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This dissertation proposes three interwoven arguments concerning Gertrude Stein’s undergraduate education at Radcliffe College in the late 19th century. First, that Stein’s Sophomore writing course in 1894-1895 – English 22, Daily Themes – played a larger role in the course of her writing life than has been understood in the fields of Modernism and American literature. Second, that the first women of Radcliffe College, and before Radcliffe’s founding, of the Harvard Annex, were more integral to late 19th century growth in English and Composition at Harvard College than has been understood in the fields of Rhetoric and Composition. Finally, that we cannot understand the expansion of Harvard College to Harvard University, the implementation of the elective system, or the founding of Radcliffe without integrating the various roles of Special Students – of which Gertrude Stein was one – in the broadening mission of the Cambridge institution.

Following these threads, and focusing on Stein as an emblematic – though idiosyncratic – student, I provide a history of Harvard-Radcliffe during the 1870s-1890s, a period of unprecedented change, the decades before and during Stein’s attendance from 1893-1898. I examine the role of female students in the origins of English Composition, a history which has previously focused heavily on male education as it emanated from
Harvard and reverberated throughout higher education into the 20th century. I focus on Stein as a student of the pedagogy of Daily Themes practiced by Barrett Wendell. In providing these institutional, historical, and pedagogical contexts, I aim to connect Stein, the student writer, to the adult innovator, to form a trajectory from her English 22 course into her adult writing life. My goal is for us to understand “The Making of Gertrude Stein” as a consequence, in part, of her reading and writing at Radcliffe. This is an educational history of one of America’s great modernist writers embedded in the institutional history of her alma mater.

In order to help further research on Gertrude Stein’s undergraduate writing, my dissertation includes in its appendices the digitized images of Stein’s Daily Themes for English 22 at Radcliffe and my annotated transcription of the Themes including professorial comments.
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Introduction – Gertrude Stein and Radcliffe College

Radcliffe College: The Great Experiment

Gertrude Stein arrived in Cambridge, Massachusetts in the fall of 1893 to begin her studies at The Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women. Her older brother Leo was a student at Harvard College, a familial-academic connection that figures prominently in most accounts of Stein’s college years. More relevant to Stein’s undergraduate experience, however, was the fact that she could attend “college” in Cambridge at all. Her five-year education near Leo bridged the establishment of Radcliffe College: she entered one institution and graduated from another. In December of 1893, just a few months after Stein’s arrival, the Society became Radcliffe College, chartered by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The last twenty-five years of the 19th century was a period of incredible educational and institutional change in Cambridge, and Stein had arrived at the very height of that change. She was part of a great “experiment,” as women’s education at Cambridge was called in its first annual report of 1880.

As early as 1874, Harvard College had awarded certificates to women who had studied at other institutions and were able to pass the Harvard exams. The “experiment” really began in 1877, when a former banker, educational philanthropist, writer, and future schoolmaster named Arthur Gilman and his wife, Stella, “began corresponding with

---

1 See Frederick Rudolph’s The American College and University: A History (1962). His chapter on “The Education of Women” gives more background on the beginnings of Radcliffe College, modeled as a “compromise between coeducation and a separate women’s college called a co-ordinate college” (319-320).

2 Arthur Gilman and his wife were the visionaries and initiators of the “Great Experiment” that was to become Radcliffe College. Mr. Gilman served first as Secretary, then Treasurer, then Regent, and authored the Annual Reports of the Society and Radcliffe until his resignation in September, 1896. The President of Radcliffe College recorded a Resolution adopted by the Corporation honoring Gilman’s devotion and services in the annual report of 1895-96 (see Radcliffe, 1895-96, pp. 7-8, sequence 9-10). Mr. Gilman was also remembered as Radcliffe’s “Founder” in his New York Times obituary: “He was the founder of the Harvard Annex, now known as Radcliffe College … he proposed, in 1877, a plan for the systematic instruction of women by the professors of Harvard College. From the beginning Mr. Gilman was the executive of this organization, which became
Harvard president Charles Eliot to determine whether Harvard professors might be allowed to offer private instruction to women students. The Gilmans, perhaps concerned about the higher education of their daughter, soon organized a group of prominent women in Cambridge determined to provide women with the opportunity to receive the same education offered to Harvard men.”

They succeeded in 1879 by offering what they called “Private Collegiate Instruction for Women by Professors and Other Instructors of Harvard College.” After three years of planning, the name was changed legally in 1882 under a Charter and state seal to “The Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women.”

The Society became popularly known as the “Harvard Annex,” and the women who attended commonly known as “Annex Girls.”

The pseudonym “Annex” was fixed upon the institution almost immediately upon its inception, as a substitute for our more formal, and now corporate title [Society]. The word Annex as applied to an institution of learning obtained a unique meaning. It signified a school for women near a college for men, carried on with the same methods, and with the same educational grade, in which all instruction is given by men engaged in work for men in the college … With us the college precedents and rules govern in all particulars; the requirements for admission are simply those of the college; the examinations for admission are identical; the courses of instruction are

---

3 Sue Carter Simmons, “Radcliffe Responses to Harvard Rhetoric,” 267. Note: Simmons places the beginning of this correspondence in 1879, when it was actually two earlier. At this time Gilman was also not yet a schoolmaster. He founded the Gilman School for Girls in Cambridge in 1886. See “Gilman, Arthur, 1837-1909. Scrapbook, 1876-1909: A Finding Aid” in the Harvard University Library Online Archival Search Information System (OASIS).

4 Most important for its financial self-sustainability, this legal change made it possible for the Society to “receive funds and to hold and administer them legally for the purposes of the collegiate instruction of women. It makes it practicable for the Society to raise a proper endowment to establish the work upon a permanent basis, and it seems that the moment has arrived when the contribution of an adequate fund will found an institution that will give women advantages in Cambridge equal to those enjoyed from time immemorial by their more favored brothers.” Reports of the treasurer and secretary for the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, 1881-82, p. 3, sequence 16. Hereafter designated as Society in Radcliffe. Available online through the Harvard/Radcliffe Online Historical Reference Shelf: http://hul.harvard.edu/huare/refshelf/HROHRSHome.htm

5 For Gertrude Stein’s take on this, see theme from English 22 dated December 12, 1894, called “An Annex Girl.”
repetitions of those given in the college and they are given by the college instructors; the requirements for the degree-certificates are the same as those for the college degree.\textsuperscript{6}

The women were taught by a group of Harvard professors, and offered courses from fourteen of Harvard’s departments – including Greek, Latin, German, a handful of Romance Languages and literatures, Philosophy, Economics and Political Science, Mathematics and Physics, and Mineralogy and Natural History. Of particular relevance to the background for this dissertation was “English Composition,” taught by A.S. Hill. The corollary course taught by Professor Hill at Harvard was called “Rhetoric and English Composition” and evolved by the early 1890s into English A, the prescribed composition course for all freshmen at Harvard and Radcliffe, and one of the few courses required of all graduates from both institutions. Despite this requirement, English A is conspicuously absent on Gertrude Stein’s Radcliffe transcript, an anomaly which I address in chapter 3.

In the Society’s annual reports of the 1870s and 80s, the Managers – as they were called – seemed at pains to demonstrate the rigor of their fledgling institution and the promise of the young ladies who attended. Though institutionally segregated until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, male and female students at Harvard and Radcliffe from the very beginning did – in theory – take the same courses, pass the same exams, and receive equivalent marks, even if they were taking them in separate quarters. The equivalence was in part because they shared a faculty. From its inception, women’s education was to be a duplication of men’s, and with Radcliffe having no faculty of its own, it borrowed Harvard’s faculty for its courses. The Annex girls read with these faculty members at a different location,\textsuperscript{7} and the courses

\textsuperscript{6} Society in Radcliffe, 1889-90, pp. 5-6, sequence 117-18.
\textsuperscript{7} Society in Radcliffe, 1880-81, p. 7, sequence 7: “The Instruction has been given in the rooms provided for the purpose on Appian Way, and the Reading-room at the corner of Appian Way and Garden Street has been continued as heretofore.”
designed “for the ladies” were to be “repetitions of those of the College.” According to John Brereton, this was in keeping with the ideology voiced by feminist academic leaders such as M. Carey Thomas – President of Bryn Mawr from 1894-1922 – who believed a woman’s education should be the same as a man’s. John Brereton writes, “in keeping with this general idea, Harvard professors gave the same courses at Radcliffe as they did in their own departments.” This may have been the goal, and the public impression, but it did not begin this way, as I will show in my third chapter, “English Composition at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1880s and 1890s.” The ideal of offering the same courses to women required an equivalent preparation, which many girls at that time simply did not have. If this ideal was to work in reality, there needed to be a coordinated effort early on between college preparation for girls and the Harvard College admissions standards. And since Harvard College had only limited direct-impact on the curriculum of these prep schools at that time, the point of contact for the “regular” or traditional college student (18 year-old from secondary school) was primarily the entrance examinations.

Tempering and gauging the entrance and qualifying examinations for the women beginning in 1874 was thus by necessity part of the great experiment. The Harvard Annex was not the only higher institution for women at this time, and so the Managers of the Society took as precedent the decisions made by other institutions. The Harvard College annual report of 1879-80 describes the evolution of these examinations during the first five years.
years of its awarding certificates to women, attentive to the larger context of peer institutions and secondary schools at the time. From 1874-1879, these exams were paid for – but not administered by – the Committee of the Women’s Education Association:

The examinations for women which the University has conducted since 1874 were fundamentally changed near the close of the year 1879-80, at the instance of the ladies who had taken the warmest interest in them. The original examinations did not closely resemble the examinations for admission to the colleges for men; in some respects they were easier, and in others much harder; in general they were more thorough; there was a greater number of options, and at the advanced examination a possibility of concentrating study upon single lines. The examinations as a whole did not represent existing courses of study either in girls’ schools or in women’s colleges, and they set up an unusual standard which, very few young women could find means to reach. Since 1874, several institutions which propose to give a collegiate education to women have come into existence, and have to some extent prescribed the course of study in secondary or preparatory schools for girls. To the persons who have arranged the courses of study in these new institutions, it has seemed safest simply to copy the arrangements of an ordinary college for men, faults and all; and especially to have an admission examination much like the conventional entrance examination of a New England College for men. It is thus made easy for the numerous high schools and academies which fit boys for college to fit girls too; for no new subjects need be taught for the girls’ sake, and no new demands need be made upon the teachers. In conformity with this general tendency, and the specific wish of the Committee of the Women’s Education Association, which has born the cost of the Harvard Examinations for Women from the beginning, those examinations will hereafter be nearly identical with the examinations for admission to Harvard College.11

On the surface the decision for “equality” does follow the philosophy of M. Carey Thomas, but less for ideological reasons than for pragmatic: furthering the prospects of adequate training for high school girls, and ease and cost of administration of the exams. At a co-ordinate school such as the Annex, it was less expensive for girls to assume the education of boys, and to set up the institution to assume that possibility from the start. The approach suggests that secondary and higher education can mutually constitute themselves in the formation of these new colleges for women, a concept that would become, within the decade,

relevant for the men’s colleges as well. The Society in Cambridge in this case was indebted to peer independent women’s’ colleges for opening up secondary education for girls, and – as would play out in the 1890s – for supplying Radcliffe with its first generation of advanced or “Special” students. There was a downside to all this equality. Few now or then would call Harvard an “ordinary college for men,” and yet, the “faults and all” that are mentioned in this report are real, historically based, and they greatly affected the first wave of students to attend the Annex as a co-ordinate institution. The greatest of these faults concerned the standards, or lack thereof, for admission.

What may be understood in retrospect as a “fault,” however, must initially have seemed a boon, as was the case with the administrative means of providing admission to women on equal terms, despite the dearth of college preparatory institutions open to them in 1879 when they were invited to take classes with the Harvard faculty. Allowances were made in that first year for women who had not received the kind of college preparation in ancient languages that made them viable as regular undergraduates; but far more important than these specific allowances, which were eliminated the following year, was the option to earn a “certificate” of entrance without passing the full slate of entrance exams. As explained in the Harvard College annual report of 1879-1880:

The subjects of examination [for women] will be identical with those required for admission to Harvard College, except that instead of Greek a certain preparation in French and German may be offered; the examinations will be simultaneous with those for admission to College in June, and the papers used will be the same; the division between two years will be allowed; and a certificate will be given to every successful candidate, stating that she has passed the examinations in whole or in part as the case may be.\(^\text{12}\)

This option of passing exams only “in part” for admission was not a concession to women; this option was also available to Harvard men. In fact, neither men nor women had to pass

\(^{12}\) *Harvard*, p. 148, sequence 456.
any exams in order to attend classes in Cambridge. They entered as “Special Students,”
aligning them with what I will argue in chapters 1 and 2 was one of the “faults” of Harvard’s 19th century student-management policies. The class of Harvard Specials already had a mixed reputation by the time women arrived in Cambridge, and yet this option was in its first years a necessary evil for the Annex: with so many women unprepared for Harvard’s college exams, there was good reason to offer this path to admission, but it also compromised by association the class of women who were identified as Specials on the same terms as their Harvard peers.

Rather than emphasize this non-traditional path to admission in its own reports, the Society described a system of academic equity across the board with “the papers being the same, and the Instructors marking the young ladies on the same scale with the young men.” I3 I take as a given that these early institutional reports, especially from the Society, were under some pressure to describe a successful “experiment” in order to justify not only the expansion of the program for women, but to maintain its very existence. That the courses, expectations, examinations and evaluations for the women be equivalent to that for the Harvard men was absolutely essential, given the institutional relationship being established between the Harvard faculty and their new female acolytes. If the Annex was to work and grow as a “co-ordinate” college, it had to demonstrate separate but equal educations for men and women, to justify its association with Harvard to administrators and professors, and to potential backers of the new institution.14

---

13 Reports of the treasurer and secretary for the Private Collegiate Instruction of Women, 1880-81, p. 8, sequence 8. This is the second annual report on women’s education in Cambridge. The following year, the annual reports were designated from the Society.
14 The Managers had raised funds to carry forward the experiment for four years beginning in 1879. After two years, the secretary of the organization, Arthur Gilman, declared that they had been more frugal than expected, and that their funds could be expected to last six years rather than the planned four. After this time, the experiment would need to be funded by the “public,” that is to say, funded by private donations, which they
The notion of separate but equal educations under one institutional umbrella must have seemed an unachievable ideal, countered as it was by more than a century of Harvard’s development as a “‘traditional school of manly character.’” Given the resistance to women’s education from within Harvard – by influential faculty such as Barrett Wendell in the English Department and the President, Charles W. Eliot – and the need to build capital for such an enterprise, this co-ordinate relationship was the best option for opening up the educational resources of Harvard to women. As one professor noted, all a women’s college could offer Harvard was women, and that Harvard did not really want. But with the juggernaut of the women’s movement, the expansion of higher educational opportunities for women elsewhere, and the demonstrated success in annual reports of the early experiment of women’s education in Cambridge, the internal resistance was slowly worn down from the 1880s to the 1890s. By 1888, the Secretary of the Society proclaimed that the Annex was no longer an “experiment” though it would undergo still another seven years of transformation and growth – expansion of the student body, increase in participating faculty, and fundraising for the endowment – before its establishment as a “College.”

It was during the last year of this transformation, 1893-1894, that Gertrude Stein arrived in Cambridge. She began her undergraduate education at the height of institutional

---

15 From Drew Gilpin Faust’s 2001 lecture to Harvard’s incoming Class of 2005, titled and printed as Mingling Promiscuously: A History of Women and Men at Harvard. In the following passage she is quoting Barrett Wendell: “Barrett Wendell, professor of English, proclaimed that there must be no deviation from the tenet that had ruled since the founding of the College in 1636: ‘that the influences amid which education should be obtained here must remain purely virile.’ Even more than an ‘institution of learning,’ Harvard was, he affirmed, ‘a traditional school of manly character.’” Wendell’s insistence on male virility is somewhat ironic given that he was physically frail and suffered as a young man with what he called “‘my probably hysterical paralysis’” and “‘nervous over-sensitivity’” (Douglas 4).

16 Faust lecture, 2001. At the time of this lecture, Faust was Dean of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, established in 1999, with the completed merger of Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges, begun in 1977. The men and women from the class of 2005 graduated from Harvard College rather than Harvard-Radcliffe College. Faust has since been named the first female President of Harvard University.
change from Society to College, a witness to the great experiment that had started in 1877 and was coming to fruition during her first year of undergraduate study. She and her female cohort were both markers and beneficiaries of institutional success. By the end of 1894, the number of faculty involved in women’s education numbered 70, the number of departments increased to 20, and the number of courses offered to women had grown to over 100. The women’s College had acquired four of its own laboratories, and the women had access to many of Harvard’s Museums, the Astronomical Observatory, and the Botanic Gardens. Perhaps most significantly, in terms of institutional change, women were allowed access to the University Library – with its 400,000 volumes – by a vote of President Eliot and the Fellows of Harvard College. Gertrude Stein arrived in Cambridge, a young woman experiencing the full backing of Harvard’s leadership behind the establishment of Radcliffe College, in essence, for her.

The great experiment announced its formal success in the inaugural report of “Radcliffe College” in 1894. From its inception as a group of Harvard courses offered to women, it had become an institution with its own identity, a “College” in the same terms as Harvard, with a charter of its own.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Radcliffe, 1893-94, no page number indicated, but would be p. 71, last page of the report, sequence 73.
Radcliffe College.

Radcliffe College, the successor of the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, offers systematic collegiate instruction to women under the professors and other teachers of Harvard University. More than seventy instructors of the University are teachers in Radcliffe College.

Fay House contains the recitation rooms and offices, and a select working library. The College has four laboratories, of Physics, Chemistry, Botany, and Biology. The collections of the Agassiz Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology, the University Museums of Geology, Botany, and Mineralogy, and the Semitic Museum, are also open to the students; and, by vote of the President and Fellows of Harvard College, the students have the use of the University Library, containing 400,000 volumes. Opportunities for study in the Astronomical Observatory, the Botanic Garden, and the Herbarium are also afforded.

The requirements for admission are identical with those for admission to Harvard College. The courses of instruction given in Radcliffe College correspond to both "undergraduate" and "graduate" courses offered by Harvard University, and are more than sufficient to enable a woman to perform the work required by the University for the degrees of A.B. and A.M. In addition to these, Graduate Students in Radcliffe College have access to a large number of Graduate courses in Harvard University. The examinations are the same in both institutions, and the diplomas conferring the degrees of A.B. and A.M. are countersigned by the President of Harvard University as a guarantee that these degrees are equivalent to the corresponding degrees given by the University.

No longer simply Annex girls, Gertrude Stein and her peers had achieved recognition and status as students worthy of a Harvard education, and therefore worthy of their own College.

From one year later, the new Dean of Radcliffe noted the significance of the College that had replaced the Annex:
The change from the “Annex” to the College, though not strikingly evident, is vital. The measures taken in May and June, 1894, by the President and Fellows of Harvard College, “constitute a complete guarantee by Harvard University for all the instruction given, the examinations held, and the degrees conferred by Radcliffe College,” and this alliance with Harvard gives Radcliffe a strength and stability, a purpose and continuity, such as it did not have before.18

And yet, if a University is comprised in part of its faculty, it does seem strange that Radcliffe would call itself a College when it did not have a faculty of its own. As one of the compromises of its founding, Radcliffe was established as an administrative unit rather than an academic one. Thus, the only way to “guarantee” that a Radcliffe education had credibility, as this report emphasizes, was to attach itself to the academic credentials of Harvard. Though Radcliffe was a separate College, with its own President and its own Dean, its status – and its certificates of graduation – were conferred by Harvard. There existed a delicate balance for Radcliffe: a pseudo-independence as a College that was still truly dependent upon Harvard for all of its academic resources, standards, methods, and policies.

The co-ordinate nature of the relationship meant that Radcliffe benefited from Harvard’s rich resources, reputation, and long storied history. It also meant that it inherited Harvard’s policies, prejudices, and problems. Just as the two institutions shared their benefits and drawbacks in this arrangement, so did the student populations within them. While the positive certainly outweighed the negatives in this co-ordinate relationship, there was one area in which Radcliffe would endeavor to take the best of Harvard’s lessons learned, to prevent the compromises of its founding from compromising the growth of the new institution, and to turn a corner on the less promising policies of Harvard in the 19th century: those policies governing admissions.

18 Radcliffe College Dean’s Report within Harvard, 1894-95, p. 251, sequence 3462.
Gertrude Stein was an emblematic student for this delicate institutional balance of taking the best of Harvard and leaving the worst behind. Stein had not received the college-prep courses that would allow her to pass her entrance exams, passing only three of seven exams before beginning her classes in the fall of 1893. It wasn’t until after she had completed her entire Radcliffe education that she passed her Latin entrance exam (in 1898), an observation that had long intrigued me in biographical accounts of her education in Cambridge. Why was Stein accepted to this school without the necessary training, and why was she permitted a Radcliffe education before passing the exams to allow her to be there? Two words: Gertrude Stein was a “Special Student.

**Gertrude Stein, Special Student**

The Special Student is often decried as a mere circumventor of admission examinations, unpresentable at the front door of the College, but, for the sake of his tuition-fee, cheerfully admitted at the back. It is worth while, therefore, to show why he exists, what he has been, and what he is.

- Harvard Annual Report, 1894-1895

My inquiry into the Special Student populations at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 19th century began with the observation of a single word in the header of Gertrude Stein’s first essay from English 22, Daily Themes. Stein was in her second year at Radcliffe College in the fall of 1894. The header was hand-written by Stein in ink in the upper right of the theme, and what interested me was her name:

```markdown
English 22
Gertrude Stein Special
October 10, 1894
Theme I
```

---

19 *Harvard*, 1894-95, p. 81, sequence 3292.
20 For facsimile of this header, see Appendix B.
The word that caught my attention was “Special.” “Gertrude Stein Special.” What did that mean? To Stein? To her writing instructor? To the institution? This “Special” is not a one-off occurrence, but a constant in the forty-seven themes she preserved from this course. And yet, few biographers note this detail, and those who report it offer no explanatory details on this marker of her undergraduate life and education. Elizabeth Sprigge, writing Stein’s biography in 1957 – before feminist criticism had enabled critics to turn more attentively and effectively to Stein’s writing as opposed to her fascinating life – provides the fullest apocryphal account of Stein’s admission to the Harvard Annex as a “special”:

There are several stories of how Gertrude Stein came to be accepted as a student. She knew no Latin, which was required for normal entry, but could read German and French and was above the average in knowledge of English literature and general history. Some say that when asked for her qualifications she bluffed about the examinations she had passed, never having sat for one. Others that she simply wrote to the authorities asking to be admitted as a special student so as to be near her brother. In any case her entrance was granted …

---

21 For example, Barbara Wineapple, in Sister Brother: Gertrude and Leo Stein (1996), identifies this class of Special Students at the Harvard Annex (in parentheses below), having remarked in the previous paragraph that Stein was admitted as one:

When Gertrude Stein moved to Cambridge in the fall of 1893, the Harvard Annex was in its fourteenth year of operation. The Annex, founded in 1879, when President Eliot made his Harvard faculty available to those women who could pass the school’s entrance examinations, by Stein’s first year enrolled about 250 students, a hundred of whom were taking a full undergraduate load. (A great many young women came and went as special students.) In 1894, the Annex was chartered as Radcliffe College … (54)

Wineapple is incorrect in stating that women needed to pass the school’s entrance exams in order to study with the Harvard faculty, an especially relevant point, given that Stein herself had not done so, and that being a Special Student gave her this access. As Specials, women were granted the same access to the Harvard faculty teaching their courses as the men in 1879, whether or not they passed their entrance exams. It is true, however, that women were permitted “certificates” from Harvard as early as 1874, if they were able to pass the final examinations given to the Harvard men. One final note: Radcliffe was chartered in December of 1893 by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the act signed by the legislature in mid-March of 1894, and signed by the Governor on March 23rd, 1894. The final acts of its founding were by the President and Fellows of Harvard College in May and June of 1894 (Radcliffe Regent’s Report, 1894, p. 15, sequence 17; and Radcliffe Dean’s Report in Harvard, 1894-1895, p. 251, sequence 3462).

