposed to various patterns of behaviour as opposed to their alternatives.

In the chapters on symbolism and imagery, it has been pointed out that Henry James's use of symbolism and imagery is not accidental. Although the references to such symbols and images do not necessitate the novel's reading as a biblical accumulation, they reinforce the readers' understanding and evaluation of the characters' personalities and the circumstances, which, in a way, give meaning to their responses to the world outside themselves.

It has also been pointed out that Henry James makes use of animal imagery to depict the animalistic features of his characters and their struggle to survive. The more carnivorous they are, the more destructive and cynical they become. As the personality gains strength the type of the animal becomes more carnivorous and aggressive. Playing, acting or working imagery, on the other hand, have been applied when the characters' rivalry to display their intelligence is conveyed. These images also have the function of a smokescreen by enabling the characters to hide their deadly intents.

James does not apply animal imagery only to highlight his characters' animalistic instincts, though. Rather, he wants to show that people are departing from their human capacities for love and life and this departure results from a

defect, which is the inability to regard a human being as a separate entity and this has been illustrated through the characters' treatment of other characters when they consider them as a "thing", an "object" or a "commodity", for in each case the individual's self is disqualified, thus making it impossible for a true human relationship to take place.

It has been revealed that "commodification" of an individual prevents that particular person's personal qualities from flowering, as in the case of Kate Croy, who has been viewed by her family as an "asset" or as in the case of the Prince, who has been mistaken for a "perfect precious crystal". Characters' "exploitive", "hoarding" and "marketing" personality orientations, which are non-productive character orientations, are proved to have been one of the sources of evil and when the characters are depicted as having grown up in such family surroundings one has difficulty ascertaining the degree of evil or good done, for such character orientations represent the close environmental circumstances, one of which is the family, in which the self is "made" and moulded and self cannot be separated from environmental, financial and contextual influences of that very family. Kate, in WD, for instance, falls prey to Lionel Croy's and Aunt Maud's commodified mentalities and her initial victimization by other "evil" characters makes her corruption less disgusting, if not justifiable. In GB this takes place in a parallel fashion. Adam and Maggie's initial passivity and their betrayal by their spouses are not enough to prove their innocence or goodness, for their own motives on certain conditions have been depicted as not being so pure and selfless. Thus Henry James once more highlights all the conflicting impulses within oneself, making use of a variety of oppositions. Human feelings, for instance, have been shown together with animalistic ones. Similarly, "perfectness" in appearances has been shown "flawed". Punishment is depicted having the power of redemption as well. The Paradise that does not incorporate these conflicting forces is "false" and living in a false Paradise is evil.

Maggie regains her true Paradise not only because of the fact that she is intelligent, loving and able to learn how to get over the problem of living by "productive activity" and incorporate her selfish motives with altruistic ones but because of the fact that she has her father's wealth beside her unlike Kate, for

whom the Paradise is lost not only because of the fact that she makes every precious human activity an instrument in her hands but also she does not have the financial freedom that Maggie has.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Bem P. *Personality Theories.* London: Allyn and Bacon,1997.

Andreas, Osborn. *Henry James and the Expanding Horizon.*Seattle:University of Washington Press, 1948.

Bell, Millicent. *Meaning in Henry James.*Cambridge Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1991.

Bishop, George. *Henry James: Life, Work, and Moral Life.*Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.

Cady, E.H & Budd, L.J., ed. *On Henry James.*London: Duke Univ. Press, 1990.

Cooper, J.C. *An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols.* London: Thames& Hudson, 1978.

Curtsinger, E.C. *The Muse of Henry James.*Texas: Latitudes Press, 1987.

Fromm, Erich. *The Fear of Freedom*. London: Routledge& Kegan Paul Ltd., 1942.

Fromm, Erich. *Man For Himself*. New York: Fawcett Premier Pub., 1966.

Fromm, Erich. *The Art of Loving*. New York: First Perennial Library edition, 1989.

Fromm, Erich. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Gargano, J.W., ed. *Critical Essays on Henry James: The Late Novels.*Boston: G.K.Hall&Co., 1987.

Internet 1.
Bertonneau, T.F. "The Mysteries of Mimicry" Sublimity and Morality in *The Golden Bowl.* [www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0402/gbowl.htm] (03.28.2003)

Internet 2.
Jenkins, C. Ryan. "Synthesis of Ecclesiastes."
[http://www.solagratia.SynEcclHeb.htm] (04.08.2003)

Internet 3.
Martin, M.S. "The Portrait without a Subject: German Re-visioning, the Self, Nature, and the Jamesian Novel."
[http://www.newpaltz.edu/~hathawar/ejourn5.html] (11.08.2003)

Internet 4.
Funk, Rainer. "Erich Fromm's Concept of Social Character and Its Relevance for Clinical Practice." [http://www.erichfromm.de/lib_2/funk13.html] (23.08.2003)

Internet 5.
Funk, Rainer. "The Continuing Relevance of Erich Fromm."
[http://www.erichfromm./de/english/life/life_relevance_funk.html] (23.08.2003)

James, Henry. *The Golden Bowl.* Hertfordshire:Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1995.

James, Henry. *The Wings of the Dove.* Middlesex: Penguin Books Limited, 1974.

Jones, Peter. "Philosophy, Interpretation and *The Golden Bowl." Philosophy and Literature*.Ed.A. Phillips Griffiths. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984. (211-228)

Kimball, Jean. "The Abyss and *The Wings of the Dove*: The Image as a Revelation." *Henry James: Moral Judgments*. Ed. Tony Tanner. London: Macmillan, 1969. (266-281).

Krook, Dorothea. *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James.* New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1963.

Macnaughton, W.R. *Henry James: The Later Novels.* Boston: G.K. Hall& Co., 1987.

Pippin, R.B. *Henry James and Modern Moral Life.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.

Poole, Adrian. *Henry James*. New York: Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Samuels, C.T. *The Ambiguity of Henry James.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Sears, Sally. "The Wings of the Dove." *Critical Essays on Henry James: The Late Novels*. Ed.J.W.Gargano. Boston: G.K.Hall&Co., 1987. (148-167)

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. New York: Penguin Books, 1987.

Tambling, Jeremy. *Critical Issues: Henry James.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Tintner, A.R. *The Book World of Henry James.* Michigan: U-M-I Research Press, 1987.

Wagenknecht, Edward. *The Novels of Henry James.* New York: Frederick Ungar Pub. Co., 1983.

Wessel,C.C. "Strategies for Survival in James's *The Golden Bowl." On Henry James*. Ed. J.Budd & Edwin H. Cady. London: Duke Univ. Press, 1990. (243-257)

Williams, Merle.A. *Henry James and the Phiosophical Novel: Being and Seeing.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.