22 Elizabeth Sprigge, Gertrude Stein: Her Life And Work (New York: Harper Brothers, 1957), 23. See also Rosalind S. Miller, Gertrude Stein: Form and Intelligibility (1949); Donald Sutherland, Gertrude Stein (1951); Richard Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces (1970); Jane Palatini Bowers, Gertrude Stein (1993). None of these biographers of Stein’s life and work make mention of her status as a Special Student when she was an undergraduate at Radcliffe. Bridgman devotes much of the opening section of his book to Stein’s writing in English 22 as well as the broad sweep of her undergraduate life at Radcliffe with nary a mention of how she got there. Most surprising, however, is Miller’s omission of Stein’s special status, since her book is the only
With the benefit of intervening research, we can say with confidence that Sprigge was accurate with most of these stories, with the exception of Stein having “bluffed” her way into admission to the Annex. She may very well have written to the authorities requesting admission as a Special Student. What is not included in Sprigge’s account, however, is that 155 other young ladies were also admitted in the same year as Special Students. Stein was in no way unique in her acceptance; in fact, as a “Special” she was in the majority of female students accepted to study in Cambridge that year. It was not “in any case” that these women were admitted. It was by a policy that Radcliffe had adopted from Harvard by the circumstances of its own founding as a co-ordinate institution.

But even some of the women who attended with Stein did not understand this route into admission at Radcliffe, or the privileges, responsibilities, or burdensome history that it might have carried. For one of Stein’s Radcliffe peers (writing a memorial tribute to Stein in 1946), being a “special student” – or perhaps, in retrospect, just being Gertrude Stein – meant that there were no rules, no curricular constraints, only access to the great geniuses in the psychology department at Harvard, and the inevitable academic success which should result:

She came to Radcliffe in 1893, at the age of nineteen, to be near her brother Leo, who was studying at Harvard, and to share in the sort of education he was getting. . . . . As a special student, Gertrude Stein seems to have been admitted almost at once to courses designed for graduate students, and much of her work was done in small groups, in laboratories at Harvard. History, Philosophy, and psychology were her major interests especially experimental psychology as it was beginning under Professor Munsterberg. . . . William James was a great friend of hers, and it was by his advice that she decided to take the course in medicine at Johns Hopkins, as a preparation for further study of psychology.23

---

22 Currently published source – besides this dissertation – for Stein’s undergraduate themes in English.
Being a special student “seems” to have brought to Stein these privileges, but there is uncertainty here, too, about how she was able to do what she did; less a circumstance of administrative oversight (or the lack thereof) than of the fog surrounding this class of students, and around these academic “privileges” – none of which were unique to Stein – for which Stein was remembered in this Radcliffe article. As a memorial tribute to Stein upon her death, this recollection is colored with an awe for the Gertrude Stein of the 20th century, the one who had become worthy of such a tribute, not simply a memory of the Gertrude Stein of the late 19th century, the Annex Girl, the Radcliffe Woman. If Stein were a special student, this suggests, then there must have been something exceptional about it.

Gertrude Stein, by those who love her, is often considered the greatest authority on her own life, not surprisingly, as much of the apocrypha surrounding her was perpetuated by herself. In her stories in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, and *Everybody’s Autobiography*, she addresses at some length her enjoyment of the social life in Cambridge, as well as her investment in the tutelage of William James, Hugo Münsterberg, and others creating the field of Psychology in the Philosophy Department at Harvard; but she is silent about her admission to Radcliffe, and also circumspect about her courses, English 22 and English C, the only courses from which she saved her student work for posterity.24 As for her status and academic performance as a Special Student at Radcliffe and her advancement and credentialing, we have only the following nugget:

There were no difficulties except that Gertrude Stein had never passed more than half of her entrance examinations for Radcliffe, having never intended to take a degree. However with considerable struggle and enough tutoring that was accomplished and Gertrude Stein entered Johns Hopkins Medical School.25

---

24 Stein references her first theme from English 22 in *Everybody’s Autobiography*, 157.
As with many claims Stein makes in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, there is truth here, but there is more truth than she tells. The fact is that Stein did not have the preliminary education from Oakland High School – Latin and/or Greek – that would have made her viable as a “regular” Radcliffe student. The only way in which she was permitted to enroll was as a Special Student and this because she had not been prepared for a college education of the sort offered at Harvard, like the majority of her female peers. Indeed, as she suggests, she did not take courses as an undergraduate that would give her access to a degree, instead following her interests as she chose, taking mostly psychology courses, and significantly, by-passing English A, the required composition course for all regular first-year students at Harvard and Radcliffe. Only upon following the advice of William James did she jump through the hoops necessary to acquire her Radcliffe degree and enter John Hopkins as a medical student – and this after she had finished all of her Radcliffe coursework. A note on her Radcliffe transcript confirms this order of events as follows: “Miss Stein passed admission examination sept. 1893 in English El & adv German and History; in June and Sept 1895 in Elementary Algebra, Geometry and English A – A; in Sept 97 in Elementary Latin B. Received the A.B. degree M.C.L. 1898.”

Remember that these are entrance exams, not graduation exams; that Stein passed these (even with a score of “A” in English A and “B” in Elementary Latin) did not mean she was exempt from them, but that she was qualified to enroll in them.

Her transcript confirms the details of the academic trajectory, but does not explain why she was taking “admission examinations” for the duration of her tenure at Radcliffe.

---

26 NB: Stein took her English A entrance exam in September 1895, four months following her completion of English 22 in May of 1895. English A was technically a prerequisite for English 22, and a requirement for all graduates.

Neither do these archival sources or the biographers explain the connection between the graduated entrance exams and this designation as a “special student.” These curious circumstances about Stein’s undergraduate record and curriculum deserve explanation: firstly, what did it mean institutionally that Gertrude Stein was a Special Student at Radcliffe? Secondly, how was it that she was permitted to take her entrance exams to Radcliffe during and even following the completion of all her coursework? Thirdly, how did she enroll in English 22, when the pre-requisite for that course was English A – the required freshman composition course of all Harvard and Radcliffe undergraduates – a course she never took? Though these details had all been noted as discrete aspects of Stein’s undergraduate life, they had not been connected in Steinian scholarship.

As I began the research for my dissertation, I believed that these questions concerning Stein’s undergraduate academic record could only be explained by her status as a Special. Answering them would provide insight into Stein as an emblematic late 19th-century female student in Cambridge. Connecting these answers would also enrich our understanding of Stein’s relationship to academe before she intended to complete her degree, to become a college graduate. Most importantly, however, for our 21st-century understanding of the Gertrude Stein from the 20th century, these years as a Special Student at Radcliffe captured her at the beginning of her recorded writing life, but before she claims to have intended to become a writer. We have in the Daily Themes Stein wrote for her Sophomore English 22 course, and the educational context around them, an opportunity to explore the institutional circumstances that contributed to Stein’s early life as a student, and to dig more deeply into her first experiences being a writer.
That one word on Stein’s first Daily Theme, “Special,” this series of questions, and my desire to connect the answers, led me into the archives of Presidential Reports for Harvard and Radcliffe, and into the long and problematic history of this population of students to whom Gertrude Stein belonged, called with delightful inconsistency “Special Students” (both capitalized and not), “University students,” “unmatriculated students,” and the unwieldy but descriptive, “Students not candidates for a degree.” As I traced the history of this student population from 1825 – the statutory year of their birth at Harvard – to 1895 – the year of Stein’s English 22 course – from Harvard’s professional schools, to Harvard College, and finally to Radcliffe, I noticed that my reconstruction of their presence at the University did not always match the institutional memory as reflected in subsequent annual reports. In one table representing their growth from 1828-1884, for example, almost a decade of statistics for “students not candidates for a degree” appeared to be missing, left completely off the chart.28 These were years in which I had already confirmed – from reports of these missing years – that students were enrolled as Specials. Why would there be such apparent institutional confusion, such selective annual reporting of numbers, with a population of students whose presence was noted annually in distressed, then optimistic, and fundamentally over time, conflicted, reports? And what effect, if any, did this class of students and Stein’s place in it have on our understanding of Stein’s undergraduate education, on her enrollment, her experiences at Radcliffe, and the development of her writing in English 22? We begin our study of Stein’s writing life with this composition course because Stein began here. She saved for posterity none of her student work from her eight Philosophy courses with William James and the other Harvard luminaries with whom she studied Psychology. She did, however, save about half of her daily themes from English 22. They comprise the most

28 This table from the Harvard Report of 1884 is reproduced in my appendices.
complete set of her student work, a self-selected archive from the course where she began to write.

* * * * * *

This is where our introduction ends, and the formal chapters begin: chronicling the pre-history of Stein’s attendance at Radcliffe in order to tell the history of her writing life from its formal beginnings in college. Our goal, as manifest in the title of this dissertation, is to understand “The Making of Gertrude Stein” as a consequence, in part, of her reading and writing life at Radcliffe. I offer up in the following chapters an educational history of one of America’s great modernist writers embedded in the institutional history of her alma mater. This involves archival research into the Presidential Reports of Harvard and Radcliffe, and the student-enrollment policies that were driving the growth of undergraduate and graduate education in the late 19th century (chapters 1 and 2). It involves digging into the history of English Composition in America during the same period of massive growth, a history which has previously focused almost exclusively on male education as it emanated from Harvard and reverberated throughout higher education into the 20th century. It involves writing the history of women’s education into English Composition such that Harvard’s influence becomes, by necessity, the influence of Harvard-Radcliffe (chapter 3). It involves, finally, observing how the lack of these scholarly contexts has made us poorer in our understanding of Gertrude Stein and her writing, both as a student, and as an adult (chapter 4). We conclude our chapters with my reading of the daily themes Stein wrote as a Sophomore, to offer up a compositionist’s analysis of what Stein was being taught by her professors in English 22, and also, what she was learning from them (chapter 5). In my conclusion, I bring together the two disciplinary approaches that have taken on Stein’s daily themes from English 22 over the
decades, offering up mini-essays from the modernist and compositionist perspectives on Stein’s student writing, and on the transitional period of writing that followed her departure from academe. I leave the last word to Gertrude Stein herself, connecting through her own writings from the 1920s, 30s and 40s, a clear through-line back to her writing in English 22, where she first was constrained by the rules of grammar, the tyranny of punctuation, and given the fundamental idea of a daily writing life. By delivering up these rich contexts, we can see more clearly that Stein’s writing life began while she was a student, not simply as a result of her psychological training, but because of her experience in her Sophomore writing course, English 22, Daily Themes. It was here that she first saved her ink on paper. It is here – at Radcliffe in English 22 under the direction of her composition professors – we must acknowledge that she began her writing life.

All students are products on some level of the institutions they attend, Gertrude Stein included. Likewise, educational institutions – for all their self-determination by the culture and knowledge of the faculty – are shaped over time by the students who attend them, who graduate, and who represent them to the public and to future generations of students. At the most basic level, we can say that the serendipitous establishment of Radcliffe College allowed Stein to pursue her education in Cambridge alongside her brother, but that is only part of the story. Two specific institutional factors made possible her attendance at Radcliffe and her successful advancement to a degree in 1898. The first was the long and checkered history of the class of Special Students at Harvard, our primary focus in chapter 1. The second, which I also address in the first chapter, was Harvard’s elective curricular reform of the 1870s and 1880s. These two polices paved the way for Stein’s psychologically-rich and English-language-poor education in Cambridge. Gertrude Stein was a Special Student at
Radcliffe. Radcliffe was a product of Harvard. In order to understand fully what that means for Stein and her Special Student cohort in the 1890s, we begin at the beginning, the statutory history of Special Students at Harvard. Before we return to the origin, consider once more the epigraph that began this section, written during the very year that “Gertrude Stein Special” took her English 22, Daily Themes, course:

The Special Student is often decried as a mere circumventor of admission examinations, unpresentable at the front door of the College, but, for the sake of his tuition-fee, cheerfully admitted at the back. It is worth while, therefore, to show why he exists, what he has been, and what he is.

- Harvard Annual Report, 1894-1895
Chapter 1 – In Through the Back Door: Special Students at Harvard University

Introduction

The history of Special Students[^1] at Harvard in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century is complicated because of the wide diversity of students that comprised the class: from ne’er-do-wells with wealthy parents, to poor but eager students lacking college preparation, to college graduates from Harvard and other institutions pursuing advanced studies. That any single class of students could encompass such a wide variety of capabilities and ambitions is at the root of the complications, and can be attributed to the faculty, administration, and Overseers of Harvard University. In this chapter, I will sort out these various populations of Special Students and their respective relationships with the institution as Harvard grew from the oldest and most prestigious American College to one of the first German-model Universities in the United States. If we are observing the role of students in this transformation – either as passive recipients of education or active agents during a period of great educational change – it is no understatement that Special Students as a class were at the center of the exponential and sometimes-compromised growth of the graduate and professional schools; and on the other side of the equation, were responsible – with their individual and collective flaws and strengths – for moving the administration to implement some of its best undergraduate policies and reforms of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century: uniform admissions standards, undergraduate academic advising, the elective system, and Radcliffe College.

[^1]: For clarity on this term “Special Students” I take the following approach in this dissertation. When the term refers to the category of students at Harvard or Radcliffe, I treat it as a proper noun and use upper case. The same is true for other classes of student, such as Freshman, Sophomore, etc. When the term is used as an adjective, for example in the phrases “special student policies” and “special student status,” I use lower case. When quoting from the Harvard and Radcliffe reports, the phrase is not consistent in its orthography, as I note later in this chapter. For all quotations from the Harvard-Radcliffe archives, I retain the original.
The Establishment of the Lawrence Scientific School in 1846

Just as the Lawrence Scientific School, established for persons unable or unwilling to get into Harvard College, promptly justified itself by the intellectual distinction of its early graduates, so the body of Special Students may already point out among its members men worth all the labor expended on them – and, what is more, all the labor expended on their incompetent mates.

- Harvard Annual Report, 1894-1895

The category of “Special Students” at Harvard is linked historically with the establishment of the Lawrence Scientific School in the mid-19th century. Lawrence began essentially as a professional school, but over several decades most of its functions were assumed by Harvard College. It was the original home of advanced chemistry, natural history, and geology, and, importantly, was “the only department in which the kind of student now called ‘special’ was received.” This class of Special Students held a unique role in Lawrence’s introduction of advanced courses into the curricular offerings, the gradual adoption of the “elective system” in the 1870s, and the eventual absorption of the Lawrence School into the College, as these students – who registered in Lawrence as “special students,” but indeed were taking most of their classes in Harvard College – were gradually permitted to register directly in the College. With the expansion of the elective system which allowed College students also to take courses in the Scientific School, the two eventually merged in the late 19th century. The historical permeability

---

2 1894-95 was the year of Stein’s English 22 course, focus of my chapter 5.
3 Harvard, 1885-86, page 15, sequence 1346.
4 The details of this ‘merge’ are complicated by financial, academic, and institutional contingences; for example, the preservation of the $50,000 endowment that established the School’s science focus for perpetuity; the movement of students across the disciplinary boundaries of the university; the spotty performance of those students as representatives of Lawrence; the creation of a Graduate Department in 1872 to administer all doctoral and masters candidates; and lastly in the 19th century, the creation of the Graduate School in 1890, the merging of faculties from Lawrence and Harvard College into the FAS, and
between these two institutional entities was a consequence as much of student enrollment policy and curricular reform, as of the missions of the schools themselves. The history of Special Students – their relationship with faculty, with their Harvard College peers, and with the growth of an institution from College to University – is a lesson in the complexity, and pitfalls, of student management in the modern university. It also provides a rich backdrop to Gertrude Stein’s education, and for women’s education at Radcliffe.

The first “special students” – so denoted – were reported in the Chemistry department’s annual report to the President in 1846, and over the next ten years increased in numbers in the School, significantly enlarging the departments of zoology and mathematics. Administrators anticipated hiring a new Professor of Engineering to accommodate the increase in Special Students in that field as well. These students were considered “specialists” in these fields, and their designation as “special students” was meant to indicate a high level of competency and narrowness in their curriculum. Because of this specialization, they were distinct from undergraduates in Harvard College who, at that time, followed a prescribed education, dominant in American colleges until the 1870s, and resonant with their founding as colonial institutions.5 As a population, Special Students in the Lawrence School were alternately grouped with the Seniors in the College – because they shared advanced work in the disciplinary fields of chemistry, zoology, mathematics – and with the professional schools – “theological students,” “law

---

students” and “students attending Medical Lectures” – because of their narrow focus as “science students” on similar terms with graduate and professional students. The main difference between Lawrence students and law, divinity, or medical students was that Lawrence students did not come as college graduates with an undergraduate degree in hand. Lawrence was a “new and interesting establishment,” in part because the population of students itself was an administrative innovation: notably, these students did not require a college degree to pursue their “advanced” studies, neither were they subject to the same admissions requirements as “regular” undergraduates in Harvard College, those admitted to the prescribed curriculum. The category of “specialist” served to justify a more narrow preparation than was expected of Harvard College undergraduates, who were required to demonstrate proficiency in Greek, Latin and mathematics, courses that were, perhaps surprisingly, not considered essential to study the sciences at that time.

The 1847 report to the President and Overseers of the University, where “special students” are first described at length, alternates between institutionally marking them as “Special Students,” a distinct category with capitalization suggesting an administrative function for a discrete and established group of students, and simply as “special students” who specialize in the sciences. They were an experimental population in flux in a new School, providing the leadership with a means for growth, and reason for optimism.

---

7 The study of science at Lawrence was to promote “advanced and systematic instruction in the practical sciences, as they are sometimes called” (*Harvard*, 1846-47, page 7, sequence 794). The Lawrence School was to provide a public and private good by increasing applied scientific knowledge, as distinct from a classical education. The President further describes the mission of the Lawrence School in his annual report to the Board of Overseers: “It was the object of the government of the University, in this way, to meet a want more and more felt in the community, – that of a place of systematic instruction in those branches of science which are more immediately connected with the great industrial interests of the country; such as Chemistry in its various applications to the arts of life; Engineering in its several departments; Zoölogy and Geology, with the other kindred branches of natural history” (*Ibid.*).
They had a newly-hired and powerful mentor in Professor Louis Agassiz, a clear academic and institutional mission, and the support of the President:

Thirteen or fourteen special students, principally in Chemistry, have been in attendance the present term; and a complete course of lectures on Zoology has been delivered by Professor Agassiz to a respectable class. The President confidently anticipates the resort of increasing numbers in these and the other departments of the [Lawrence Scientific] School, and the collection within its walls of a full representation of the intelligent young men of the country, preparing themselves by the most thorough training, not only to apply philosophical principles to the arts of life, and to explore the vast physical resources of the country, but to make the laws and mysteries of nature the subject of those original researches, which are necessary to give intellectual and moral dignity to the pursuit of science.

In his vision for the Lawrence School, the president identifies two overarching priorities: the “pursuit of science” and the “full representation of the intelligent young men of the country.” The science initiative is tied directly to regional expansion of Harvard’s reach, and to recruiting a new population of students whose focus will be different from that of the regular Harvard undergraduate. Such a new initiative required the support of a well-respected faculty member and Professor Agassiz fit the bill. There was a special relationship early on between the special students at Lawrence and Louis Agassiz, Professor of Geology and Zoology, and director of the museum of comparative zoology, where many of the special students in the Lawrence school were “employed in their

---

8 Agassiz was recruited from the Lyceum of Neuchautel in Switzerland to be Lawrence Scientific School’s first professor. He had been invited previously to speak on Zoology at the Lowell Institution. While at Harvard he was a tireless fundraiser, which was especially important in establishing the Museum of Comparative Zoology. Amongst his other notables: founding member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1863; named Regent of Smithsonian in 1863; and life-long opponent of Darwinian evolution, though his own research and writings were valuable to the field.

9 Harvard, 1847-1848, p. 12, sequence 854; italics mine. James Berlin also writes of the competition between private and public institutions for expanding access, noting that of privates, Johns Hopkins and Harvard were leaders in 19th century reform; that is, the public institutions of higher education were much more invested in expanding opportunities than the privates, Johns Hopkins and Harvard excepted. See James Berlin, Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges, 59.
several branches of study under the direction of the Professor” (a recurring phrase in
annual reports from late 1850s into the 1860s).

Louis Agassiz was more than a distinguished professor in the sciences. He was
also the husband of Elizabeth C. Agassiz, first President of Radcliffe College, and one of
its founders. Mrs. Agassiz served as President of Radcliffe for twenty-three years, from
its origins in 1879 as the “Harvard Annex” until 1902, when she was named honorary
President; she was also ex officio Chairman of the Executive Committee and a member
of the Academic Board charged with maintaining the academic standards of the women
admitted to Radcliffe. Professor Louis Agassiz’s involvement early on with Harvard’s
Special Students in the sciences gave credibility to the promise of this institutional
innovation, to the welcoming of a new “kind” of student to Harvard; and this
involvement was equally crucial when introducing women to the Harvard faculty a full
three decades later.¹⁰ Professor Agassiz’s expert role in shepherding through the new
special student population would serve the fledgling women’s college as well; as would
the many mistakes made, and lessons learned, in managing Harvard’s special student
population as it expanded, both in number and in kind of students. It is also worth noting,
by way of association, that one of Professor Agassiz’s junior colleagues at the Lawrence

¹⁰ Unlike many of his Harvard colleagues, Professor Agassiz was an early supporter of women’s education,
extending the resources of his laboratory to women when few were open to them. As described in the
Radcliffe report of 1893-94: “The provision for laboratories is also insufficient. The laboratory of Zoölogy
is, it is true, provided with a room in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, through the kindness of Mr.
Agassiz, and the classes in Geology have been permitted to enjoy advantages in the same building; but the
laboratories of Physics, Botany and Chemistry are both too small, and are deficient in apparatus” (p. 25,
sequence 27). Agassiz not only opened up his laboratory, he was also instrumental in the late 1880s in the
first publications of two women in advanced studies, Miss Mayo (1888) and Miss Henchman (1890): “both
were prepared at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, where the Director allows us a small Zoological
laboratory, conducted under the guidance of Dr. Mark. These papers showed very careful and thorough
investigation and were published by consent of Mr. Agassiz, in the Bulletin of the Museum with the
Contributions from the larger laboratories of the Museum itself” (Radcliffe, 1895-96, p. 9, sequence 11).
This early publishing opportunity paved the way for establishing a fund to publish more monographs of
Radcliffe’s advanced students.
School was none other than Charles W. Eliot, who would later become the most influential President of Harvard (1869-1909) overseeing the introduction of women to the resources of Harvard, and the subsequent establishment of Radcliffe College.\textsuperscript{11}

Within two years of the establishment of the Lawrence Scientific School, the number of Special Students in the sciences had more than doubled, and within four, had doubled yet again. In these first two years, however, the School was still determining the requirements for the degree, so these students were not yet in a “degree-granting” program. Attendant to this, the statistics for tracking the growth of the student population were, for the first three years (until 1849), given their own category within the University tracking of “students not candidates for a degree”: “Special Students in Chemistry and Mathematics.” In these first few years, there was direct overlap between the only population of Special Students at Harvard and “students not candidates for a degree.” The rapid growth under these arrangements proved an auspicious start for Lawrence: by 1851, “the success of the Scientific School, since the new arrangement, has thus far fully answered the expectations of its friends.”\textsuperscript{12} The growth and success of the new School, and its continued financial backing by friends and donors, were dependent in part upon the success of its students in the new program. As an experiment in expanding the opportunities and resources of Harvard, and focusing attention on the need for science education for the country, the early years boded well for everyone. In 1851, the first degree of Bachelor of Science was conferred upon graduates from the Scientific School. This meant, as well, that the overlap between those admitted as “Specials” and “non-

\textsuperscript{11} Eliot was not initially a supporter of women’s education in Cambridge. See Brereton, \textit{Origins of Composition Studies}, pages 6-7 for more on Eliot’s involvement, and for general information on the expansion of scientific knowledge in American Colleges from 1870-1900.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Harvard}, 1850-1851, p. 5, sequence 979.
degree status” became inconsistent with a portion of the students each year, but not all. With the success of the first graduates, then, the population of Specials within Lawrence began to encompass two different kinds of students in terms of their relationship with the institution.

With the conferral of the first degrees from Lawrence, the graduated Special Students were no longer included statistically in the counts of “students not candidates for a degree” (since they had graduated, and since Lawrence had then become a degree-granting School); and yet, all of these students at Lawrence were still being admitted as “Special Students.” Early on, the Lawrence Scientific School was almost completely populated by Special Students, “each one giving his whole time and attention to a single science.”13 This expansion of the program through the admission of new students continued through the 1850s and 1860s, until the student population at Lawrence plateaued at about 75 students. Even as the growth demonstrated a healthy School, the disconnection between “Special Students” and “students not candidates for a degree” perpetuated a grey area in the administration of the Lawrence Scientific School; that is, the students were considered Special Students, were granted degrees in applied fields, but there had not been established academic admissions standards for them as Special Students. They needn’t demonstrate proficiency or preparation in the sciences they were intending to pursue; even more incredibly, there were no curricular guidelines or restrictions on the course of study these students took once they arrived, even though a degree had been established to recognize their successful completion of a course of study. They did not even have to demonstrate an intention to take advanced studies in the sciences. The only standard of acceptance and continuation as a Special Student was a

13 Harvard, 1857-1858, p. 6, sequence 1298.
certification of “moral character.” While moral character is certainly desirable in those who pursue the expansion of science knowledge, it was clear that science-based policies governing the admission of Special Students were becoming necessary as the student population diversified and expanded within Lawrence, and as the credibility of science education was solidified in the curriculum.

When setting their student-admissions policies for Specials in the Lawrence School, it would have been useful for the faculty, the President and the Board of Overseers of the 1850s and 60s to look back to the origins of the Special Student; not to the establishment of the Lawrence School in 1846, when they were first called “Specials,” but to 1824, when this class of student was first proposed by Judge Joseph Story – Supreme Court Justice from 1811-1845 and Harvard alumnus – in a report to the Corporation and Board of Overseers of Harvard. In his prescient report of 1824, Judge Story first applied to Harvard as a fifteen-year-old and was denied admission because he lacked college preparation. He was apparently devastated, but after a period of home-study, reapplied and was

---

14 More on the specific relationship between “moral character” and Special Students in the next section. This certification of moral character has a fascinating broader history worth outlining briefly. “Moral character” and the certificate for entrance became codified in Harvard’s annual reports in the early- to mid-1800s, but its origins are in the colonial college with its clerical roots and emphasis on moral teachings. “Moral character” as voiced by Thomas Hill in his final report as President in 1869 gives a sense of that history. Not only was moral character central to admission, it was also the standard by which a student should be allowed to continue in his studies. President Hill opposed that a “student’s continued membership of College [be] contingent mainly on his annual examinations. In the judgment of the undersigned, every student who maintains a blameless moral character, attends College exercises regularly, and is not culpably negligent in the preparation of his lessons from day to day, should be permitted to remain undisgraced and unmolested” (Harvard, 1868-69, p. 7, sequence 1775). This institutional viewpoint changed under President Eliot in the 1870s and 80s, and was further eroded by the Dean of Radcliffe College, as we will explore in my chapter 2. President Eliot claimed in 1891-92, that “as protection to the College, the present requirement [of a certificate of moral character] is, in my judgment, worthless, – and worse than worthless, since it stands in the place of something good.” For the rest of President’s Eliot’s withering assessment of the failure of the certificate of moral character to produce useful student evaluation either at admission or during enrollment, and the role of the special student policies in providing a new format for these references, see Harvard, 1891-92, p. 82-83, sequence 3571-72. Finally, it is no coincidence that the end of “moral character” at Harvard College was declared by the Harvard President in 1893-1894, the year of Radcliffe’s founding: “At last the College has given up that specious but futile safeguard, the certificate of moral character” (Harvard, 1893-94, p. 89, sequence 3054). Special Students, both at Harvard and Radcliffe, were instrumental in shifting the focus on moral character for admissions to a systematic method of inquiry.

15 Judge Story first applied to Harvard as a fifteen-year-old and was denied admission because he lacked college preparation. He was apparently devastated, but after a period of home-study, reapplied and was
Story proposed admitting a new and diverse group of students from across the United States to specialize in science education at Harvard. This may appear to be exactly what happened with the establishment of the Lawrence School, twenty-two years later, when both Harvard and the country were ready for such a curriculum. But there were two fatal flaws with the execution of Story’s proposal, one by the Overseers in 1825, and the other by the Lawrence School in 1847: first, when the Overseers passed their 1825 statute allowing for “students not candidates for a degree,” they severed the formal link with the sciences proposed by Judge Story; and second, the 1825 statute that allowed for the admission of these students to the University was repealed in 1847 as soon as the promise of the Lawrence Scientific School was realized. The consequences of these two changes reverberated through the University and through the Special Student population for the remainder of the century. To understand how and why this mechanism unfolded as it did, let’s turn now to how it began in 1824 with Judge Story’s report.

**Judge Joseph Story and the Special Student Statute of 1825**

Though “special students” were first recorded in 1846 in the Scientific School, the statutory history of Special Students at Harvard began in 1824, in a report by Judge Joseph Story that, significantly, also introduced the idea of the elective system, whereby students would have more flexibility in choosing their courses and determining their curriculum. Here is the provision in Judge Story’s report (as quoted in the Harvard Annual Report of 1883-1884) which gave rise to the concept of “special students” and the reality of the Lawrence Scientific School:

accepted to Harvard College. He graduated second in his class. He was appointed to the Supreme Court at the age of 32. He remains the youngest appointee and the longest-serving junior justice.
“With the view of meeting the demands of our country for scientific knowledge in the mechanical and useful arts, the Committee further propose, that provision should be made for the admission and instruction of students in the University, who may not wish to receive a degree, but to pursue some particular studies to qualify them for scientific and mechanical employments, and the active business of life. Such students to have a right to choose their own studies, and upon passing through the regular, prescribed course with the approbation of the Government, to be entitled to a certificate stating their character and qualifications.”

Following Story’s provision, the allowance for these “students in the University” was clearly for advancement in the sciences, and called for curricular freedom (“a right to choose their own studies”) in order to do so within the curricular confines of the early 19th-century American College. The connection between the admission of these students and what would later be called the “elective” or “voluntary” system was on the table for discussion, with what appeared to be an educational purpose and reasonable blueprint.

And yet, it took half a century for elective reforms to be gradually adopted at Harvard in the 1870s; and it took twenty-two years for Harvard to implement Story’s vision for increasing scientific knowledge for the betterment of the country through the Lawrence School. The admission of students to the University “who may not wish to receive a degree,” however, was implemented within only one year, and with two devastating alterations from Story’s proposal. The statute adopted by the Corporation and Overseers in 1825 removes the impetus towards the sciences, and also the passage about “passing through the regular, prescribed course with the approbation of the Government,” thus opening the University in 1826 to any male student satisfying the following broad, and non-academically-based criteria:

“The University is open to persons who are not candidates for a degree and who desire to study in particular departments only: Provided that such persons have a good moral character; that their previous acquisitions be such as are now

16 Judge Story’s Report, May 4th, 1824 in Harvard, 1883-84, p. 25, sequence 959; italics mine.
demanded of students before admission, so far as the studies proposed to be pursued shall require; and that they be subject to all laws of the University in regard to diligence and good conduct.”¹⁷

In this rendering, the first sentence establishes a fundamental link between specificity of study and not being a candidate for a degree. This is obviously incompatible with the establishment of a degree-granting School such as Lawrence, a fact we will revisit in a moment. But there were two clauses even more crucial to the future of Special Students at Harvard: first, “that their previous acquisitions be such as are now demanded of students before admission, so far as the studies proposed to be pursued shall require.” This did not mean that these students needed to satisfy the admissions requirements of matriculated students. Rather, it meant that if a student could satisfy the demands of the individual faculty member teaching the course, the student could enroll in that course. Any sense of uniform academic “standards” by the College or University for these students was eliminated with the second part of that clause. If a student could demonstrate proficiency – it’s not clear what kind – to an individual faculty member, he could attend Harvard. Secondly, the course of study was not directed towards the sciences, as Judge Story’s proposal had been conceived. The specificity here is not disciplinary, but merely restrictive, and not even that restrictive, since a student could study in different “particular departments” each semester. The effect was to allow students access to Harvard College in 1826 who otherwise would have been prevented academically from attending. The only institutionally regulated criterion in this Statute was “good moral character.” This was clearly a first step towards applied or professional study in the undergraduate liberal arts College. The question of whether this was also a bold stroke towards democratization of the college student body decades before its rise

¹⁷ Ibid., from the “Code of Statutes and Laws” adopted in 1825 by the Corporation and Overseers.
nationally, or whether it was an open invitation to the unqualified and wealthy, would play itself out in reports through the rest of the 19th century and well into the 20th.  

But the immediate affect on student enrollment was nil. The reality in 1826 was that students did not respond to this opening in great numbers following the statute, although the institution began recording a handful of students in the first year of its implementation. They were called at that time “students not candidates for a degree” or “University students,” and averaged only 3 students a year in Harvard College from 1825-1847, when statistics about these students began to appear in the annual reports for the Lawrence Scientific School. Given the limited numbers, it’s not surprising that little is written about these students in the twenty-two years preceding the establishment of Lawrence. The only indication of how they were received during the pre-Lawrence years was recorded decades later in 1883, where it was reported that throughout this early history (1825-1847), University students “felt themselves in a position of inferiority and the College as a whole, officers and students, did not much regard them.” The context for this assessment was a comprehensive history of the administration of Special Students at Harvard back to its origins in the 1825 statute. Judge Story’s vision was prescient, but, by my read, the execution was poor from the very start. The 1825 statute was an initial

---

18 The egalitarian impulse was certainly present as early as 1825. Story’s vision was supported by prominent figures at Harvard and in Cambridge who saw a benefit to society, and to Harvard, of opening up its educational opportunities more broadly. Professor George Ticknor, for example, believed it the “duty and the interest of a large institution like Cambridge [Harvard] to meet [the demand] for a liberal education for many persons in all classes of the community; to make its resources minister freely to a much wider usefulness than is now thought of; and to extend effectual instruction to portions of society that now never resort there; for, while it is conferring all these benefits, it will, of course, be increased in the number of its students, and be strengthened in the interests and good will of the community, by having its basis so much more broadly and firmly laid in the very constitution of our society” (Harvard, 1883-84, p. 25, sequence 959).

19 It would be interesting, though beyond the scope of this chapter, to explore the internal and external reasons for this lack of growth between 1825-1847.

20 See appendices for special student enrollments at Harvard from 1828-1883, as recorded in the Harvard annual report of 1883-84.

failure for a number of reasons: first of all, because the students did not come; it was an opportunity largely ignored, and for those who accepted it, it was an invitation to attend Harvard College as outsiders to the undergraduate community. Secondly, the 1825 statute did not realize any of the educational potential of Judge Story’s proposal, and did not seem even to benefit the small population of under-appreciated students who availed themselves of it. And yet, the administration did nothing during those twenty-two years to amend the statute. The student numbers were so limited that there was no institutional benefit or risk associated with their presence, and so little reason to respond. They were a small, benign population. More importantly, their numbers remained limited because there was no academic coherence to their presence, and no incentive for their increase: they were dispersed throughout Harvard College, following no prescribed curriculum, and divorced from the degree, a population offering nothing towards healthy institutional growth either from within or from beyond. The numbers were insignificant, however, and though the 1825 statute was serving neither individual nor institution effectively, the scale made it easy to ignore.

**Opening the Back Door: Repeal of the 1825 Statute**

When did the university take notice and begin using the potential for this category of student? The establishment of the Lawrence Scientific School in 1846 reinstated Judge Story’s initial ideal of a science-oriented student population, and shifted that population to a new School, removing them – ostensibly – from Harvard College. But here is when they made their second institutional miscalculation – not with the science initiative, which was just being revived, but with the management of the “special students” that
populated it. The 1825 statute allowing for “students not candidates for a degree” (here called “University students”) was repealed in 1847, the reasons being given: “first, that the number of University students had at all times been small, and that the greater number of them had been young men who were desirous of entering College, but were not fit; and secondly, that the foundation of the Scientific School had made ample provision for the class of young men supposed to have been originally contemplated when the statute was adopted.” Put plainly, by 1847, the poorly devised 1825 statute had become the “back door” policy whereby unqualified students could take courses at Harvard College. But the numbers were small, and the Scientific School seemed to solve the problem by shifting them out of the College, while fulfilling the original intentions of the statute. The benefit for Lawrence was obvious: it renewed the ideal of specialization by instituting a scientific school with a mandate and an endowment of $50,000, and so invested this student population with needed academic focus and an institutional purpose. It also limited these students’ access to Harvard College courses. At least in theory. But at its founding, there was no procedure governing the admission of Special Students to the Lawrence School either, no official policy to compel them to restrict their education to the sciences, or in fact, to prevent them from taking Harvard College courses. This provided for a more defined and yet unhinged population, nominally affiliated with the Lawrence School, and nominally pursuing advanced studies in the sciences, but with no institutional leverage to insist upon these arrangements. With the repeal of the 1825

---

22 Ibid.; italics mine. It may be noticed from the frequent references that the report of 1883-84 is particularly rich in history about this population of students. Simply put, this was a watershed year for assessment in the Eliot administration brought on by recent expansions in the professional schools and graduate programs, elective reforms, and even more restructuring on the horizon: the 1890 creation of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and, especially as regards the scrutiny of Special Students, the founding of Radcliffe College in 1894.
Special Student Statute in 1847, Harvard was unwittingly opening up a back door through the Lawrence School; not as a means to end the admission of Special Students, but as an opportunity to come in increasing numbers and with no management policy in place.

This is how things stood for Special Students in the 1850s and 1860 as the population grew: most of the Special Students at Harvard were localized at Lawrence, and, they were the dominant population for that School. Some of these students had been shifted from Harvard College, where they had previously been taking classes as unmatriculated students under the 1825 Statute. At Lawrence, they were to specialize in the sciences, but did not require a college degree to attend for advanced studies; those categorized as “special” were unmatriculated, meaning also that they did not have to pass the entrance exams required for Harvard College admission, nor did they have to carry a full course load. They could take one course per semester if they wished. Those who followed the degree program did eventually have to satisfy the changing and expanding requirements for a Lawrence degree, but they, too, were considered “special students” in the sense that they were pursuing advanced studies in the sciences without undergraduate degrees. So there is confusion brewing in the growth of the 1850 and 1860s about what “special student” really means as a marker for students attending or advancing through Harvard. Add to this that the statute allowing for their presence in the university had been repealed in 1847 and, without resolution about who these students were and why they were attending Harvard, the institution had the makings of a long-term problem.

What is most important here is that the repeal of the special student statute allowing for the enrollment of Special Students did not result in their gradual disappearance. In fact, the absence of a rule about their presence led to an expansion of
their numbers as “special students,” a kind of inertia born of the mutually beneficial relationship between student and institution: on the one hand the need for institutional growth and an investment in the public good; and on the other, the individual interest in a Harvard education on whatever terms were available. At this time, the only school within Harvard system truly affected by this was the Lawrence School, but that would change as the university grew as well, and grow it did, dramatically, under Charles W. Eliot, who became Harvard’s president in 1869. Eliot was familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the class of Special Students, having taught individuals in the Lawrence School along with his colleague, Louis Agassiz. He was also a bold leader, one who would transform a failed student management policy into a vehicle for expanding the institution. Rather than containing the student population at Lawrence, Eliot’s administration oversaw the admission of Special Students beyond the Lawrence School, opening the back door first to young men pursuing studies in the Divinity School, then in the Law School, and finally in Harvard College. Before the decade was over, the Special Student population would also include an entire class of students who were all but inconceivable to Judge Story and the formulators of the 1825 statute: women.

**Opening the Door Wider: Special Students Beyond Lawrence. Divinity School, Law School, Harvard College … Women’s College?**

It is useful to note right here that this class of students I’m calling “Special” was identified at various times between 1825-1884 the following: “special students,” “University students” (taken from Judge Story’s report), “unmatriculated students,” and “Students not candidates for a degree.” All of these names referred to the *same class of students* – wherever they may have been enrolled in the university and all present under
the same fundamental university provisions – which, not surprisingly, created a challenge in managing them as a group. This may have been just the point: the shifting monikers afforded maximum flexibility during periods of institutional change, especially as different Schools and departments began taking different tacks in handling Specials within their programs. During this period, the problem in “defining” or “refining” the student populations was not limited to the class of specials. In the 1870s during attempts to formalize the statutes of the university, the question of “who a student was” apparently proved so sticky across the Faculties of the University, that no new overriding statute could be agreed upon: “there was no attempt in the new statutes [of 1877] to define the term student, and there was no allusion in them to resident graduates not candidates for a degree, to unmatriculated students, to students attending the summer courses, or to Special Students in the Scientific and Divinity Schools, although these classes of persons were actually enrolled as members of the University when the new statutes were adopted.”

Thirty years after the repeal of the 1825 statute in 1847, there was still no statute, in 1877, allowing for the enrollment of these students; and yet, the university continued to expand their presence decade after decade.

In order to contextualize Special Students within the expansion of the university in the 1870s – and to track this mutually constitutive relationship between student and institution – this section focuses briefly on two additions to the Special Student population beyond the Lawrence Scientific School, and the impact each additional School population had on the history and future of specials under President Eliot’s tenure. First,

---

23 *Harvard*, 1883-84, p. 28, sequence 962; italics mine.
24 By “mutually constitutive relationship between student and institution” I mean, in short, that Harvard became a university through the admission of new classes of student; the Eliot administration expanded the student base to grow the institution, and Special Students were integral to this process.
I address the acceptance – and then exclusion – of Specials in the Divinity School, and the shift away from regarding special students as “specialists” within Harvard and towards regarding them as “uneducated”; secondly, I note their centrality in the population growth of the Law School, and the compromised academic standards that were the catalyst for the Law School to implement rigorous entrance examinations.25 As each institutional entity introduced Specials into their student population, the category grew wider, morphed according to the needs of each School within the university, and reflected increased polarization of the strengths and weaknesses of this population of students.

* * * * *

The first mention of “special students” outside the Lawrence Scientific School after 1846 was in the Divinity School report of 1871-1872, just a few years after professional school annual reports were disaggregated from the “President’s” report, which focused on the College. Until 1869-70 the “professional schools” were juxtaposed within the President’s report which contained them; after 1869, President Eliot’s inaugural year, each school presented its own discrete report, a small but significant signal of his administration’s commitment to establishing Harvard as a modern German-

---

25 The Medical School also admitted Special Students, but held the tightest rein on their selection, eliminating them completely by 1880. In the late 1880s when the university-wide concerns about Specials reached their height, the Medical School expressed their exclusionary policies of Specials as sound academic judgment, though they signal also an elitism unique to the Medical School: “The Medical School is completely protected by its admission examination against uneducated persons; because it does not admit special students, unless by vote of the Faculty in peculiar cases” (Medical in Harvard, 1886-1887, p. 18, sequence 1507). This direct statement pulls the veneer from the category, equating “uneducated” directly with “special” and suggests why the “problem” of Special Students at Harvard seemed to bubble up every 5-10 years from various units within the University, all of which must have had proponents of this viewpoint, even if their department did not adopt such an exclusionary policy.
model university.26 There were a number of differences between the Specials at Lawrence in the early 1870s, and the newly-admitted Specials to the Divinity School. First, unlike the Specials at Lawrence, who received full funding for their coursework, the Divinity School Special Students paid for their own educations, meaning that the “poor but eager students” that were invited into Lawrence were never part of the Divinity School’s population.28 Secondly, while the vast majority of Lawrence’s students were Specials, most of the Divinity School students were college graduates. This meant that the average Divinity School student had already completed four years of college education before pursuing his Divinity degree.

The lack of formal preparation of this special student minority stood out during the first exams, when “the examination papers of some special students were not so satisfactory as those of the students in regular course.”29 More importantly to the future of Divinity Specials was the conclusion based on this assessment: “This result is to be expected from the absence of trained power to receive and retain what is put before them in books and lectures.”30 In other words, the Divinity School connected lack of formal preparation to an inability to learn from formal methods; these students were not considered suited for the college classroom. This immediate response to the preparation and performance of the Divinity School’s Specials highlighted an important shift in the

---

26 Johns Hopkins was the first American university structured after the German model. See Rudolph, The American College and University, and Kitzhaber, Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900, for the transitional history from colonial college to German-model university in America.

27 In 1860, special students at Lawrence began to “receive their instruction gratuitously” – in other words, they were all on full scholarship – presumably because of the onset of the Civil War, and the desire to educate scientists. The issue of scholarship assistance is not central to this dissertation, but additional discussions of whether and how to provide financial support for Special Students can be found in Harvard, 1880-81, p. 17-18, sequence 489-90; and Harvard, 1882-83, p. 12-13, sequence 778-779.

28 In fact, at the Divinity School financial responsibility was leveraged as a dis-incentive for students to apply.

29 Divinity in Harvard, 1871-72, p. 56, sequence 2044.

30 Ibid.
rationale for their admission to a professional school for advanced studies. The Special Student isn’t recruited as a “specialist” in the Divinity School, but rather is identified on arrival as a person of inadequate training; and yet, the School invites these students with inadequate preparation – and specifically the inability to pass either entrance exams or to perform well on exams after some college training – to take courses as long as they can pay their own way, setting up an explicit pay-to-stay relationship with this population:

The existing regulations of the [Divinity] School permit any person of good ability and worthy aims, who may be unable to comply with the conditions of admission to the regular course, to enter the institution and get such benefit from its instructions as his imperfect preparation will allow. But it is the desire of the faculty to limit rather than enlarge the number of imperfectly prepared students called special, and to present every fair and honorable inducement to pupils to enter, if possible, and pursue the regular course. Accordingly, special students are made to depend for support mostly on their own resources or on aid obtained outside the Divinity School.31

It is in 1872, then, upon the Specials admission within the Divinity School, that the category moves from specialization within a field, to “special” as particularly unprepared and slow to learn as compared to their “regular course” peers in those special lines of study. This is not entirely surprising; regular Divinity students had college degrees already, and had been prepared for the specialization that distinguishes professional from undergraduate education. In this graduate environment, where specialization was, of course, the point, the rationale for the special student as “specialist” made no sense. This began the regulatory shift away from specialization as the main purpose for special student status, and towards admission outside of the standard course for those who were unprepared, but who may be able at some point to “pursue the regular course”; finally, the already specialized graduate environment took away that central academic point of

---

31 *Divinity in Harvard*, 1872-73, p. 59, sequence 2135.
special lines of study within an otherwise prescribed curriculum.\(^{32}\) This description of special students in the Divinity School effectively changes the definition that had been building for 25 years within the Scientific School.\(^{33}\)

The Divinity School, based upon its early experience with Specials, never allowed their population to rise to the numbers of Lawrence – averaging just 5 per year from 1871 until 1884. It was a small school, with a strong and stable graduate population. The minimal financial benefits Special Students could bring through tuition dollars were not worth the unnecessary compromise to the Divinity’s School’s academic standards. With no institutional incentive to grow their numbers, and after ten years of debate about the benefits to the students and the drawbacks for the School, the Divinity School began in 1881 to exclude special students “who lack the preliminary education necessary to enable them to profit by its teaching, and keep up with its classes.”\(^{34}\) Regarding its decision to exclude, the Divinity School report provides the following rationale:

> It must be admitted that this regulation in regard to special students is inconsistent with the general tendency in other departments of the University to open instruction to all comers; but the Divinity School requires some special protection, because it peculiarly needs a reasonable degree of homogeneousness in its small classes, and because it is liable to be seriously discredited by the crude public performances of incompetent young preachers, who can say with truth that they

---

\(^{32}\) I will address the prescribed vs. elective curriculum in the next section, but it is worth noting here that while Harvard College and the Lawrence Scientific School both adopted the elective system, the Divinity School did not; this means that there was an additional redundancy in accepting Specials to the Divinity School. Not only were they amongst an entire population of specialists, but there was no alternative coursework within the curriculum for them to pursue. As Divinity School Specials, they were merely taking fewer of exactly the same prescribed courses as their regular course peers, unless of course, they entered the Divinity School in order to attend classes at Harvard College: “As, owing to the small number of instructors, the elective system has not been introduced into the School, the position of the special student is the only one in which is found that freedom in choice and arrangement of work which the elective system offers to undergraduates” (Divinity in Harvard, 1879-80, p. 82, sequence 390).

\(^{33}\) I will address the prescribed vs. elective curriculum in the next section, but it is worth noting here that while Harvard College and the Lawrence Scientific School both adopted the elective system, the Divinity School did not; this means that there was an additional redundancy in accepting Specials to the Divinity School. Not only were they amongst an entire population of specialists, but there was no alternative coursework within the curriculum for them to pursue. As Divinity School Specials, they were merely taking fewer of exactly the same prescribed courses as their regular course peers, unless of course, they entered the Divinity School in order to attend classes at Harvard College: “As, owing to the small number of instructors, the elective system has not been introduced into the School, the position of the special student is the only one in which is found that freedom in choice and arrangement of work which the elective system offers to undergraduates” (Divinity in Harvard, 1879-80, p. 82, sequence 390).

\(^{32}\) Richard Miller notes that this may simply indicate that meaning has arisen out of context, a multi-contextual university that is in the process of forming itself, in part, out of its student body.

\(^{34}\) Divinity in Harvard 1881-1882, p. 27, sequence 643. This claim is contradicted, though, by a table in the Harvard 1883-84 report which shows Special Divinity Students in attendance from 1882-84 as well. I have included this table in the appendices to this dissertation.
are connected with the School, although it has no real responsibility for their quality.\textsuperscript{35}

It must be said, too, that the same concern arose at Harvard College a mere decade later. But the Divinity School took a particularly harsh approach. As a final expression of its disdain for the uneducated – and poor – who might enter by the special student door and detract from their academic credibility, the 1881-1882 Divinity School report states that because the tuition is so low, there is no way for the school “to afford any protection against the entrance of unsuitable persons.”\textsuperscript{36} If tuition were set higher, it could exclude the poor and, presumably uneducated, by default because of their inability to pay. This would, of course, still allow the wealthy and uneducated to become Divinity Students.

Raising tuition was not the chosen solution. After its ten-year experiment, Special Students were officially no longer welcomed at the Divinity School; the negatives of the individual students who would use this route for admission outweighed the positives they could bring to the institution including increased revenue. The wider affects would be to associate Specials more with being unprepared than with being specialists. Whereas the Lawrence School had some redeeming Specials who could justify their presence as a class, the Divinity School ultimately did not. It rejected giving ill-prepared students the opportunity to learn, in order to prevent claims of a Harvard Divinity School connection in some far-flung pulpit. In essence, the argument was that a Special Student at the Divinity School could do more damage to the reputation of Harvard than a Special Student studying the sciences at Lawrence. An interesting take from the perspective of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, but at the time, perhaps historically accurate, given the power of the pulpit in contrast to the blossoming fields of geology, natural history, and zoology that

\textsuperscript{35} Divinity in Harvard 1881-1882, p. 27, sequence 643.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
were taught at Harvard. The bottom line was that maintaining the health and exclusivity
of the field trumped keeping the doors open for Specials at the Divinity School.

*   *   *   *   *

By contrast to the Divinity School, the Law School’s Special Student population
was larger, more prominent, and early on, contributed substantially to the growth and
stability of the School. But the students were no better prepared educationally. The Law
School reported 18 Special Students in 1876-77, but then averaged 29 students per year
between 1877-1884. Why the sudden 61% jump and sustained increase in the enrollment
of Specials? This coincided with the establishment of a 3-year course of study and new
entrance examinations, combining an attempt to maintain academic standards while
growing the curriculum.37 Specials, who represented a “considerable proportion”38 of
these students, were allowed to pass these exams at any time during the three years of
attendance, while regular students were required to pass them before entrance. The
faculty were generally frustrated with the Special Students’ preliminary education, but
the health of the School in the late 1870s depended upon sustaining the numbers
regardless of their academic preparation: “The number of special students is larger than
could be wished, but without them a large increase in the graduates of colleges [that is,
college graduates] would be necessary to keep the numbers of the School good.”39 This
increase was apparently not possible, as most of the Law School population was
comprised of recent Harvard College graduates, and they were not a large stream; hence
the need for Special Students to keep the numbers desired by the administration. All of
this was taking place a few years before the Divinity School began excluding Specials.

37 Previously, the Law School had maintained a 2-year course.
38 Law in Harvard 1883-84, p. 103, sequence 1037.
The Law School, despite growing frustration, would maintain its policies for another decade.

Like Divinity, the Law School eventually put an end to Special Student admission for reasons of academic qualification, but they maintained their numbers throughout the 1880s. During this decade, the “abuse” of the special student provisions increased, such that Faculty saw a need to correct what they called an “evil”: the “continuous registration of special students permitted some persons to maintain a nominal connexion [sic] with the [Law] School who took no part whatever in its work.”

This did not mean necessarily that these students were taking courses instead at Harvard College, though for some that was the case. At the Law School, they could register and take no classes whatsoever.

When the administration did decide to limit access for Special Students, it also took a different route from the Divinity School: instead of excluding Specials by fiat, the Law School required that they pass the examinations in order to re-enroll in courses the following year. The result was that “no student, whether a candidate for a degree or a special student, who has not in any year passed an examination in at least three subjects will be allowed, unless by vote of the Faculty, to continue as a special student in the School.”

As if to balance this proactive academic approach, however, the Law School reaffirmed its criteria of “moral character,” requiring the students who were not college graduates to “produce certificates of good moral character, and give two references for further information” returning to a “character” issue what properly should have been a preparation issue. Even still, this was a step towards requiring students to demonstrate annual competence in order to remain engaged and on the School’s books.

---

41 You can almost hear the conversations in the Boston clubs: “Oh yes, I’m at the Law School, but…”
The final straw for Specials in the Law School was in 1892-1893, the year before Radcliffe became a College, and the same year as Gertrude Stein’s arrival at Cambridge as a Special in the women’s Society. In this year, the Law School instituted a new policy that overwrote the most basic premise for Special Students: the provision that they needn’t pass examinations before their admission to classes. Going against this long history of access without evaluation, the Law School decided in 1893 for the “exclusion of all special students except such as could pass an examination in Latin, French, and Blackstone [Blackstone’s Commentaries]; the consequence was that, whereas there were seventy-one special students in the Law School last year [1892], there are only twenty-two during the current year.”\(^{43}\) This is a radical departure from all previous policies, and the first step towards requiring students to study in advance for the entrance exams to the Law School, rather than attend the Law School (as a Special Student) in order to prepare for their entrance exams. This was the first pro-active policy change regarding Specials which did not simply pose exclusion; the effect was in keeping the Law School a place of higher study, and using the entrance exam as the point of departure for that study. The Law School was the only place in which this policy was enacted. The result was far less egalitarian than the policies at Lawrence and presumed that students who had already attained a degree would be able to prepare independently for the unique entrance requirements to the Law School (no secondary schools taught Blackstone).

The result was not to have the “effect of abolishing special students; but it did have the effect of abolishing them as a class of students who were not permitted to enter as candidates for a degree. Henceforth, therefore, special students were to consist only of such a small number of persons as should prefer to be special students rather than to be

\(^{43}\) *Law in Harvard*, 1892-93, p. 31, sequence 2761.
members of any class which they would be entitled to enter.”44 By the mid-1890s, Specials at the Law School entered on the same terms as regular candidates, eliminating any difference at all between Specials and regulars as far as academic preparation or admissions standards were concerned. The category difference was in name only. The Law School was taking its first steps towards a truly selective admissions process followed by a demanding system of accounting: they instituted a policy which also required yearly examinations in at least 3 subjects in order to remain in good standing, regardless of whether the person was affiliated with a particular class.

The four salient points from the Law School administration of Specials are as follows: 1) this was a school like Lawrence which needed in the 1880s the Specials in order to maintain its numbers, and yet expressed frustration with their lack of academic preparation; 2) some students entered as Specials to prepare for the entrance exams, while others merely to claim a connection with the School; 3) the School responded with exam policies which addressed these abuses; 4) once the School was able to maintain its health without admitting Specials by the 1890s, it used entrance and annual examinations effectively to eliminate Specials from the population.

Though the routes were different in Divinity and Law, the results were the same. In both the Divinity School and the Law School, Special Students were a temporary population, not in the sense of a revolving door of the individuals passing through, but in the sense that the institutions opened their doors temporarily, and then closed them within a few decades. In short, the Divinity and Law Schools opted for a meritocratic system – with its elements of plutocracy – in which only the academically qualified – and wealthy – were invited to participate; and also only those who wished to pursue a degree, an

official and permanent affiliation with Harvard. Specials in the professional schools and graduate departments made little sense, but for the undergraduate college, they did. For Harvard College there remained – even increased – a sense of the egalitarian obligations of the University to the public good. Of course, the public good was not without its incentives for the university as well.

**The University’s Dilemma: Egalitarian Democracy vs. Meritocracy**

Two models of education were competing in the 1870s at Harvard, indeed sometimes within a single School: an egalitarian approach that opened the doors, in part to compete with the public universities whose numbers were increasing faster than the East Coast privates; and a meritocracy which gave access only to those who had already demonstrated their suitability for college as it was then understood. James Berlin attributes the timing of this tension to the aftermath of the Civil War, tying the opening of the doors to the broadening curriculum, and vice versa:

After the Civil War the American college became transformed, moving increasingly toward a commitment to serving all the citizens of society – not just an aristocratic elite – and towards an encouragement of learning and free inquiry. The domination of colleges by clergymen was beginning to weaken even before the war as governing boards came to be occupied by men of affairs. After the war, these groups were instrumental in pushing for change in the curriculum, arguing for an education that prepared students for work in this life, not for rewards in the next.

Amongst private institutions, Johns Hopkins and Harvard were leaders of this kind of reform, both in admissions policies and in curricular expansion. Berlin notes that this

---

45 Remember that there was no scholarship assistance to Specials in either the Law or Divinity Schools. In some reports from these decades, the decision to deny financial assistance categorically is bemoaned; in others, it is valued as a means of restricting access.

46 Thanks to Sue Schurman for her insight and commentary on this tension between egalitarianism and meritocracy in the admission of adult and nontraditional students.

egalitarian impulse was tied not only to expanding educational access beyond previous
class distinctions, but upon the specific inclinations and talents of individuals. The
following passage should resonate with our discussions thus far of Special Students: “The
new college was to serve the middle class, was to become an agent of upward social
mobility. It was based on an educational psychology that abandoned mental discipline
and the training of the faculties in favor of a view emphasizing individual differences and
the importance of the student’s pursuing his own natural talents.”48 For its part in this
post-Civil War shift, Harvard College pushed for the adoption of two mechanisms in the
1870s that allowed for both expansion of the curricular possibilities, and more
specialization: the elective system, which we will discuss in the next section, and a return
to direct admission of Special Students to Harvard College. Just as these expansive
changes were being considered in the College, a contraction of access was occurring in
the professional schools.

The professional schools ultimately met the needs of their best students by
rejecting the worst. They privileged increasing the selectivity of their admissions in the
late 19th century, and protected their institutional reputation over providing an open
education, even when that education denied credentialing. At the other end of the
spectrum was Lawrence, open to all, with no academic polices governing student
admission. A third way was also emerging, what might be called a graduated
*meritocracy* in which the promise of a student was estimated before entrance, and then
that student was held accountable for his efforts. This was the approach being developed
for the Harvard College undergraduate in the mid-1870s, as the College began to

48 Ibid., 60.
contemplate opening its doors to the population of Special Students to whom it had
closed them in 1847, when Specials were consolidated in the Lawrence Scientific School.

By the early 1880s, the diversity of Special Students and the specificity of the
Schools caused a divergence in policy from school to school, from the College, and then,
after 1879, to the women receiving instruction from Harvard’s faculty through the
Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women. For all but the women’s Society, the
common denominators in the attitude to the Special Students were ambivalence,
equivocation from year to year, and the pendulum swing of policy. Also consistent
amongst the male students was the polarization of the class of Specials themselves. The
policies of the university towards the Specials actually protected the “dull” and the
“slow,” as well as the disadvantaged or unprepared, a model that had taken egalitarianism
to an extreme. We can see in the following passage the range of student that this category
supported, and can imagine the near impossibility of policing the standards with such a
wide constituency being served:

The provisions now made for special students are useful: 1. To persons who wish
to devote themselves to single subjects, and do not care for a degree; 2. To young
men of good parts who have been prevented from getting, at the usual age, the
common training preparatory to college life; 3. To those who are physically
unequal to the labor and competition of the regular course, but who can do well a
smaller amount of quiet work; 4. To the slow and dull whose fathers can afford to
give them the general advantages of a residence at the University.

… As all these varieties of ability, purpose, and condition, are now
represented in every degree among the special students, these students constitute,
as might be supposed, a miscellaneous body of young men without common
characteristics of common life. It was precisely to meet these diverse needs, which
arise so naturally in the present condition of American society, that special
students were admitted to the University. 49

This is hardly the vision of Judge Story’s statute in 1825, but after decades of
manipulation balanced by neglect, it describes the University’s dilemma in the early

1880s. The history of Special Students shows that the openness of the institution coincides with compromised educational outcomes, followed quickly by the swing back to more selective admissions – true for every one of the discrete bodies under Harvard’s umbrella, but affecting most profoundly the Law School and Divinity School, as we have seen above, and the Lawrence Scientific School and Harvard College, as we will explore in the next few sections. We have already seen how the Special Students forced – or inspired – the solidification of entrance requirements into the programs of advanced study at the Law School and the Divinity School, on the basis of preparation and money respectively. The effects of the Special Students for the Lawrence School, and for Harvard College, were less clear cut, but no less significant for the institutions. For the Lawrence School, the Special Students were a core student population that enabled the school to exist because of the bypass of the core curriculum requirements that special student status allowed. As I will also show, the Special Students contributed to the successful adoption of the elective system at Harvard College in the 1870s. This adoption of elective study simultaneously triggered the failure of the Lawrence Scientific School; for the freedom of choice that the elective system brought to Harvard College, and the eventual admission of all Special Students to Harvard College in 1880, meant that there was no need for the Specials to use the Lawrence back door to become Harvard students.

There is one more piece to this puzzle, which I will explore in detail in chapter 2, but which is worth mentioning here. The polarized nature of the Special Student population at Harvard, divided, as it was, between “dullards” and “geniuses” – as Charles Eliot described the Harvard College undergraduates in 1885 – meant that, while the policies developed for encouraging the geniuses and mentoring the dullards had an
enormous influence on the structure of the University and its treatment of all students, the Special Students policies of the 19th century could not be described, based on these results, as a success. Indeed, their failure can be seen in the dissolution of the Lawrence School, where the “specialization” that was meant to be the hallmark of the Special Students in the sciences ultimately led to the school’s collapse, in that the specialists could get their education at Harvard College, and so did not need Lawrence any more.50

But there was another population of Specials in Cambridge who were precisely the kinds of specialists that the original statute described: the women of Radcliffe. In the remainder of this chapter, I will describe the events and policies at Lawrence and Harvard that opened the way for the acceptance of female Specials across the Yard in 1879, and the subsequent redemption of previously failed policies governing Specials.

But back at Harvard in the mid-1870s, the ideal of Judge Story’s provision – that the Special Students should be only the most “competent” and “eager” of students who had not had a “regular” training due to poverty or isolation – gave way to the expediencies, and the needs, of the growing University and its educational initiatives.51

The category of “special student” was one mechanism by which it happened. The confluence of this growing population of either very strong or very weak students, and the growth of the professional schools for advanced studies, were catalysts for the most influential reform to undergraduate education in the late 19th century: Harvard’s elective system.

---

50 This narrative, it must be said, is not the standard history of the Lawrence Scientific School promulgated by Harvard. It is, rather, what I would call the unauthorized, unabridged, but not undocumented, history. See my fn. 74 for the standard narrative.
The Genius, the Drone, and the Dullard: Special Students and the Establishment of the Elective System

Having said this much about the effects of free choice of studies upon the unpromising student, I must add that the policy of an institution of education, of whatever grade, ought never to be determined by the needs of the least capable students; and that a university should aim at meeting the wants of the best students at any rate, and the wants of inferior students only so far as it can meet them without impairing the privileges of the best. A uniform curriculum, by enacting superficiality and prohibiting thoroughness, distinctly sacrifices the best scholars to the average. Free choice of studies gives the young genius the fullest scope without impairing the chances of the drone and the dullard.

– Charles Eliot, “The Elective System,” 1885

The establishment of the elective system at Harvard in the 1870s is credited to President Eliot, but the seeds of this system preceded his presidency by more than 40 years, and only reached fruition during his management of the top Harvard post (having been torpedoed by President Edward Everett in 1846 for lack of professorial support from departments opposed to the system). In fact, just as the history of Special Students found its origins in Judge Story’s report of 1825, so does the history of the elective or “voluntary” system, of undergraduate education. The history of its 60-year gradual adoption is covered in the President’s report of 1883-1884, in great detail, including attributing founding credit to Judge Story:

It was sixty years ago last May that Judge Story’s remarkable report was read to the Board of Overseers. The experience of Harvard College during the long transition from a uniform required curriculum to a regulated freedom in choice of studies, may, perhaps, be useful to other institutions which aspire to become universities; for they must advance over the same road, although they need not be so long upon the way.

52 Subsequent presidents to Everett continued to press for a limited elective system. For example, Thomas Hill, who directly preceded Eliot as president, wrote the following in his last annual report in 1868-69: “The undersigned would by no means recommend a return to the old method. The elective system is entitled to a prolonged and thorough trial. It was demanded by the public voice; it is sustained by the suffrages of many of our wisest and most experienced educators. But, in order to give it a fair and full trial, it should be confined to those who wish to exert the prerogative it gives” (p. 7, sequence 1775.)

53 Harvard, 1883-84, p. 24, sequence 958; italics mine.
This statement itself brings together the expanding undergraduate curriculum provided for by the elective system, and the transformation of Harvard College to Harvard University. What is missing in the equation is the crucial role of Special Students as a means for institutional growth and change; most importantly, in focusing attention on the academic and departmental distinctions between undergraduate and graduate education. I bring these initiatives of Special Students and electives from Judge Story’s report back into conversation here to propose a connection between the special student population and Eliot’s success at implementing the elective system where previous presidents had failed; and also to propose that his success was based in part upon reaching a critical mass of Special Students, and the need to address the evolving problem of their presence at the institution. The elective system and the special student population may not be an obvious connection – lagging secondary education marked by a decreased lack of preparation for college-level work is more-so – but it is no coincidence that the elective system and the special student population were proposed at the same time in 1825; and, as I will show, it should be no surprise that the elective system was adopted at the height of the problems for Harvard with its special student population, and during these decades of growth and solidification of its professional schools. Harvard had become the destination for higher education, and was attracting in increasing numbers the “best” and the “least capable” students. During this time of intense institutional expansion both populations were welcomed.

The over-riding question of whether Harvard College would become one of America’s first German-model universities was at stake during those decades of contention: overlapping interests between the College and its new graduate programs,
expanding the courses offered to undergraduates, and supplying the teachers to cover them. An elective system, by its nature, proffers more choice than a required system, and this transition from a restrictive to a broad curriculum took many years to work itself out; one consequence being the formation of independent departments headed by faculty chairs, such that they could develop their courses irrespective of the “whole” as established by the President or the Corporation, in essence the beginnings of formal graduate education and the research institution. My project here is not to provide a history of the elective system at Harvard, which has been done elsewhere – not least in Eliot’s own lecture, “The Elective System,” in 1885 – but to bring Special Students into the picture, and to explain how their presence helped to signal the need for distinguishing between the undergraduate education and curriculum of the college and the advanced studies of the university.

Eliot himself emphasized “choice of studies” as the main reason for advancing the elective system, but the second he highlighted was “opportunity to win academic distinction in single subjects or special lines of study.” The irony of the elective system is

54 It may be useful to offer a brief history of this term “university” as it applied to Harvard. Harvard was established in 1636 as “New College” and renamed “Harvard College” in 1639 after its benefactor, John Harvard. The first reference to Harvard as a “university” was in 1780 in the Massachusetts Constitution, though our contemporary understanding of a university – based on the German or Humboldtian model, named for Wilhem von Humboldt – was not established until the 19th century. For its first century and a half, Harvard functioned as an undergraduate institution. It was governed by a Corporation called “The President and Fellows of Harvard College” and its description as a “university” in the state constitution indicated its ability to grant degrees. It began resembling the German model university with the creation of its first graduate and professional schools: the Divinity School (1816), followed by the Law School (1817). From the 1883-84 Harvard report, the adoption of the elective system from the faculty perspective: “the Faculty set out upon a road which they have steadily followed ever since. Year by year they have endeavored to reduce the amount of the required studies, to increase correspondingly the amount of the elective studies, and to add to the number and variety of the courses of instruction annually offered to the choice of the student” (p. 21, sequence 955).

55 From the 1883-84 Harvard report, the adoption of the elective system from the faculty perspective: “the Faculty set out upon a road which they have steadily followed ever since. Year by year they have endeavored to reduce the amount of the required studies, to increase correspondingly the amount of the elective studies, and to add to the number and variety of the courses of instruction annually offered to the choice of the student” (p. 21, sequence 955).

that, while it provides more freedom of choice and so potentially more diffuse educational pathways than a prescribed curriculum would, it also provides more opportunity for specialization, for advanced studies, earlier in the curriculum. This is why the special student population, managing it, leveraging it against those who opposed electives (but perhaps supported graduate program expansion), was integral to its adoption under Eliot. For the strongest students in this system, the result is excellence in advanced studies, for example, the best students at Lawrence and their senior colleagues in the College. The risk in the system is that for the poorest students, the result is dilettantism or dissipation. The special student population at Harvard had already shown over three decades a decided split between both kinds of students.

The Eliot administration took heed of the special student population in the 1870s, in part, because of the potential of that population to help advance the benefits of the elective system to the Harvard faculty. The special student population was a means to an end in the successful establishment of the elective system; it also allowed faculty to grow their graduate departments for the specialization of fields. Since some of those Specials were in fact undergraduates benefiting from the university, it must have made sense to open those resources to all Harvard College students, giving them the full resources of studying as an undergraduate at a research university.\textsuperscript{57} One needed only to convince the faculty of the need for formal specialized instruction for undergraduates, and for curricular freedom to pursue it; and the population of students most adapted to this model were the Specials, not the “drones and dullards” that Eliot described in his 1885 apology.

\textsuperscript{57} This was also true for undergraduate academic advising, which was first instituted for the Specials who resembled the “drones and dullards.” Academic advising was implemented to address their lack of skills at selecting a worthwhile curriculum and their inability to navigate the university – but was extended in short order to the entire undergraduate student body. I address this more fully later in this section.
for the elective system, but the “young geniuses.” These young geniuses showed that it was possible for an undergraduate to benefit from the curricular freedom that the elective system provided.

The problem was that the system of Special Students up until that point had no way of separating these two polarized groups out: the strongest of them beginning to overlap with the developing graduate schools, and the weakest of them detracting from the success of the undergraduate College where they were dabbling in courses. The views of the graduate schools in this debate are not irrelevant; the relationship between graduate and undergraduate studies was so permeable at this time that policies governing the curricular overlap created by the elective system were becoming more necessary for the graduate schools: “At the opening of the present [Eliot] administration a settled purpose was manifested to establish the instruction of advanced special students on a permanent and efficient footing.”58 The report goes on to describe the thin line between these advanced special students and undergraduates as a result of the elective system put in place by Eliot: “Under our elective system it is impossible to draw a sharp line of distinction between studies suitable for graduates and those which belong to undergraduates.”59 On the one hand, it allowed the geniuses flexibility to explore areas of specialized interest; on the other hand, it exposed the system to abuse by the drones and dullards who sank to the bottom rather than floating to the top.60 Even more disturbing,

59 Ibid., p. 75-76, sequence 383-84.
60 These unpromising students were not taking advanced courses offered to graduate students. They were taking introductory courses in Harvard College, many in an effort to prepare for their entrance exams. With the adoption of the elective system, several of these introductory courses became prescribed for regular undergraduates, stretching the capacity of the teaching faculty, and leaving no more room for the Specials, some of the weakest students in the university, and those who would benefit most from introductory work. I address this issue of capacity and resources in chapter 3 on the history of English Composition at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1880s and 90s: the drones and dullards of Harvard were
they became permanent fixtures on the bottom because the university had no institutional or academic means of compelling them to leave, regardless of why they had come in the first place. In the early 1870s, there was no way, for example, to “[discourage] athletic youths who might be fitted for College in a preparatory school from using College as a place of secondary education and sport.”  

With no oversight mechanism in place, it was impossible to keep track of both kinds of Special Students during this transitional time to the elective system: those who were admitted to study beyond the prescribed curriculum, and were therefore not candidates for the degree, and the shift of some of those Special Students successfully into degree-programs such as the Lawrence School. None of these Special Students, it must be stated clearly, were being admitted directly into Harvard College in the first half of the 1870s. And yet, during the 1860s and early 1870s, these students were moving across these categories freely, with the encouragement of the university, which was using their flexibility both to grow the capacity for advanced study, and to expand the possibilities for elective studies; for they could only offer more variety in courses if they had the students and the faculty to engage in them. As the student body grew, the possibilities for more advanced study within the necessarily growing departments also grew.

The Lawrence School, however, was in a much different position from the graduate departments with the formal embrace of the elective system under Eliot. If the Lawrence School were the only place for students to pursue advanced studies in the sciences, it served a function. But with Harvard College undergraduates given the

---

“clogging” the required courses of regular undergraduates, and so were refused entry in the very courses that would have fitted them for college.

opportunities to read more widely, and so more narrowly in specific areas under the
elective system, the founding principles of Lawrence for the strongest students (the
focused student) no longer applied; and yet, the policies governing the weakest students
at Lawrence were still operating. Now qualified undergraduates could pursue advanced
lines of study as regular students at Harvard College, leaving Lawrence the repository of
those drones and dullards who could not pass Harvard’s exams but could take Harvard
courses – and perform poorly in them – with the seal of Lawrence’s approval, and still
not be compelled to leave the university because there were no statutes requiring their
dismissal, nor means of evaluating and assessing their performance as a group or as
individuals. The integrity and purpose of the Lawrence School was at risk, and the cause
was the perfect storm of curricular reform without attendant well-founded student-
management and advising policies.

Closing the Back Door, Opening the Front:
Harvard College Admits Special Students, and Lawrence Loses Them

With the arrival of President Charles Eliot in 1869 the specialization that had been
the hallmark of the Lawrence Scientific School gave way to a new system of
undergraduate education for Harvard University: general education which allowed for
special advanced study, and facilitated – and enhanced – by the graduate programs. As
freedom of curricular choice opened up to Harvard College undergraduates, the Special
Students did not remain exclusively in the Scientific School, or, as previously described,
in the Divinity or Law Schools. During the 1870s and 1880s, the implementation of the
elective system for Harvard College lead to gradual withdrawal of public interest in the
Lawrence Scientific School as an avenue for advanced science study. With more
flexibility in undergraduate coursework, students could pursue science specialization within the College proper rather than resorting to Lawrence. If they were interested in specializing in the other disciplines, they could enter as Special Students in one of the graduate or professional schools that were still open to Specials during this decade. And yet, there was still one great incentive for young men to register as Special Students in the Scientific School: in order to have access to Harvard College courses where otherwise, barring admission to the regular course, they would have been prohibited. Remember, with the repeal of the 1825 statute, and the opening of the Lawrence School, Special Students had not been admitted directly into Harvard College since 1846, and this remained so in the early 1870s even as the professional schools began to admit them.

In order to close the Lawrence back door into Harvard College, the administration did not adopt a new Special Student statute governing the enrollment policies at Lawrence. Amazingly, given the ambivalence towards these students and their checkered performance at Lawrence, the administration chose to invite the Specials in by the front door. Harvard College began admitting Special Students directly in 1876. By this time, Harvard College undergraduates could pursue several “special lines of study” which were made possible by offering elective courses; so the Lawrence School was no longer the only place at Harvard for advanced studies in the sciences – or other fields of advanced studies – prior to securing a college degree:

In 1876 the Faculty began in a cautious way to admit to the elective courses persons who had not had the advantage of a regular preparation for college and

---

63 As explained in the previous section, the openness in the professional schools would change in the 1880s with the formal exclusion of specials from the Divinity School, and the implementation of entrance exams for the Law School, essentially eliminating any difference between the entrance requirements for regular students pursuing the full course-load, and Specials who were permitted to attend the Law School part-time.
were past the age when such preparation was possible or expedient for them, but who, nevertheless, were sufficiently trained in special lines of study to pursue with profit the courses of instruction in certain departments. The restrictions originally placed on the admission of this class of persons, who were known as unmatriculated students, have been gradually removed, until now [1882] all the courses of study in the College are open to any person of good moral character who satisfies the Faculty of his fitness to pursue the particular courses he elects...  

What this meant was that beginning in 1876, adult students – only those over the age of 21 – were invited into Harvard College as Special Students if they did not already have a college degree. Revisiting once again Judge Story’s concept, these were men older than the traditional undergraduate, and so, likely to have work experience that would prepare them for advanced study in some specialized field. Since the elective system had made these courses available within Harvard College it was not unreasonable for an older student to want to pursue them there rather than in the Lawrence School, especially in fields other than the sciences. This age-restriction on the Special Students in Harvard College remained in place only from 1876-1880. It is important to note that during these four years, the Lawrence School was still accepting Special Students under the age of 21, so from 1876-1880, the Scientific School was the primary route whereby Special Students between the ages of 18-21 could take courses in Harvard College.

And take courses they did, much to the consternation of both the Lawrence School and Harvard College. These traditionally-aged Lawrence Scientific Students

---

64 Harvard, 1881-82, p. 73, sequence 689; italics mine. Notice, still, centrality of “good moral character” and the permission of the relevant Faculty as the criteria for admitting these Specials. What is new at Harvard College in 1876 is the age restriction, essentially targeting an adult population and prohibiting traditionally-aged undergraduates. We see here one of the fits and starts of 20th century adult education (this policy would only last four years) which would not be realized at Harvard until 1909 with the establishment of the Extension School. Michael Shinagel, Dean of Continuing Education and University Extension at Harvard, has recently published a history of the Extension School: The Gates Unbarred: A History of University Extension at Harvard, 1910-2009 (2009). Though beyond the scope of this dissertation, it would be worthwhile to bring the history of Special Students as I have written in this chapter into scholarly dialogue with the formal history of the Harvard Extension School.
navigated (“gamed”) the Harvard system in order to take the courses they wished. The report of 1879\textsuperscript{65} describes their navigation – completely legitimate, and yet destabilizing the relationships between College and Schools – and calls upon increased cooperation amongst the Faculties across Harvard as regarded the regulation of Special Students:

There is no inducement to enter the Scientific School as a special student in order to pursue theological, legal, or medical studies, because special students are admitted directly to those three professional schools;\textsuperscript{66} but it is sometimes an object for a young man to gain admission to courses given in the College by registering himself as a Scientific student, since direct admission to the College without examination is only granted to persons twenty-one years of age who are not candidates for a degree (unmatriculated students). By entering the Scientific School as a special student, a person who is not twenty-one years of age may obtain access to College courses of instruction; and there is nothing to prevent such a student from devoting himself wholly to College courses, – to Latin and Greek, for example, – if he can satisfy the instructors whose courses he wishes to attend that he will not be a hindrance in their classes. … As it is undesirable that the legitimate practices of one Faculty should enable students to evade the legitimate regulations of another, either the practice of the Scientific Faculty in regard to special students, or the regulations of the College Faculty in regard to unmatriculated students, ought to be reconsidered.\textsuperscript{67}

It must be said that the quandary here described was exacerbated, and made fully possible, by the deliberate lack of a centralized controlling statute governing the Special Students back to 1847. It is no coincidence that the reports addressing conflicting faculty regulations began in 1879, the first year that selective faculty members had been engaged to educate women in Cambridge. The ad hoc practice of recognizing the individual merit of a Special Student gave way to Faculty considering them more as a class.\textsuperscript{68} With the

\textsuperscript{65} Note the parallel history: this was the first year of “Private Collegiate Instruction for Women by Professors and Other Instructors of Harvard College.”

\textsuperscript{66} By 1886, the Medical School was no longer admitting Specials; see my footnote 24. The 1886 report suggests that the Medical School never embraced special students as did the Divinity and Law Schools.

\textsuperscript{67} Harvard 1879-80, p. 37-39, sequence 345-47.

\textsuperscript{68} Richard Miller notes that for the women, their sex visibly answered their difference as a class, marking their “specialness” in Cambridge. And yet, not all women taking courses were Special Students, so this observation complicates rather than clarifies the associations between “Special” and “different” or “of a separate class” such as a specialist, an uneducated person, or an adult, as we have seen. My point is that the arrival of women catalyzed the administration’s focus on addressing the needs of their students en masse in
male population of Harvard, the most complex overlap occurred between Lawrence and the College, and so it was the first place of real contention, needing coordination involving the Specials because both Faculties (Lawrence and the College) were affected, and neither was benefitting any longer from the laissez-faire handling of Specials.

Several different student populations emerged from close scrutiny of the Specials at Harvard and Lawrence at this moment, some of them tried and true characters from the history of this class, but one category – based upon Harvard College’s age-restriction between 1876-1880 – that showed a crack in Lawrence’s student enrollment stability:

A careful examination of the records shows that they may be fairly divided into the following classes: First, those who are unable or unwilling to prepare themselves for the entrance examinations, and yet are desirous of pursuing certain definite courses of study; secondly, those who cannot now pass all the entrance examinations, but will be able at the end of a year to pass those examinations, and also the annuals in many of the regular studies of the first year in the course selected, and thus enter as regular students; thirdly, those who wish to have some kind of connection with the University, but cannot enter as unmatriculated students of the College on account of the disqualification of age [i.e., Harvard College only accepts Special Students over the age of 21 and these Lawrence students are traditionally aged, 18-21 years old].

This third class of students – keeping in mind that these “classes” are still informal categories and in no way distinguish groups of “Special Students” institutionally from one another – is especially detrimental to the institution, as described in the Lawrence report. They are not in the Lawrence School for any reason other than to take courses at Harvard; and they are not strong students, or they would have pursued admission to well-defined groups, as well as individually on their personal conduct or merit. In chapter 2, I explore some of the unintended consequences of this class-based approach, which saw the influence of the female students on the administration’s expectations, and management, of their Harvard peers.

Lawrence in Harvard, 1880-81, p. 95, sequence 567. Though this describes the male population of special students in the scientific school a full 13 years before Gertrude Stein’s arrival in Cambridge, the first two classes very adequately describe the circumstances facing the 19-year old Stein in 1892 when she entered. In fact, she becomes during her next few years a member of the second category, as she sits a number of entrance exams each year. As stated earlier, the Latin entrance exam caused Stein some difficulty, and, as she did not pass that exam until 1898 following the completion of her coursework, she was technically a Special Student throughout her 4-year undergraduate education.
Harvard via a direct route; despite these realities, they are counted amongst the Lawrence student enrollment numbers, and their performance is a reflection on the Lawrence School, not on Harvard College. This would seem damaging enough to the Scientific School.

But even more damaging to Lawrence than this population of students within its walls, was the repeal of the Harvard College age-restriction in 1880 “so that the College, like every other department except the Medical School, now stands open, without any barriers in the form of admission-requisitions, to all special students who are not candidates for any degree.” In fact, dropping the restriction on under-21-year-old students from entering the College meant that this third category began to accumulate within Harvard College after 1881. As described in the Lawrence report, “The third class contains those pupils with whom it is most difficult to deal. In the College, if a student does not come up to the required standard, he is dropped to a lower class … and the only mode of dealing with a negligent student is to notify his parents that their son is wasting his time, and ask them to remove him from the University.” The consequences, in terms of student enrollment shifts, were swift and dramatic, and served as evidence of the porous relationship that had developed between Lawrence and Harvard College. Unlike the relationship between Harvard College and any of the other professional schools or graduate departments, Lawrence had become Harvard College’s back door, and once the front door was open, Lawrence Scientific School was at risk of becoming superfluous.

The Lawrence School report echoed the Harvard College report with some optimism that ending this back door relationship would help to stabilize the Lawrence

---

70 Ibid., p. 32, sequence 504.
71 Ibid., p. 95, sequence 567.
population, even if that meant a smaller school: “It is understood that the College has recently done away with the restriction of age as regards unmatriculated students, and therefore the Scientific School will probably not be resorted to in future by this class of persons. They will naturally go to the College and come under its discipline.”72 Indeed. Without the need for 18-21 year-olds to use Lawrence as the back door into the College, “the immediate effect of the change of rule was that the number of unmatriculated students in the College more than doubled from 15 in 1880-81 to 34 in 1881-82, while the number of special students in the Scientific School almost halved from 26 in 1880-81 to 17 in 1881-82.”73 These fluctuations of student enrollment as a result of the rollback of temporary age restrictions, coupled with the high percentage of Specials within Lawrence whose movements shrank the size of its overall population, reinforce my claims about the centrality of Special Students to the absorption of the Lawrence student body, and thus Lawrence as an independent School, into Harvard College.74 Though Lawrence had been growing in the 1850s and 1860s, it became very unstable during the 1870s and 1880s.

72 Lawrence in Harvard, 1880-81, p. 96, sequence 568.
73 Harvard, 1880-81, p. 52, sequence 504. Total enrollment at Harvard College at the end of academic year 1880-81 was 829; at the end of 1881-82 it was 823 (Harvard, 1881-1882, p. 56, sequence 672). This puts the percentage of Specials at Harvard in each year respectively at about 2% and 4%. This percentage would increase to 10% within the decade. At Lawrence, total enrollment in 1880-81 was 41 and in 1881-82 was 31 (Lawrence in Harvard, 1881-82, p. 95, sequence 711). This puts the percentage of Specials at Lawrence in each year respectively at about 63% and 59%. As stated by the Dean of Lawrence in the report where these raw numbers are recorded: “In my last Report I suggested that the removal, by the College, of the restriction of age, as regards unmatriculated students, would naturally diminish the number of our special students. The result has verified this anticipation” (Ibid.).
74 General accounts of the Lawrence School do not give Special Students a role in Lawrence’s checkered 19th century history or its demise; these are attributed to institutional competition with Yale’s Sheffield School and MIT. Indeed Eliot tried several times during the 1890s to merge Lawrence with MIT, with the last unsuccessful attempt in 1904. The standard narrative elides the 19th century troubles with student enrollment and qualifications, explaining that after the failure of these merges, Lawrence “became” in 1905 the Graduate School of Engineering. In the mid-20th century, responding to new research areas, it then became the Division of Applied Sciences (merging in 1948 with the Department of Engineering Sciences and Applied Physics). The most recent transformation was in 2007 when the Division formally became the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. See Elliott and Rossiter, eds., Science at Harvard University; and Hawkins, Between Harvard and America. See also the selective history available at the homepage of the Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. http://www.seas.harvard.edu/our-school/facts-history/history/founding. Accessed February 2010.
with Harvard College’s elective reforms and changes in their policies towards Special Students. Thus the stage was set in the 1880s for Lawrence’s student population to disappear quietly into the numbers of Harvard College, and for Harvard to have a much larger population of Specials who previously had enrolled through Lawrence.

With the expected growth within Harvard College came a new urgency to identify who these students were. After thirty-five years of ad hoc practice within the professional schools, five years after accepting this class of student at Harvard College, three years after the first female Specials had begun studying with Harvard faculty, and one year after this dramatic student shift from Lawrence to Harvard, a formal definition of Special Student was established for Harvard College in the report of 1881-1882:

They are to be known henceforth as Special Students; they are members of the College from the time of their admission, and subject to the College regulations, the Faculty reserving the right to deprive any one of his privileges who abuses or fails to use them. In their studies they are substantially on an equal footing with undergraduates in all respects except that they are not candidates for any degree. But no inducements are held out to enter the College in this way except to persons of ability and diligence.\(^75\)

To be sure, these students did not need “inducements” to understand the position they had within Harvard College. For many who entered as Specials, it was the only route whereby they could affiliate with Harvard; and many of the reservations expressed by faculty before admitting these students directly to Harvard were still in play. As the number of Special Students increased at Harvard College, the number of Special Students at the Scientific School and other professional schools decreased, since there was no longer a restriction from the College courses, and since it appeared that Special Students at the schools were using them more for access to the elective system than for “specialization” in the schools themselves. Hence, by the mid-1880s, the term “special student” no longer

\(^{75}\) *Harvard*, 1881-82, p. 73, sequence 689. By “inducements” they mean, in part, financial assistance.
meant “specialization” by any of the Schools serving Harvard men, but merely a class of student who had access to all the privileges of Harvard without prior demonstration of the standards of admission required of those in the degree program. It is easy, then, to see how this category devolved for the male population into one of lack of preparation to the exclusion of the benefits for those who are given membership through it. It is also easy to see what the impact would be on Harvard College when the Specials were admitted directly. Harvard College may have “defined” Specials in 1881-82, but it still had no policy governing their admission or their on-going management within the University.

The lack of a controlling statute merely accentuated the circumstances whereby they were allowed to remain, and demanded explanations for their presence, first in the Scientific School, then in the Divinity School, then in Law, and finally in Harvard College. For as the university schools grew, the Special Student population was the mechanism by which students continued to enroll. As the admissions requirements for these schools became systematically more enforced, the “class” of Special Students that remained at the professional schools was no longer beneficial. In fact, the only class of Special Students to distinguish itself positively in the 19th century were the female Specials whose immediate success gave rise to the women’s College, demonstrating that a Special Student population constructed around academic standards and motivations—rather than a tradition of moral character and manly education—could fulfill the promise of Judge Story’s report, much to the satisfaction of student, administration, and faculty.
The New Revolving Door: The Special Student Statute of 1885

With the gradual arrival of women in Cambridge, there arose a new urgency to figure out these issues in the mid-1880s, at first, because of the risk these women posed to Harvard’s reputation and standing. At this time there was still no policy in place to govern the admission of Special Students. I believe that the timing of this urgency – this desire to address the problem again with a statute – is owed to the introduction of women to the campus; the need not only to determine who the “students” are, but to police somehow the expansion of the university across the board, and to insure that the introduction of women did not dilute Harvard’s reputation. Why did it take until 1883-1884 to address the problems of Specials centrally? While the growth through the professional schools was a cascade driven by academic inquiry of faculty already installed at the College, the addition of women as students suggested something entirely new. And so, Harvard College – whose co-ordinate female institution was largely populated with Special Students – set about on a serious inquiry as to the history of Special students back to 1825, with an eye to correcting the repeal of the statute that allowed for their existence and unfettered growth since 1847. The arrival of women precipitated serious self-reflection on the purposes of undergraduate education and the impulses towards egalitarianism which fueled – and justified – the presence of Specials.

It is not until 1883-1884 that the wholesale failure to institutionally account for the Special Student population is acknowledged in the annual reports. In this year, the institution outlines the history of “special students” since 1825, and begins a serious inquiry into their “quality” as students, especially within the College proper, including comparative analysis of freshmen and their special student peers, who, on average, were a
year or so older upon entrance to the College. This report also includes the first
categorical descriptions of grading standards and success, and of provenance of the
students.\textsuperscript{76} The report acknowledges a paradox that had been playing out around Special
Students since the repeal of the 1825 statute in 1847: in short, that the provisions
allowing for Special Students in different departments were serving useful purposes; but
that in fact there was no authority by which any of these students should be studying at
the university at all:

Since 1847 there has been no authority, derived from the statutes, for the
enrollment of any students not candidates for a degree, except that resident
graduates not candidates for a degree [part-time graduate students] were provided
for by statute down to 1877. The statutes of 1877 are silent upon the subject;
although there were 89 such students enumerated in the Catalogue for 1876-77;
and although the last action of the governing boards about students not candidates
for a degree had been to repeal in 1847 a statute which for 22 years [since 1825]
had explicitly recognized them as members of the University …\textsuperscript{77}

In other words, Special Students had only been explicitly recognized by the university
until 1847, after which point, there was an entire class of students who had no formal
recognition by the university, but were allowed to continue enrolling in courses, decade
after decade.

This comprehensive report in 1883-1884 elicited a quick response from the Board
of Overseers, who enacted a new statue regarding “students not candidates for a degree”
in the following year, 1885. Elements of the repealed statute of 1847 remained – such as
the one giving Faculty the decision-making of whether a student could enroll in particular
courses – but emphasized newly that these students should only be permitted who come

\textsuperscript{76} It is significant to this newfound attention to academic standards that women had been admitted five
years previous in 1879, and that a percentage of Harvard faculty had chosen to teach females, the majority
of whom were Special Students governed by these same policies. I address the founding of Radcliffe
College, its Special Student population, and its academic/administration affect on Harvard in chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Harvard}, 1883-84, p. 30, sequence 964.
“with genuine purposes of study.” The most important new aspect of the Special Student statute of 1885, however, was its application to the entire University, not only to the

*College*. Harvard was an entirely different animal in 1885 than it was in 1825 or even 1847. In this statute, all of the students attending the university, *including the women at its Annex*, were covered under this new statute, which in so many other ways merely replicated the historical relationship between this class and the institution:

> “Persons who are not candidates for a degree may be admitted to any of the courses given in the University provided that they satisfy the appropriate Faculty of their fitness to pursue the particular courses which they elect. The several Faculties have the right to deprive any such student of his privileges, if he abuse or fail to use them.” This statue is practically a re-enactment of the statute on the same subject which was in force from 1825-1847. It legalizes a class of students which is increasing in number, and, in the College at least, improving in quality … When the Overseers consented to the adoption of the new statute, they passed a resolution urging that great care be taken in admitting special students, and that only those persons should be admitted who come with genuine purposes of study.78

With this statute, the university conferred the power for evaluating competency on advanced studies to the Faculty, which of course carried its own risks. The discretion was given not to individual faculty members, however, but explicitly to the Faculty of the institutional and department units (a difference enabled by the university structure), which meant collective oversight rather than individual judgment that had been the previous routine. Secondly, it had to be acknowledged that no student, having been accepted into a classroom without previous examination, could be evaluated until the last four months into study (one semester), or up to nine months of study in the professional schools. So the issue of quality control is still missing from the heart of the statute. It appears, in this sense, that in 1885, Harvard College returns to 1825, with 60 years of “unmatriculated student” growth through a combination of denial and indifference, with a

---

78 *Harvard*, 1884-85, p. 53, sequence 1173; italics mine.
new statute to validate continued growth of the same kind for individual units rather than a unified Faculty. The larger context had changed dramatically: undergraduates no longer had a uniform curriculum, the number of electives was growing year-by-year, the Lawrence School was still operating though its future was uncertain, Harvard now had women in its ranks as students, and with the growth of the graduate departments, a Graduate School was on the horizon, creating a clearer institutional demarcation between graduate work and undergraduate.

While the number of special students at Harvard College had become noticeable enough to address, that number was still dwarfed by the number of regular students fully enrolled in the 4-year course, by about 10 to 1. It was a long-standing, increasingly frustrating, but minor problem in the whole context of the institution; and yet, as a policy position, it is troubling that no solution could satisfy the Faculty while producing the kinds of student results that reflected well on the institution. The statistical tracking of special students over the next few years increased, and the 3-year tracking of the students showed some improvement in the number of special students earning certificates. But taken generally, special students still did not do as well as their counterparts, and never out-performed them in significant numbers (especially in the Law School). So the College perpetuated its on-going problem for lack of a clear policy on evaluation and assessment; they decided, finally, in 1886, that that policy required Faculty not acting independently of one another within departments, but through a committee that would oversee the supervision of the most vulnerable students within Harvard College.

79 *Harvard*, 1884-85, p. 95, sequence 1216.
80 See *Law in Harvard*, 1884-85, p. 113, sequence 1234.
Admit, Lament, Supervise, Dismiss: 
Special Students and the Origins of Academic Advising at Harvard

The conservative argument is: a college must deal with the student as he is; he will be what he has been, namely, a thoughtless, aimless, lazy, and possibly vicious boy; therefore a policy which gives him liberty is impractical. The progressive argument is: adapt the college policy to the best students, and not to the worst; improve the policy, and in time the evil fruits of a mistaken policy will disappear. I would only urge at this point [1885] that a far-seeing educational policy must be based upon potentials as well as actualities, upon things which may be reasonably hoped for, planned, and aimed at, as well as upon things which are.

– President Eliot, “The Elective System” 1885

Though Eliot aspired to tailor his policies to the best students, the reality was that the best policies for all students were being formed in response to the worst students. The Board of Overseers adopted a new measure providing for a “committee of the Faculty on Special Students, which is to supervise their admission, their plans of study, and their work with their chosen instructors. The committee is essentially a committee on advice to a class of students who especially need advice.”81 This is a benevolent response to the origin of the problem, as laid out before Faculty earlier in the year, and written into the following charge, which resembled a gate-keeping function much more than an “advising” function: that “privileges extended to Special Students ‘being readily subject to abuse, be very sparingly granted, and that the several Faculties use every effort to maintain a strict discipline and to admit in this department only persons who show that they seek these advantages for the purpose of genuine study.”82 Concern had grown out of observations in 1886 that the “number” and “incapacity” of the Special Students had

81 Harvard, 1885-86, p. 10, sequence 1341. The report goes on to note that the results of this new advising system were so successful with Special Students that they are considering devising a comparable system for the entire Freshmen class, which had grown to several hundred students, increasing the student to faculty ratio and recommending a more formal system for academic advising. I will address the influence of special student advising on the regular class in the next section.
82 Ibid., p. 73, sequence.
become “alarming,” instigating their supervision scheme. The language describing these decisions reveals the depth to which even this attempt proved unequal to staunching the problem of students whose “admission [was] casual, or choice of studies [was] preposterous, or their work intermittent.” The committee’s responsibilities beyond this charge were encapsulated in the following regulation: “Special students are admitted to College by a committee of the Faculty to whom their choice of studies must be submitted for approval at the beginning of the year; and their work is carried on under the constant supervision of this committee.” The goal of this supervision was noble: shepherding the weakest amongst the new students through the “labyrinth” of the University.

The result was that this five-member Faculty committee – for the first time – met to vet “applications” to allow Special Students access to the Harvard classroom. It does not appear in this report what the new standards were, though the report says the students were subject to “scrutiny” and that each member not only kept supervision of his own grouping of admitted students, but the Faculty committee met frequently to consult about their work. In short, beginning in 1886-1887, Special Students were afforded more direction, more supervision, more advising than the four-year students in the College. From being first an ignored, and then ill-regarded and nervously tracked population, it had become in one year, the most attended-upon group of students at the University. It is at this time that the Harvard reports first acknowledge that this population of students may, in fact, be emblematic of something larger than the individuals afforded the

83 Harvard 1894-95, p. 82, sequence 3293.
84 Harvard 1885-86, p. 73-74, sequence 1404-05.
85 For a detailed picture of the advising scheme, see Harvard, 1886-87, p. 42, sequence 1531. This report offers specific details and actions taken by the committee regarding individual students including “sifting” through the existing students and “inducing” some to withdraw. Those permitted to stay “were required to furnish detailed statements of their previous education and their purpose in coming to the University,” assigned to faculty mentors in their stated areas of interest, and tracked through their coursework.
opportunity: “The project is an important one, and of interest beyond the limits of the class of students immediately concerned; for the experience gained cannot fail to throw some light on the problems involved in the regulation of the work and conduct of undergraduates.”\textsuperscript{86} The following year, the report of the President suggests, again, adopting the methods of this committee for wider application in the College, pointing to an increase in the quality of student work as a result of the supervision, and an increase in the number of Special Students successfully gaining entrance to the College.\textsuperscript{87} I might add that beyond giving insight into the broader undergraduate population, it also calls for more scrutiny of the attitudes of faculty towards this population of students, and the Faculties’ management and evaluation of them. This signals again a consciousness that I would attribute to the addition of women in the classroom, for the same faculty teaching the male Specials were now attending to the females at the Society, where the success of Specials was notable.

Within two years, the benefits of such an advising system were obvious, and plans to extend to the entire freshman class were underway. What had begun as a minor problem with a small population of students had exposed the potential for an entirely new system of oversight in undergraduate education. It happened by way of a “trickle-up” phenomenon, quite the opposite of Eliot’s public position on education as targeted at the strongest, which suggests one reason why policies towards the weakest had been allowed to languish for so long. Being such a small proportion of students at Harvard, the Specials could be ignored, until they had become enough of a critical mass exiting the Harvard community (with or without degrees) to seriously compromise the reputation of the

\textsuperscript{86} Harvard 1885-86, p. 74, sequence 1405.
\textsuperscript{87} Harvard, 1886-87, p. 11, sequence 1500.
university. But by fixing that small population within the University, the leadership saw that it could not only fix a problem at the bottom of the undergraduate population, but if applied to the entire student body, would improve overall performance:

The improvements recommended by the Board of Overseers had all been proposed and discussed in the Faculty in former years, but with only a languid interest and without action. When, however, the Faculty were convinced by the action of the Overseers that administrative defects which really concerned only a small portion of the students, – and that the least interesting and promising portion, – [i.e. “special students”] might nevertheless seriously impair the reputation of the College and imperil the reforms with which it is identified in the public mind [most prominent of which was elective reform], they at once set to work to provide legislative remedies for these defects. The measures which they took are now on trial, and the indications are that the needed remedies have been found. At the same time, not content with remedying evils, the Faculty introduced two positive improvements. The first of these improvements was the regulation concerning advisors for Freshmen …. Encouraged by the favorable experience of a committee on special students which had been in existence for three years, the Faculty placed the Freshman class under the charge of a committee of thirteen members of the Faculty, each member of which should act as adviser to about twenty-five Freshmen …

So worthwhile was this deemed, that it was adopted for all Freshmen within just a few years. The Special Student advising system essentially became the pilot program for the Freshman advising system in the College. This advising system was surely one means of reducing the gap between the young geniuses and the drones and dullards, of not only teaching within the classroom the elements of the new elective curriculum, but training those unprepared – whether Specials or not – to be effective students within the rigor of the new university system.

**Through the Revolving Door, A Harvard Man for Life**

Although many new systems were in place in the late 1880s to enter a new stage of Special Student management, all was not solved. Around 1888, the College began

---

88 *Harvard, 1888-89*, p. 9, sequence 1845.
tracking the starting numbers of Special Students, and the fluctuations in their population over one year’s time. The population, not surprisingly, proved volatile, with some numbers entering the College as regular members after one year as Specials, some dropping-out before the exams, some failing the exams, and a portion returning again the following year as Special Students again. The largest number was those who had left: in this year 60 of the 141 students. The smallest number of these populations was the number that joined the College officially, certainly giving the impression that as a whole, this still – despite more advising, more supervision, more oversight through exams during the term – was a group of students either interested in only a few courses, or less qualified or able to be students than their peers.

The report of 1890-91 speaks to this impression by revisiting the obligation of the university to these students, especially when the reputation of the College is potentially compromised by extending the privilege of attending, even for a short period of time. It is, by the sweep of history, one more swing of the pendulum back to acknowledging that this class of student is separate, and does have a different place in the school than 4-year students, if only because he is not a permanent fixture of the student population:

The Special student is a transient guest: he is admitted on trial; and he cannot come back for a second year unless formally admitted again. Sometimes he is a mature man who wishes to devote a year or more to a single study; sometimes he is a youth unable to complete his preparation for College, but eager for College life and for an opportunity to make up his deficiencies. The committee in charge of Special Students will not admit a youth at once untrained and lazy; and it sends away, or refuses to readmit a student who proves undeserving.89

One presumes, however, that Harvard College was willing to admit youths either untrained or lazy, for at least one year. By 1892-1893, the special student class no longer entered by a back door policy into Harvard. Instead, it appeared that a large number of

89 Harvard, 1892-93, p. 88, sequence 2818.
them entered by a revolving door, whereby any student with “moral character” who could explain his reason for wanting to pursue courses at Harvard had a chance at one year of education, whether or not he was qualified. Having unsuccessfully demonstrated a reason to stay, he would be asked to leave; only to be replaced by another untrained or potentially lazy young man who could afford to buy a seat. This may seem an excessively cynical reading, but is justified by the accounts during this period. The institution was at an impasse where the students it was purporting to give a “fair chance” were also described as “earnest persons of defective training” indistinguishable at the time of consideration from “dull persons best fitted for manual labor, or from portable athletes, or from petted weaklings.”

The institution is in conflict with itself: what does Harvard want, or gain, from serving a population of students it describes thus? For that matter, what does an “undeserving” Special Student gain from one year in this environment? Without merit-based standards for admission, there was no means of preventing unprepared students from a year-long stay, or protecting Harvard College’s reputation from those students when they left. The standards of “moral character” and “genuine purposes of study” were no longer sufficient to the needs of the institution as the number of Special Students having been denied readmission increased each year.

Even the best advising system in higher education cannot counterbalance this kind of revolving door policy or remediate the students given access through it. How could the problems of an entire class of student be resolved without revisiting the policies whereby these students were in attendance in the first place? In the report of 1894-1895, we find the first acknowledgement that decisions made on behalf of unqualified individuals actually hurt the institution in the long run, and offer little lasting educational value –

---

90 Harvard, 1894-95, p. 82, sequence 3293.
though considerable social value – to those unable to return for a second year. The
language in this report is blunt about the “danger of admitting persons academically
worthless”:

…College work, so far from removing or disguising mental disability, reveals and
emphasizes it; and unearned admission to College privileges, so far from
promoting industry, begets blind self-satisfaction in the present and blind
disregard of the future. The lazy and well-to-do Special Student finds that the
little accident of intellectual unfitness is no social drawback even in College; and
that, out of College (even if he is turned out), he shall still be “a Harvard man” for
life.91

Here we see very clearly the long-term risks of basing college admissions and education
on “moral character” – which does not mitigate “intellectual unfitness” – rather than on
academic standards. The concern for the College’s reputation is deserved, exposing the
disconnection between moral character, academic potential, and the traditional manliness
that characterized a Harvard education. The institutional recourse, even at this time after
decades of observation, falls short of the solution needed. This report lauds an “admirable
system of correspondence” that is supposed to evaluate these students with a series of
written testimonies. The real issue is that none of these measures is binding. The
Committee and Faculty can only discourage students from applying for their first year.
Their evaluations at the end of that year may prevent them from returning, but there is
still nothing preventing any student from attending for at least one year, being expelled,
and calling himself a “Harvard man.” The report even acknowledges the human element
of policy-making, that “even men who are blind to this truth as a general principle see it
(perhaps more clearly than others do) in the case of their own sons; and every reasonable
man sees it when he traces the career of some of these unpromising youths.”92

91 Ibid.
92 Ibid., p. 83, sequence 3294.
What happens in this report of 1894-95 appears to me to be a settling of some sort with the methods they have created. Even though “many Special Students prove incompetent, the present policy of the Committee is justified by the number that gain regular standing … The rapidly transient character of this body of students shows how fast the Committee drives out the idlers and advances the workers to regular standing. Through the devoted labor of this Committee the college need no longer look with suspicion on the Special Student.”\textsuperscript{93} This is cold comfort for the Harvard Faculty, especially those teaching introductory courses such as English A, valued by the Specials in order to prepare for their entrance exams, and secure that invitation back into the regular course of study. These instructors were locked in the revolving door with these students, each population coming and going, only to be replaced by a new crop of students who would be gone in a year. It should be no surprise that these policies affected overall classroom capacity, teaching labor, curriculum development, and pedagogy, becoming very problematic at Harvard in the 1890s. The pressures on the required freshman composition course, English A, were especially intense, as I explore in my third chapter.

Harvard’s original desire – both noble and socially progressive – was to provide an education to those “for whom … admission examinations are a misfit [but who] may yet merit a university education.”\textsuperscript{94} And yet, the report must admit that the system is a failure when the “rarest” grouping of Special Students are those “specializing students for whom the category was designed.”\textsuperscript{95} The other two categories present in 1894-95 – the signal year in my dissertation given Gertrude Stein’s enrollment in English 22 as a

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.
Special Student – were rejects from the College allowed to become Special Students on trial, and lastly, mature and trained students, who had applied for admission without taking examinations. Many of these in the last category are what we today would call transfer students, and are the most “profitable” according to the chair of the Committee on Admission from Other Colleges, and also are the most rare, at least at Harvard College. All this suggests a failing admissions policy over at Harvard Yard. But not at the Harvard Annex. All the Harvard faculty need do in the 1880s and 1890s to see the class of Special Students bringing credit to the University, was to look across the Yard to the ladies of the Society and Radcliffe College. For the women’s institution, the Special Student population proved early, and convincingly, one of its greatest assets.

The most amazing thing about these Harvard annual reports of the 1890s is that they borrow language from the Radcliffe reports of several years previous, as if the male College could redeem its history back to 1825 by adopting – from its new co-ordinate institution – a reason for admission and a student body with “genuine purpose,” which in no way described the balance of Harvard Specials, but did indeed describe Radcliffe’s. Harvard not only gained “women” in its association with Radcliffe, but also gained a model for righting decades of problematic management of this outlier class of students, and a vision both for advanced and adult education. The majority of the female population was able – by its very nature as older, already semi-professionalized, clear about what Radcliffe could do for their careers – to show the ideal of what Judge Story’s statute was meant to be, if not exclusively through the pursuit of the sciences, then through the ideal of “advanced studies” and the promotion of public education. Many of the women admitted to study with Harvard’s professorate fulfilled the vision of the
original Special Student statute. It became possible that this vision, in real practice at the women’s College, could then be applied back to its original source for the men.

Conclusion

The long and complicated history of Special Students testifies to the tremendous growing pains – and opportunity – of Harvard University in the late 19th century. The case of Special Students in the 19th century allows us to trace the mutually constitutive relationship between the individual students and the institution, especially as the institution is growing and changing. As the Harvard report of 1883-84 states, “In short, the statue concerning persons not candidates for a degree was a thing for the University to grow up to, but which could hardly bear immediate fruit.”96 The short-term benefits to the least capable students themselves were obvious, as were the potential benefits to the University community in competition with private and public peer institutions; but it took more than 50 years for the potentially negative consequences to the institution to play themselves out and emerge into the discussion of Faculty and administrative reporting for the men at Harvard. But play out they did, rising to a pitch in the 1870s and 1880s with the adoption of the elective system of President Eliot, the expansion of graduate and professional school education, and the institutionalization of female students affiliated with Harvard. President Eliot’s desire was to create a university around the “best” students, but the undertone suggests that only by responding proactively to the “worst” could the university protect itself from its own growth and govern the competing interests of elite education and serving the public good. The class of Special Students was a distillation of both “best” and “worst” within Harvard, and from both poles made possible

96 Harvard, 1883-84, p. 25, sequence 959.
the expansion of the graduate departments and professional schools, provided the impetus for an academic advising system for all undergraduates, and, as I will explore in the next chapter, comprised the majority of female students at Radcliffe through the turn of the century, reinvesting the Special Student class with focus on “advanced studies” that had made it so promising in 1825, and creating a powerful and vital new relationship between secondary and tertiary education through the scholarly training of high school teachers.

The 19th century history of Special Students at Harvard, as I’ve written it, came to a close in 1910 with the establishment of the University Extension School. Newly-installed President A. Lawrence Lowell created the School to serve the population of students previously admitted as Specials. With little evidence from Harvard’s history justifying the potential of such a school and its student body, I believe the Radcliffe women were instrumental in moving the university, in the decade preceding the establishment of the Extension, towards the creation of this new school that would facilitate the admission and expansion of this student population for the entire university.

As I will show in my next chapter, the Radcliffe women proved that the population of Special Students could not only benefit the growth of the university through tuition dollars and numbers in the classrooms; could not only provide a public good for the community, what President Lowell called “systemic popular education”; but could produce in increasing numbers successful students, many of them adults, who would benefit from a Harvard education and reflect well on the institution. The model, in fact, for the courses offered to the public on the Harvard Extension School homepage in 2010,

97 Special Student status at Harvard persists in the 21st century within the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, the descendent of the Lawrence School where Specials were first admitted. Today, these are non-degree candidates who already hold bachelors degrees. As a class of student within these schools, these non-degree Specials most resemble the female Radcliffe students pursuing advanced studies in the late 19th-century who we will discuss in chapter 2.
reflects the language in the founding documents of Radcliffe College from 1894: “The tradition established by President Lowell very much applies today, as faculty are ‘substantially repeating for the benefit of the public courses given to students in college, under conditions which require the same amount of work and the same examinations.’”\textsuperscript{98} The repetitions of courses given to the women in the 1880s and 1890s, are today given to the general public. The women of Gertrude Stein’s generation at Radcliffe were, in truth, the first successful class of students justifying Harvard’s increased involvement in broadening higher education.

\textsuperscript{98} Harvard Extension School website: \url{http://www.extension.harvard.edu/}. 
Chapter 2 – A New Breed: Special Students at Radcliffe College

Introduction

As with the history of Special Students within Harvard College, there were a number of competing interests regarding Special Students in the Radcliffe population. The most basic was balancing admissions expectations against opening the opportunities for women to take Harvard courses. There was a significantly smaller pool of young women than young men who could pass the entrance examinations to Harvard; and yet in order to increase the student body, and to demonstrate that women given a college education could pursue careers beyond teaching – one of few professional positions open to women at that time – the managers of the Society needed a mechanism whereby the women could gain admission, and prove post-facto capable of the work. This mechanism already existed at Harvard through the special student statutes, and so its application to the admission of women in 1879 was not unreasonable. Without this special student status, the majority of women in that first decade would not have been admissible by Harvard’s standards; nor could the new experiment in women’s education have claimed “equivalence” in its examination policies, one of the very important credentialing moves made in its first report.

In the first report detailing women’s education in Cambridge, the description of special status followed the listing of entrance examinations, and read thus: “Special students who wish to pursue only higher studies will not be required to pass any of the above examinations, provided they satisfy the instructors of their ability to pursue these special studies with advantage.”\(^1\) In 1882, a minor, but significant, addition clarified that

\(^1\) *Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe*, 1879-1880, p. 10, sequence 10; italics mine.
“special students may take any course that is given.” The consequence to that amendment was to open up formally not only “higher studies” to these women, but any course given to the regular female undergraduates at Cambridge. That meant that women were offered, in addition to higher level electives, the traditional courses available to undergraduates at Harvard College, those courses which would have been required of regular students to obtain their degree. This freedom to pursue the regular curriculum opened to women the potential for replicating the problem that had been accruing at Harvard: that is, men entering as Specials with the hope of becoming regular students.

All of the courses were offered as repetitions of the men’s courses, and as such, they needed to create classes large enough to make the faculty investment worthwhile. So in a similar history to that of the Lawrence School, the best way to increase the course offerings in the first few years was to populate the newly introduced courses with Special Students. In these early reports from the Managers of what will become the “Society for Collegiate Instruction” in 1883, there is increasing emphatic description of the “ladies’” preparation for studies at the Harvard Annex with a declaration that “those who did not give account of their preparatory studies … were not, however, less thoroughly prepared. They were all careful and eager students.” In this model of education, “preparation” was not deemed as essential as being a “careful and eager student.” This approach mirrored the approach taken at Harvard at this early moment in Radcliffe’s history. But, as my chapter explores, that parallel approach to preparation changed within a few short years as the women’s institution began to assert its independence, and to raise its standards – especially for its special population – above Harvard’s.

---

2 Society in Radcliffe, 1881-1882, p. 15, sequence 28.
3 Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-1881, p. 8, sequence 8.
There is clearly ambivalence and contradiction within the institution over opening the doors of Harvard to less-prepared individuals – whether men or women – who may yet demonstrate the capacity to overcome their educational disadvantages en route to a degree. Across the Schools and Harvard College, in any given year in the 1880s, annual reports indicated a continuing increase in the number of Special Students; in the following year, a claim that the number has never been large. Within this pendulum of accounting, and as this class changed and developed at Harvard, those students within it occupied a larger portion of the attention of administrators for two reasons: first, because of the on-campus resources expended on them by faculty and deans, including the classroom seats they took from regular undergraduates; and secondly, because of the consequences of their affiliation with the institution – however short it may have been – and how they might represent their time spent at Harvard University, with or without certificate or degree. The affiliation, and risk to reputation, pointed to an increasing urgency to regulate their standards, especially as Specials became a larger portion of each incoming class.

That percentage increase at Harvard College was nothing compared to what was happening with women in the Society. Early in the Harvard Annex’s history, the total pool of female applicants admitted as Specials was small as compared to Harvard, but it was a much larger percentage of the incoming class of women. Whereas the percentage of Special Students in Harvard’s classes peaked around 10% in the 1880s, the percentage of female Specials began near 85% and averaged out about 67% in the first ten years of its operation. The number of Special Students at Radcliffe dwarfed the number of regular admits, as seen in the following table of Annex Girls from 1879-1889:
As can be seen in the comparisons of Specials and Regulars in these first ten years, without the Specials, the Society would have comprised a much smaller group and would not have been able to grow at the rate it did in the early years of its founding. Their enrollment was not only allowed, it was encouraged enthusiastically. There seems genuine excitement about the possibilities for exceptional students – whether prepared or unprepared for the rigors of college – to take advantage of Harvard’s resources and faculty, and a desire to open the doors to these students. But there is great caution, too, about maintaining the standards and traditions that had made the institution what it was.  

---

4 The statistics and report for the year 1882-83 is included within the publication dated 1884, the first report of the Society so named, in the “fifth year” of reports serving women’s education in Cambridge.

5 No breakdown offered.

6 In this year and following, the reports do not identify “Special” or “advanced” students but seem to identify the difference between “regular” students pursuing the four-year course, and non-matriculated students, by describing the non-matrics as receiving one of the “Society’s certificates,” which is basically a certificate of enrollment in one, two, or however many courses they were taking. This certificate “entitles the students to the warm commendations of their instructors” (Society in Radcliffe, 1885, p. 7, sequence 23).

7 First ten years of total number of students enrolled (column titled “Enrollment”) taken from table in Secretary’s report of Society in Radcliffe, 1888-89, p. 6, sequence 94.

8 As stated by Elizabeth Agassiz: “The idea of a woman’s college in Cambridge, so situated that it might share in the advantages of the University without demanding, or even suggesting, any change in its long-established policy, took definite shape in 1878, and soon gave rise to stated meetings in which many of the professors joined and which ended in the formation of a very simple unwritten organization. This informal organization made the basis of the first programme announcing the proposed experiment” (Radcliffe, 1893-94, p. 7, sequence 9). The assumption here is that this is about women altering the male environment, but it was the Special population where the first challenges to this “no harm” clause actually affected policy.
Given the concern about increasing numbers of a population who had not performed well as a group at Harvard, the addition of a significant female population of Special Students must have given pause to those who were most interested in preserving the status quo of the undergraduate population in Cambridge. The same faculty who taught Harvard Special Students also taught Radcliffe Special Students, and they had clearly formed an opinion of this class of students within their courses, as evidenced in the Harvard reports of this time. By the mid-1880s this population of students had become the focal point of remediation within Harvard; it served as a cautionary tale. The strongest argument, in fact, against the admission of women was not that they were women, but that they were mostly Specials; the history of Special Students at Harvard would surely have served as an effective counterargument to their admission. Why should the institution grow a class of students that had failed so dismally in such numbers? What risks for bringing women in under these circumstances? If men had failed for so many years through the “faults” of this program (as you may recall from our Introduction), was it inevitable for women to replicate those “faults” in their co-ordinate institution? On the other hand, as they had continually deferred a direct end to the admission of these students at Harvard, they could not very well draw the line at women either; at least, not for lack of preparation. Harvard’s long-overdue remediation for these students in the 1880s paralleled the growth of female Specials, not – as might be expected – as an additional impetus for dealing with weak students, but as a strategy to raise the male Specials to the quality and preparation of their female counterparts.

Sex may have been the fundamental difference between Radcliffe and Harvard, but baseline educational preparation was an invisible yet more powerful marker. The
success of Radcliffe’s experiment with Specials provided Harvard a benchmark against which it could evaluate its own special population, and gave Harvard administrators and faculty an opportunity to reflect anew on their mission towards the general population who desired a college education regardless of their preparation. In 1882, three years after women began enrolling in courses, and the very year when the full curriculum was opened to them, the Harvard College report included a long passage about the benefits both to individual and College for admitting Special Students, with a particular focus on their character and potential, not unlike what had been said about the “careful and eager” ladies at the Society:

The number of special students in [Harvard] College continues to increase. The faculty has by gradual steps finally admitted them to all the privileges of undergraduates, except that of winning a degree and consequently gaining admission to the quinquennial catalogue, and has brought them in all respects under the same discipline to which other members of the College are subjected. They may study anything which is taught in the University; they are ranked with other students upon the published rank-lists; and they may win “honors” if they can … No scholarships or other beneficiary aids are at present open to them; and this exclusion from beneficiary aid is a loss not only to them but to the College.9

This passage from the Harvard annual report reflects an inexplicably welcoming tone given the balance of criticism in the previous decade. Remarkably changed from those reports which bemoaned their presence at the university, this presents an argument for expanding the opportunities of Harvard College to those previously deprived. One might even call it optimistic. The language employed here bears a distinct resemblance to the language of the recent Society reports.

At this moment in the history of Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges, I read this change of heart as a direct consequence to the admission of women and the success they showed almost immediately, a success that their male counterparts had yet truly failed to

---

show, but whose presence gave Harvard reason for their newfound optimism in this class of student. Here is the assessment of the Society’s Specials at the end of the first year:

The [Society’s] Managers do not make prognostications regarding the future. Their simple purpose from the beginning has been to try the experiment of offering to women advantages that had previously been given to men only … Their success has been beyond their expectations. They have proved that there exists in the community a class of women capable of taking this grade of instruction, and requiring it …

The students have conducted themselves in a manner so exemplary and in all respects satisfactory, notwithstanding the almost entire freedom to which they have been left, that they have rendered the work of both Managers and Instructors pleasant, and have prepared the public to support the movement with heartiness.\textsuperscript{10}

Why this success so immediately? Unlike Harvard, who had placed little importance on the academic potential of their special population, the Society admitted women in its first years who were qualified as future scholars, either in that four-year course, or because they had already received a four-year college education elsewhere. This was a new breed of Special.

The opportunity to study at Harvard was as attractive to women as it was to men; the difference was that the Society held its new students to a much higher standard than did Harvard, in part, because it had to, but also, because it could, for it was admitting into its membership at much higher numbers – proportional to the total class – women who already had their college degrees. The Society therefore did not set out initially with the purpose of providing a four-year education to women; but merely the opportunity to study as Harvard’s men had for so long:

It is not the purpose of the Society to stimulate a demand for the education it offers. Its directors have never held the doctrine that it is the duty of every young woman to pass through a regular course of study such as is represented by the four years’ course of the candidates for the Bachelor’s degree in College. It is

\textsuperscript{10} Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-81, p. 10-11, sequence 10-11.
their wish simply to offer to women advantages for this highest instruction, and to admit to the privileges of the Society any who may actually need them.\footnote{Society in Radcliffe, 1881-82, p. 4, sequence 17.}

They were candid about not seeking a traditional undergraduate population at first; and this rationale explains why the Special Student population of women was so large as compared to its regular population who would have been young women in the four-year course. It also suggests why the first few years of the Society were so successful. They looked to their prospective population, they looked to their administrative options, and they found a match between flexible coursework, a nontraditional four-year course, and the women who were most likely to attend courses offered at Harvard, to use them with profit for themselves, and for the institution. These were women who either already had their college degrees in hand, or who were already employed and seeking additional educational experiences. In short, they were women who had already demonstrated some level of intellectual success, and were primed to use a short stay in Cambridge to enhance their academic portfolio and return to their professional lives. They were exportable in a way that the average Special at Harvard simply was not. The exportation of this success was another of the arguments to admitting the female Specials:

In devotion to work and success in study the grade is more than ordinarily high, and the number of advanced students great. It should be remembered that though the undergraduates in the four collegiate classes constitute here and elsewhere the nucleus of the college, the “special” students have among us an unusual importance, because they represent investigators, sometimes advanced in years and experience, who come to us with a strong purpose which contact with the world and a struggle for self-support have intensified to an extent that the ordinary undergraduate has no conception of. These women, when they leave us, carry our methods and our principles into immediate action, applying them with energy, and with an efficiency which the graduate from a four-years’ course can only obtain after years of labor. It is therefore the special students of this class...
who most warmly appreciate the privileges that we give them, and who carry our influence abroad the most quickly.\textsuperscript{12}

This type of student was unheard of in Harvard College or the Professional Schools, and this description of the Society’s Specials demonstrates the profound difference from Harvard in terms of accomplishment and accolades both from the university and prior to it. Harvard could validate its special populations while at the school, could remediate them as necessary, could offer them opportunity, but it could not count on exporting them with promise.

This is where the fundamental difference of sex and the parallel difference of past experience and future promise become entwined: though admitted by the same statues, women were not, in fact, men. They were not a part of the hundreds of years of tradition governed by the ideal of a “manly education.” They also brought with them a range of ambitions, experience, and skills that the Harvard undergraduate, Special or regular, would not have had. As exceptional students by sex, these women started unencumbered by the 60-year history of Harvard’s class of Special Students. More importantly, the disadvantages of their education in prior years actually made the Society’s Managers more keen to uphold academic standards that at Harvard mattered very little until the system seemed broken enough to fix. Harvard had, as we saw in the previous chapter, begun to address its Special problems in the mid-1880s, and so we might assume that Radcliffe was beneficiary of Harvard’s recent reforms in student management. The timing of these reforms suggests, however, that they were not a precursor to the

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 1887-88, p. 14, sequence 78; italics mine. Pointing to this last sentence in particular, this very exportation of education was taken in the opposite context at exactly this time in the Divinity School at Harvard: it was the risk of students going forth and representing the university, but without the full and proper training – call it imprinting – of the university via the degree, that was such a risk for institutional credibility.
expansion of women in Cambridge, but a consequence of their arrival. Once women
overcame the hurdle of their own sex, and were invited into the community of
Cambridge, the impact on the institutional rules governing their male brethren was almost
immediate, and provided a vital example of student success, as well as an effective
approach to academic administration at the end of the 19th century; one which used
academic promise, professional experience, skills, and potential as a gauge for college
and post-college success, rather than family, certificates of moral character, or wealth.\(^\text{13}\)

The women of the Society were a new breed of student in Cambridge, not only
because they were women, but because they were a population of Special Students unlike
Harvard had seen in its 60-year history of admitting them: graduates from women’s
colleges, teachers from Boston and Cambridge, housewives seeking a peek behind
Harvard’s doors, and published authors:

To this body [Special Students] belong those older students who may have passed
the school age before the opportunities for collegiate work were to any
considerable extent open to women. Some of these have been teachers, but others
have not pursued any professional career. Many of this class of students have
gone out from us to take positions of high rank which but for our intervention
would not have been within their reach. Others are carrying forward scientific
investigations which in their published results do them credit.\(^\text{14}\)

The first expectation had been that the institution would be chiefly serviceable to
young girls intending to be teachers. But soon older teachers began to come in,
not only from the neighborhood, but from distant parts of the country, attracted by
the wider opportunities, while young women who cared for study simply for its
own sake, without reference to any other object, joined our ranks.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^\text{13}\) That said, in the early years of the Society scholarships were no more available to female Specials than to
male. Women needed to be able to pay for their educations as well. Many of the reports in the 1880s
discuss keeping costs low enough for women to take classes; a larger issue for them was paying for room
and board to stay with local families. There were no dormitories until Radcliffe and its new endowment
could pay for infrastructure.

\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., 1892-93, p. 6, sequence 238.

\(^\text{15}\) Radcliffe, 1893-94, p. 9, sequence 11.
During the 1880s, three distinct kinds of Special Student had really begun to emerge: the specialist, the generalist, and the teacher. The specialist was pursuing graduate studies, most often arriving with an undergraduate degree or certificate in hand (“carrying forward their scientific investigations”); the generalist was most akin to the Harvard Special, an Annex Girl, perhaps pursuing a four-year course by fits and starts, but not admitted as a normal undergraduate (“young women who cared for study simply for its own sake”); the teacher was returning to enhance her professional credentials and her education (“young girls intending to be teachers” and “older teachers”). All three of these types of student, it must be noted, were throughout this period of Radcliffe’s development admitted as “Specials,” so the one characteristic Radcliffe did share with Harvard at this point was in the very breadth of the category to entertain a wide variety of students not conforming to admissions standards of the undergraduate, and/or not interested in pursuing a classical education in the traditional model of Harvard College.

The differences were in their preparation and their potential upon leaving.

As I showed in the last chapter, Harvard was at this very time trying to figure out what being a “student” at the institution meant. Harvard’s administration was also beginning to interrogate exactly what preparation should be required of its college freshmen and its graduates. In Harvard’s terms, that was in large part a consequence of the special student population, but also the introduction of electives and the expansion of graduate opportunities. The question was not simply, “What is a student?” but more specifically, “What is a college student?” And that meant also asking, “What is a college?” especially with the arrival of women eager to pursue higher studies. Would the Society become, in fact, a college comparable to Harvard, with a core nucleus of 18-22
year olds pursuing a four-year degree? Would it remain a destination for graduates of the women’s colleges, arrived at Harvard to pursue graduate studies? Would it continue to serve teachers seeking instruction in Harvard’s methods? What role would the Special Students play in the administration’s expansion of the female student body? Answering these questions would be vital for the administrators and the new population of women invited to study at the Harvard Annex.

These questions about the students and the foundation of the College also guide my inquiry in this chapter, which proceeds as an institutional history of women’s education at Harvard from 1879 through the establishment of Radcliffe College, focusing specifically on this new breed of female Specials, and their affect on the development of that institution, not, ultimately, as a destination for graduate studies, or teacher preparation, but as an undergraduate College. This chapter also explores Radcliffe’s contributions to Harvard through this population of Special Students – what Radcliffe gave to Harvard beyond “women” – and in so doing, demonstrates why President Eliot’s staunch opposition to women’s education in 1869 was replaced a mere decade later with enthusiasm for their presence.

1885: Radcliffe College Emerges

It is not a small question, what the future of an institution like this is to be.
- Society Annual Report, 1886-1887

It was not contemplated to create a college; but a college has been created.
- Society Annual Report, 1886-1887

1885 was a defining year in Cambridge. Six years after the launch of the Great Experiment of women’s education, the Managers for the Society had set their sights on

16 Both epigraphs from Society in Radcliffe, 1886-87, p. 15, sequence 63; and p. 6, sequence 54.
forming a full-fledged undergraduate College for, and from, the Society of female students.\textsuperscript{17} Their ambitions reflected the early success of their students, but also an urgency born of fundraising: they had only raised enough money to guarantee women’s education in Cambridge for six years. 1885 marked the end of that sixth year, and so without an endowment or additional annual giving, the Great Experiment would come to an end. As we shall see in this section, the Society had the good fortune of fine administrative management from the start, but it also had the good fortune of a very strong student body of females, giving testimony, with each succeeding year, to the value of this enterprise.

As proof of its promise, the Society for Women had recently graduated its first students from the four-year regular undergraduate course, an observation especially important to beginning to argue that a “college” was emerging. In fact, they went further than this, claiming its premature establishment in 1885:

In conclusion, it remains only to be said that the enterprise enters upon its seventh year with greater reasons for hopefulness, both in respect to the co-operation of the Professors of Harvard College and the earnest work of its increasing number of students, than it ever before enjoyed. \textit{A real college for women has been established}, and is effectively accomplishing its work of diffusing intelligence and disciplining the mind.\textsuperscript{18}

But of course, this was still 1885, and a “real college” had not yet been established. The founding of the college would take another seven years more. But it was becoming clear what would make that claim viable, and though it did have to do with “disciplining the

\textsuperscript{17} For Harvard College, 1885 was a year in which the slow changes of many decades found solid ground. In this year, the Harvard faculty had finally identified the most serious challenges and ambitions facing undergraduate education at Harvard, had put names to them, and established an administrative structure that would provide oversight. President Eliot delivered his address on the Elective System, the Harvard Overseers made official statutory provision for Specials – male and female – at Harvard University, and the Harvard Faculty began supervising the Harvard Special Student population. In 1885, English A was moved from sophomore year to freshman year, becoming the very first “freshman composition” course in American educational history.

mind” it had as much to do with the leadership of the Society in building the capital – monetary and educational – to justify a women’s college in perpetuity. The educational component required credentialing its students with the imprint of Harvard, not only on the mind, but on paper, through the successful exams and certificates of its students.

In this same year, 1885, the Society’s Managers assumed responsibility for the administration of Harvard exams to women seeking entrance, a responsibility previously handled by the Women’s Educational Association of Boston. These exams were tied with the granting of certificates, for they were taken as tests of admission and placement prior to beginning studies in Cambridge. In the passage below, the claim to being a college was associated first with the faculty charged with disciplining these young female minds, then through the administration of exams, and finally, through granting certificates to guarantee the work of its students. Thus the college for women becomes the equivalent of a Harvard College education through the imprint of the Harvard faculty, as written below “based upon its instruction and these examinations”:

It was not contemplated to create a college; but a college has been created. Our catalogue bears the names of some fifty of the Professors of Harvard College, whose names and work give to that institution its worth and its fame. These teachers offer to women through us some four score courses of instruction in almost every department of learning represented in the college. They not only give the instruction, but they conduct the examinations, and certify to the grade of work accomplished by each candidate. At last the Society sends forth its graduates armed with a certificate based upon its instruction and these examinations. The women thus sent out have been subjected to the same training that Harvard College gives her graduates, and they have in the most instances sustained themselves with ability equal to that of their brother. The brains and the work constitute the college.19

Brains and work may (or may not) constitute the college, but it is the piece of paper that proves the education. The irony here, however, is that the piece of paper did not

19 Ibid., 1886-87, p. 6, sequence 54.
necessarily prove the education had taken place in Cambridge, or that the women had, in fact, ever studied with the professors. Some women did not want the experience of attending “college,” for they may have already had such an experience elsewhere. These female applicants would sit the Harvard exam, pass, and fail to arrive for the first day of class; they did not want to attend college; rather, they wanted the certification by Harvard of educational accomplishment gained elsewhere.

From 1882-84, just prior to these claims of a “real college” having been formed, women educated at other institutions wanted to take the Society’s entrance examinations with no intention of studying at Radcliffe at all, but only to validate the preparation they had received elsewhere: 35 women sat the exam in 1883, 17 were admitted, and only 4 enrolled. In order to better control the exam to yield an enrolling population, in 1885-86 the Society officially assumed responsibility for “The Harvard Examinations for Women in Cambridge” from the Women’s Education Association of Boston which had administered them since 1874. Women who had passed these exams – even prior to any opportunities of studying at Harvard – were awarded Certificates from Harvard College. After three years of administering these exams, the Society requested of Harvard College in 1888 to be relieved of responsibility, and the exams were discontinued as of June, 1889: “The discontinuance of the Harvard Examinations for Women in Cambridge simply means that a valuable agency has served its purpose and is no longer needed.”

They had begun in 1874 (prior to The Great Experiment) as a measure of women’s accomplishment, a stamp of approval by Harvard of the education it did not provide.

---

20 Ibid., 1883-84, p. 6, sequence 6. One reason for this lack of enrollment was that the “examinations” at this time were more akin to “final exams” than “entrance exams.” They were to provide equivalence to the Harvard education, not to guarantee proficiency to begin. The administration had not yet adjusted the content of its exams to the purpose of the changing Society; that is, as a shift from validation to education.

21 Ibid., 1888, p. 23, sequence 87.
They remained such a mechanism even after women were invited to study with Harvard’s faculty. The exams had become a means of getting this validation for free without pursuing the education, becoming a burden on the Women’s Association and then in expanded form on the Society. The solution to this was to, as of 1889, charge a fee for taking the exam, and then remit that fee upon entrance to the Society’s courses. For those who did not choose to enter, that fee would exist for the privilege of sitting the exam and would pay for the administration of it. Instead of an evaluative exam, then, it became an admissions exam, a vital distinction in the formation of the Society. This decision was also attached to the establishment of Smith and Wellesley which were now offering degrees to women; so the free credentialing by the Society was no longer cost-effective for them, nor necessary as a public good to women. Most importantly, the Society had begun to consider the “brains and work” to “constitute the college” and had solidified its relationship with the Harvard professorate to do that work with the women who attended courses with them.

The short history of this Harvard Examination for Women testifies to the speed with which perfunctory credentialing actually became a Cambridge education. First printed in the catalogue in 1885, the Society granted its Certificates to recognize the successful completion of coursework by the ladies: the First Form, a certificate for completion of one or more courses as Special Students; the Second Form for successful completion of a year’s study on the way to a four-year degree (the women may be awarded “Honors” and “Honors of the Highest Grade” in their course of study); and the
Third From for those pursuing the four-year course equivalent to a Harvard degree.22

Following are reproductions of these Certificates from the 1887-88 report:23

---

**First Form of Certificate.**

**THE SOCIETY FOR THE COLLEGIATE INSTRUCTION OF WOMEN.**

**CAMBRIDGE, 188**

During the Academic Year pursued the Courses of Study mentioned below, corresponding to courses of instruction given in Harvard College; and passed satisfactorily examinations upon them, corresponding to the College examinations.

**Secretary.** **Chairman of the Academic Board.**

---

22 These certificates are described in slightly different form in 1889, the final year of the Harvard Exams for women, as designated for three “classes of students”: the first certificate for four-year course equivalent of BA; the second for teachers pursuing supplementary instruction; the third for “special studies.”

23 *Society in Radcliffe*, 1887-88, pp. 7-8, sequence 71-72.
SECOND FORM OF CERTIFICATE.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE COLLEGIATE INSTRUCTION OF WOMEN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

We hereby certify that,
has successfully pursued, through a period of four years, a course of Liberal study given, under the supervision of this Society, by Instructors in Harvard College.

In testimony whereof we have caused these presents to be signed by our President and Secretary, and by the Chairman of the Academic Board, this day of

in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and

Chairman of the Academic Board.  President.

Secretary.

THIRD FORM OF CERTIFICATE.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE COLLEGIATE INSTRUCTION OF WOMEN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

We hereby certify that under the supervision of this Society,

has pursued a course of study equivalent in amount and quality to that for which the Degree of Bachelor of Arts is conferred in Harvard College and has passed in a satisfactory manner examinations on that course, corresponding to the College examinations.

In testimony whereof we have caused these presents to be signed by our President and Secretary, and by the Chairman of the Academic Board, this day of

in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and

Chairman of the Academic Board.  President.

Secretary.
The First Form Certificates were signed by two officials of the university: first, the Secretary of the Society, Arthur Gilman, who was also the author of the Society’s reports until the establishment of Radcliffe College, when he became Regent; secondly the Chairman of the Academic Board, William E. Byerly. The Second and Third Form Certificates were also signed by the President, Mrs. Louis Agassiz (later recorded as Elizabeth C. Agassiz). This brings us to a discussion of the specific Harvard faculty – the members of the Academic Board – charged with overseeing the emergence of Radcliffe College, not as the brains and work of its students and professorate, but as an institutional entity, dependent upon Harvard, but aspiring to its own set of standards.

**Raising the Harvard Bar: The Evolution of the Academic Board**

Overseeing the academic standards of its operations, the Society established a separate Academic Board from the one charged with administering the Harvard policies. The Academic Board at the Society served the same purpose as the Harvard committee, and was “almost exclusively composed of Harvard Professors.” Until the establishment of Radcliffe College, these boards operated quite independently, with the Society pushing at the upper end of the standards in response to some pressure to allow students admission by lower standards, especially for the admission of Specials. The Harvard College approach had generally been to admit the underprepared, monitor their performance, and if sub-standard, dismiss. The Society’s Academic Board was much more directly engaged with the threat of lack of preparation than Harvard College, and took a

---

24 The Special Student certificate received an additional explanation: “The first certificate, given to ‘special students,’ bears upon its face a record of the grade to which the student was assigned in each study, and has therefore a meaning which is at once understood by any intelligent person to whom it is presented” (Ibid.).

25 *Society in Radcliffe*, 1890-91, p. 10, sequence 162.
pre-emptive approach, largely preventing the arrival of unprepared students at Cambridge by maintaining the most rigorous standards possible, as seen in 1891:

Lowering the grade of requirements breeds distrust, and it is our constant aim to hold our candidates to the highest tests that Harvard College allows. During the past year, indeed our Academic Board has advanced its requirements for special students in order to ensure a continuance of the high standard that had previously marked our classes; for it is undisputed that popularity leads to a pressure upon an institution like ours from half-prepared candidates, which it is only possible to resist by elevating the requirements. Under our present rules special students must not only be of mature age, but they must be prepared for advanced work. No girls unable to complete the curriculum of the High School or the Latin School can find places among our students. The Board desires to draw the line distinctly between the work of the Preparatory School and the college. By the application of this rule some candidates have been disappointed; but with little reason, for the propriety of it is apparent, and those women who are temporarily excluded congratulate themselves all the more heartily after they are admitted.26

The firm line drawn distinctly between Preparatory School and the College was especially important because the women at the college were, many of them, already teachers, and were using Harvard for professional development, intending to return to their teaching positions in the preparatory classroom after their Harvard courses were complete. It made no sense, then, to contemplate “college” as a location for these teachers to “prepare” for college, when they were already teachers of college prep looking to become better teachers. They couldn’t, in short, be both teachers and students of a method simultaneously. The Specials at Harvard, on the other hand, could, because they were not a part of this preparatory education loop. The Society thus took much more seriously the distinction between secondary and tertiary education than did Harvard College in the implementation of its admissions policies.

26 Ibid., p. 8, sequence 160. Interestingly, this accurately describes the experience of Judge Joseph Story in his first attempt to enter Harvard. The Special Student provision that he proposed in 1824, and that the Board of Overseers adopted in 1825, eliminated that stringency of admissions preparation at Harvard, but clearly was not adopted by the managers of the Society.
It also took more seriously the requirement that its Specials be of “mature age” and “prepared for advanced work.” It was the responsibility of the Academic Board of the Society to maintain these standards. The Society’s Managers felt an urgency that Harvard clearly did not feel when faced with unqualified candidates, that “the only reason for our existence lies in the fact that we keep up the high grade of our work, and that grade can certainly not be sustained if the quality of the incoming students is permitted to drop.” Since 1885 when a college was first claimed, the student body of women (again, the “brains and work”) in the early 1890s became critical indicators of whether this claim was warranted. These concerns accumulate in the reports as the Society grows its population and comes closer to its establishment as Radcliffe College.

In the first report of Radcliffe in 1893-94, Arthur Gilman, now the Regent of the College, emphasizes the standards that have been set by the Academic Board:

The Academic Board has continued to raise the requirements for the admission of Special Students, with the intention of admitting none who are not in the strictest sense of the term specialist. It is this strictness which has given us the high grade of scholarship, upon which we congratulate ourselves, in the department of Special Students. This is a class which we aim to encourage if they are capable of advanced collegiate work.

Indeed, the women in this category were capable of advanced collegiate work, for they were “usually of greater maturity than the undergraduates” and “the ones to be heard from in the way of publications.” Just as the Radcliffe regent is praising the work of its Specials, the Harvard president reports that “it is a good sign that the proportion of special students in the Scientific School is decreasing” from 60% in 1890-92, to 34% by

---

27 Ibid., p. 9, sequence 161.
28 Radcliffe, 1893-94, p. 25, sequence 27.
29 Ibid., p. 20, sequence 22.
Remember, too, that although some of these students were moving from Lawrence to Harvard College, thus being absorbed into the institution rather than eliminated, the Special population at Harvard College never rose above 10%. And yet, at the Society and then in the first year of Radcliffe’s founding, the goal is clearly to allow as many qualified women to pursue these very advanced studies as possible, even as it is growing its population of generalists, four-year regular students, and teachers. All of these decisions about which students best served the growth of the institution had been made by the two Academic Boards responsible for their standards, each preserving and promoting their academic agendas: the Society Board for the women, the Harvard Board for the men. But with the establishment of Radcliffe College, these two Boards were merged, forcing their members to come to a compromise about academic standards, educational goals, and the core student population of the new women’s college.

The establishment of Radcliffe, and the responsibility that Harvard College then assumed for the governance and management of the new women’s college “made it necessary that we [formerly the Society, now Radcliffe] should reorganize to a certain extent … The membership of the Academic Board was enlarged in such a way as to make the Board more completely representative of the different departments of study, and the members were chosen with the approval of the President and Fellows, so that the Board represents both Colleges, and through it the Corporation of Harvard College obtains the information by virtue of which the President signs the diplomas of Radcliffe College, and

\[\text{Harvard, 1893-94, p. 19-20, sequence 2984-85. The reality behind this statistic is that they are killing Lawrence softly by allowing these special students to enroll at Harvard College; as expressed here, and by contrast to Radcliffe’s report, the goal at Harvard is to limit the number of specials in the professional schools, precisely where advanced studies are supposed to be carried on.}\]
affixes to them the official seal.” For the remainder of the 1890s, academic standards for both Harvard and Radcliffe were assumed by an eight-member Academic Board.32

Once the Society became Radcliffe College, these Academic Boards were reorganized, such that Harvard’s board had a much greater connection to the academic standards of Radcliffe. The Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women had previously operated much more independently from Harvard; with the chartering of Radcliffe College, the union between both entities became much more enmeshed, leading to the threat, for example, of lower standards for Special Students at Radcliffe, but also the possibility for the goals and ambitions of Radcliffe to directly affect Harvard’s policies academically, not only as regards the Special Students, but also in general. It is no surprise, then, that we see the promising influence of Radcliffe’s handling of Specials on Harvard with the merging of these Boards.

Here is but one example of this positive influence from the year following Radcliffe’s founding, showing the decisions made by Harvard in policing its Specials, methods which should appear familiar from the way that Radcliffe had been handling them since its origins over a decade before. Although this report seems to suggest that these decisions were first made within Harvard College, my research has shown that these kinds of structures were first adopted with success at Radcliffe, if only by choosing not to adopt Harvard’s laissez-faire approach to this category of student, but to select them only with high standards which would prove beneficial to the university. Especially

---

32 “The members of the Academic Board for 1897-98, appointed by the Associates, with the express approval of the President and Fellows of Harvard College, are: Professors Greenough, Mark, Wright, Macvane, B.O. Peirce, von Jagemannn, Ashley, and Kittredge” (1896-97, p. 20, sequence 90). In 1897, Ashley was replaced by Grandgent.
amazing, in the following passage, is the suggestion that the University should follow the strategies of Harvard College, when it is Radcliffe to whom these standards are owed:

The Dean of the College gives in his report (pp.81-84) an account of the class of special students which has now become a permanent element in Harvard College. He points out that the establishment of the Faculty’s Committee on Special Students, which was intended not only to determine their admission, case by case, but also to regulate their choice of studies and to supervise their work in College, led to the appointment of the Committee of Advisers for Freshmen – a Committee which now seems an indispensable part of the College administration. He also shows how the Special Student Committee devised a method of inquiry about new-comers, which as been adopted by the College, replacing with great advantage the certificate of moral character formerly presented by candidates for admission. This method has now demonstrated its efficacy, and should be adopted by the other departments of the University. The class of special students is not one of long residence. About half of them remain not more than one year; but as the Dean points out taken together they do as honest work as the members of any College class, and need no longer be looked on with suspicion. “The body of Special Students may already point out among its members men worth all the labor expended on them.”

Seventy years of reliance on “moral character” has been replaced definitively by a “method of inquiry” established by the Special Student Committee and affirmed in the year after Radcliffe’s birth. Only following the merging of the Academic Boards in 1894 would this new rigor have made sense at Harvard. They appear to have adopted wholesale the rigorous examination of Special Students which had been an element of the women’s institution from the beginning. To look at it in a brief timeline, female Specials came in 1879, standards for Specials at Harvard were introduced in 1885, and the Academic Boards which oversaw the standards were merged with the establishment of Radcliffe College in 1894, eliminating the last vestiges of Harvard’s previous handling of Specials. Surely these decisions made for the men of Harvard were affected by the success and example of their sisters at Radcliffe.

---

33 Harvard, 1894-95, p. 20-21, sequence 3231-32; italics mine.
In this context, Eliot’s claim that by serving the strongest students within the university, he would also serve the weakest, really did ring true. The new breed of female Specials offered a strength in academics that the Harvard Specials did not, and through them, Eliot could also serve a much larger ambition than simply fixing the problems at Harvard College: that is, to become a first-rate German-model university. In the next few sections we will break down this new breed of student into the three categories previously mentioned: specialists, generalists, and teachers, all of whom were arriving in Cambridge – as a previously untapped and newly educated population – just as Eliot had begun successfully dismantling centuries of the collegiate classical education focused on developing the Harvard Man with his moral certificate, and on the wave of German education that had began to take hold in the US. Rather than expanding the depth of undergraduate education in Cambridge in the model of Harvard College, a significant percentage of the early female attendees came with a college education already, entering as specialists prepared to pursue their advanced studies, just as the Special Student Statues had first envisioned. These women arrived at Cambridge for their “Collegiate” education, not as Annex Girls, but as graduate students.

We have seen that, more and more, a Special Student at Radcliffe was becoming closely linked with students pursuing at least part of an undergraduate degree at Harvard. But at Radcliffe, the Special Students were also of a different caliber from those Harvard students: they were “specialists” where the majority of Harvard Specials were pursuing a general undergraduate education. Just as the Special Students were important for the growth of Radcliffe College, these specialists were essential to the growth of the departments at Harvard. It is to these Specialists – women with undergraduate degrees,
enrolling at Radcliffe as graduate students in order to further their training – that we now turn.

**Specialists: Foundation for An Institute for Advanced Study**

Vassar, Smith, and Wellesley had opened their doors in 1861, 1871, and 1875, respectively. With the opening of women’s education in Cambridge in 1879, graduates of these women’s colleges came to the Society to pursue advanced coursework. They were already equipped with a four-years undergraduate course, and because they were not taking the undergraduate certificate, and could not be admitted to Harvard’s graduate courses due to their sex, they were admitted as “Specials.” If we consider these members of its student body as part of defining the new institution, the beginnings of Radcliffe College truly were an Institute for Advanced Studies, before any such program existed for women, and only recently for men.34 This is one reason why the special population was from the very start so different at Radcliffe from Harvard, and why it had such an affect on the experiment that would become Radcliffe College. This desire for higher studies was one argument for offering women’s education at Cambridge: “One or two scholarly young women, who had sought and obtained private instruction at Harvard, gave a practical test of the genuineness of this new demand for University instruction – ‘If there are these, then why not more, – and if they have the taste and the ability for higher lines of study, why should they not also share the means?”35

34 Harvard began granting PhDs to men only seven years previous, in 1872. Harvard’s Graduate School was established in 1890. Radcliffe granted its first PhD in 1902. Female students were admitted to the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences six decades later in 1963; at that time the Radcliffe Graduate School closed its doors. For more information, see Eisenmann, *Historical Dictionary of Women’s Education*, 340.

The dean and president of Radcliffe saw these advanced students as the reason for the “special student” category, thus explaining why “specialist” pertained so much more strongly to the Radcliffe women than to the Harvard men, for whom such a purpose just did not take hold. This was a useful student category for Harvard only as long as the institution needed them to expand the graduate programs. Once these were fully enrolled by advanced students (such as they already had at Law, Divinity, and Medicine), the category of “special” made little sense to the institution; it was only useful at that point as a form of outreach to the general population.36 For the men, who had considerably more opportunities for preparatory school, there was a different stream of students wanting to take advantage of the College (thus, using the Scientific School as a way into the introductory College courses) as discussed in the previous chapter. At Harvard the Specials were primarily generalists seeking admission to Harvard College for an undergraduate degree.

But for the women, who might want to take advantage of Harvard’s resources, the most likely to be capable would have had College training elsewhere, or teaching or professional experience that would recommend them as profitably admitted to the institution for “advanced training” that Harvard could provide. Thus, reflecting back to the beginnings of women’s education in Cambridge, Secretary Arthur Gilman notes the central role of these advanced students:

At the beginning of our career it was thought best to promise and to give to advanced special students and to graduates the greatest hospitality, and that policy has always been adhered to. It is still believed that we have no higher duty than giving to advanced specialists and to graduates coming from other institutions the advantages which Harvard College offers so liberally to men. These students come to our classes in yearly increasing numbers. [sic] and are very welcome. They give a high tone to our whole body. They are women with a purpose. They

36 This is essentially what the Harvard Extension became in the early 20th century (beginning 1909).
have had experience of life and they come to us with definite intentions. When they go forth from us they put to immediate use the knowledge of facts and of methods that they have gained with us and they step into positions of importance which are never, from the circumstances of the case, open to graduates fresh from the senior class, who have all their practical experience to gain.37

For this group of women, even so close to the forming of Radcliffe, college was graduate or professional school. This was of course good for the women, but also for the establishment of the college as an institution, which could point to their accomplishments as evidence for the need of an endowment a permanent institution for all of the women. These specialists were the best argument for the establishment, not of a graduate school necessarily, but of an undergraduate institution which would invite them to pursue their undergraduate educations at Cambridge rather than at Smith, Wellesley, or Vassar. The connection between graduate and undergraduate here is mutually reinforcing for the growth of the German model. And yet, this raises again the decision between founding Radcliffe as an institute for advanced study or as a college equivalent to Harvard.

Reports throughout the 1880s highlight individual students and their scholarship, the research, and the publications, their honors, awards at graduation, including a growing list of endowed scholarships.38 In these long lists of plaudits, we see the women who had published their work, or come to Radcliffe from Vassar, Smith, or other women’s colleges, or come for specific studies (in one case for Astronomy), or gone on from Radcliffe to a higher degree elsewhere. The 1889-90 report makes a point of noting that these are “special students” admitted for advanced study at the Society: “It is to be

37 Society in Radcliffe, 1890-1891, p. 8, sequence 160.
38 On the last several pages of the inaugural report for Radcliffe College, in 1893-94, there is a list for first time of the various endowed scholarships available to women: The Agnes Irwin Scholarship, The Widow Joanna Hora Scholarship, the Maire Denny Fay Memorial Scholarship, the Josiah M. Fiske Memorial Scholarship, the George B. Sohier Prize (pp. 69-70, sequence 71-72). The following year, they added the Elizabeth Cary Agassiz Scholarship (1894-95, p. 71, sequence 71).
noted that all of the students who have thus far been mentioned belong to the class known as ‘specials,’ who are admitted to our courses on the same terms as those on which special students are admitted to Harvard College.”

According to the admissions criteria, men and women were equivalent, but the accomplishments listed in the Radcliffe reports are of a vast quality apart from the Harvard discussions at this time. Their work sounds impressive, indeed, and demonstrates their intellectual capacity as well as the maturity of adults, not college-aged students. There is very little, in fact, in common between these Radcliffe Specials and their Harvard counterparts.

This would explain why this report also focuses intently on pre-empting any association between the description of female “special students” and their male counterparts at this historical moment in Cambridge. By 1889, the Society is working very actively against an impression – of the Harvard Annex and the kinds of students admitted – of association between high praise for the scholarly results of these advanced students and the Specials of Harvard College. Because of the difference in population, it had become obvious that the majority special student population at the Society could not in good conscience be compared with the Harvard College special population. The only way for them to continue to distinguish their Specials as truly “specialist” was to deny admission for those who were not up to the task:

The Academic Board has … endeavored to keep the standard of admission for Special Students high as usual. Many candidates who were under twenty years of age, or who were not able to take really advanced work, such as ‘special’ students ought to undertake, have been refused admission, and it is hoped that it will in the future be understood that we do not want in our classes young women who have not reached maturity sufficient to make it possible to call them ‘specialists’ and that those who are unable to do work of a higher grade than that of the Latin or other Preparatory School should not ask to be admitted. The increased number of

---

39 *Society in Radcliffe*, 1889-90, pp. 8-9, sequence 120-121.
graduates of other collegiate institutions who are now coming to us seems to indicate that to some extent this is already beginning to be understood.40

This language distinguishing Special Students at the Society from their Harvard College counterparts may be veiled but knowing the contemporary context of remediation of Special Students at Harvard, the language takes on a more aggressive and distancing effect in 1892-93, to be followed only a few years later with direct distinctions between the Specials at Radcliffe who are pursuing advanced studies and those who are not.

There were, of course, both kinds of students in that first decade of the Society’s existence. The largest contingent of women in the second year was prepared at private schools (18 of 47),41 while the balance came from a variety of educational experiences: 12 attended High Schools in Massachusetts, one attended High School in Illinois, and the rest attended, or graduated from Academies, Collegiate Institutes, or the women’s colleges, Wellesley, Vassar and Smith. Regionally, 39 were from Massachusetts, but even in these first few years, the possibility of studying at Harvard drew individual women from as far away as Minnesota, Illinois, and South Carolina:

…our classes are fed by the best private schools, and by the public high schools, but, presumably, that even to those who have graduated at the Colleges established especially for women, we offer opportunities to carry their studies forward to an extent that is not excelled elsewhere.42

While the education was to be “college,” the experience was seen by the attendees – whether they were college graduates or not – as an opportunity for “advanced study” and the institution catered to this idea, largely because the admissions standards were linked historically with special status.

40 Ibid., 1891-92, pp. 9-10, sequence 197-98.
41 Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-81, p. 7, sequence 7.
42 Ibid., p. 8, sequence 8.
At this time in its history, the fact was that there was no determining how these women fit into the general education of Harvard, whether their courses would be considered “graduate” by Harvard’s standards, or whether their advanced work would be more along the lines of the electives that were offered to undergraduates. The distinction between undergraduate and graduate study was at this time in the Harvard system fluid. The majority of male graduate students at Harvard were Harvard graduates who stayed to pursue advanced study. 43 The women had of course come from other institutions, and so the distinction between their undergraduate and graduate work was defined by the new institution. And yet, as with Harvard Specials, even the women who came as regular undergraduates could choose to study in advanced lines. Without a formal graduate school, these students were all part of forming a broad curriculum that in the 1880s was still fully available to any students who studied in Cambridge.44 This fluidity would gradually disappear for Harvard with the awarding of PhDs in 1872 and the formation of the Graduate School in 1890; but prior to this, it was the female population that most indicated that the preparation divide between undergraduate and graduate work would

43 Kitzhaber offers the following enrollment numbers for Harvard: 1869: 5 Harvard grad students; 1872: 28 graduate students; 1876: 61 graduate students; 1889: 111 graduate students (Kitzhaber, Rhetoric in American Colleges, 16). Kitzhaber does not address the female population of graduate students in Cambridge.

44 There was risk, demonstrated with the Harvard Specials, that some students would not be able to navigate the expanded choice of studies appropriately. In the following passage from the Society reports, the women are not having the same trouble as the men, from whom they may have acquired that “fear” of the “desultory choice:”

A marked improvement in noticeable in the selection of studies made by the students. Instead of the desultory choice, to which it was somewhat feared the freedom of election that we allowed might lead, there has been an increasing tendency to consolidate upon definite, well-considered plans of study. This is encouraging as indicating an intelligent method of work as well as a specific aim on the part of the students, and it is at the same time eminently favorable to the financial success of our undertaking (1883-84, p. 13, sequence 13).

It appears that the female Specials were far more adept at choosing their educational pathways than their male counterparts given the freedom of election; and, as I’ve noted previously, the Managers saw this success, and the focus on limited study, as intimately tied with generating the financial backing for the institution. Finally, Gertrude Stein would fall directly in this category of student, a generalist entering, who became successful at concentrating in single lines of study.
become a policy issue for the women’s Society as the student population grew; more broadly, however, it was an indication that the women’s population at Harvard equaled the breadth of university potential – from first-years to graduate students – that had been developing for the men. In fact, the Society offered a microcosm of the German model university with a far smaller population than its brethren at Harvard.

In 1892, the Society makes the distinction for the first time between work done by “graduates” and done by “undergraduates.” Women had been coming from other schools with degrees since the first year of Private Collegiate Instruction, and had been enrolled as “specials” in relation to Harvard College, not graduate departments. But with the formal organization of the Graduate School, the women of the Society could be grouped with the Harvard graduate students more sensibly than with the Specials. Through the Special Student Statues, the Society had realized in practice what Harvard College had only claimed: a class of students admitted nontraditionally who would use their time at Harvard to study in advanced courses: “The University has taken us under her charge, has made herself responsible for the validity of our degrees by the strongest official guarantees, while the liberal interpretation she puts upon her own pledges shows that they include more than they promise … [such as] a far larger number of advanced courses than we had hoped for.”\textsuperscript{45} In return Harvard gained a cadre of highly talented advanced female students who would bring credit especially to the student body of Specials that had so long plagued Harvard’s policies governing this group of students. In this sense, the Radcliffe women contributed directly – because of their advanced status – to the growth of graduate education at Harvard at a time when it needed the influx of students in order to continue the growth of the departments. Indeed, for these women pursuing graduate

\textsuperscript{45}Radcliffe, 1893-94, pp. 9-10, sequence 11-12.
studies, the classes were not segregated from the Harvard men. In this first year of Radcliffe College “of the sixty-three graduate courses thus offered, fifty-one and one-half are courses in Harvard University, the women being in those cases admitted to the same classes with the men.” Graduate education expanded directly in the classroom by the introduction of Radcliffe’s advanced students to the actual Harvard classrooms with the men. Radcliffe College was an “Institute for Advanced Study” at its inception. It is fitting that more than a century later, it should come to claim that name legally and in an institutionally redefined relationship to Harvard University. In some senses, the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study established in 1999 has finally grown into its origins of these female “specialists,” a modern-day institution modeled after those Special Students who availed themselves of the privileges in those first decades.

Specialists & Generalists: Redefining the Special at the Society

Having first admitted women as Special Students in 1879, the Society re-defined what “special” meant for the female students in Cambridge in 1885, the same year that Arthur Gilman, the Secretary of the Society, suggested that what they were forming was a “college” for women. Whereas in the previous section we saw the line between undergraduate and graduate education come to be defined as a college within a university, in this section, the Special Student policies at Radcliffe begin to broaden more towards the Harvard College model; and yet they do so with efforts at maintaining the positive reputation that Special Students had gained from their “specialist” population, the one more resembling graduate studies. This happens, first, by claiming that a “real college” has been formed, and then making it happen in reality. The Society’s re-

46 Ibid., p. 16, sequence 18.
definition of Special Student suggests an entirely different history and potentially
different future for this group from the Harvard definition, an important distinction at the
moment when the Society is moving from a majority of teachers and advanced students
to a core nucleus of women pursuing undergraduate education comparable to the Harvard
undergraduate. The issue was that this core nucleus of women pursuing undergraduate
courses were still admitted as Specials, not as four-year candidates. Hence, in order to
preserve the strengths of the Society in its advanced students, there was a desire to
separate out definitively this new group of Harvard look-alikes and the type of Special –
the advanced student – that had made the Society such a success in its first seven years.

This new nuanced description of the female Specials themselves – the students,
ot the policy that enabled their attendance – appears as a bracketed footnote beneath the
statistics for number of classes, and number of students by department, in the Society
report of 1885. (Again, 1885, that crucial year for the emergence of the college.) It
emphasizes a distinction between “special” students and “general” students amongst
those women who are not pursuing a four-year course either of classics or electives: 47

\[
\text{Analysis of the Courses taken by the Students.}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking the usual four years' college course</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking an elective course of four years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a smaller number of elective studies than are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary for the second certificate of the Society:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[By “special” students is here meant specialists who come to our classes
with the earnest spirit of the scientific or literary investigator and seek
instruction in those lines of study in which they have been before at
work. The “general” students are those who come for general literary or
scientific culture, and their comparatively small number is significant.]

\[47\] Society in Radcliffe, 1884-85, p. 9, sequence 25; italics mine
By this description, the “special” students are older women coming to Cambridge either from a job or from previous study. They are graduate or continuing students, the specialists described in the previous section. The “general students” are coming to Cambridge for a general education in science or literature. The “significance” of their small number is meant to indicate that the majority of women who study at Cambridge are still, in 1885, “advanced” students, in a sense comparable to graduate students, or women seeking to enhance their professional credentials, most likely in teaching. By contrast, one might assume that the female “general students” in this passage were comparable to the majority Harvard undergraduate. They were not. These “general students” were still “Specials.”

In fact, all of the students in these two categories “special” and “general” are Special Students in the Harvard sense: they have not passed their qualifying examinations, and are not pursuing the four-year course en route to a degree. Just over half of the 55 women attending in 1885 were degree-candidates (22 studying the classical course, and 7 taking a four-year course of electives), while the remaining ones (26 total) – described as special or general – were all admitted as Special Students. It appears that the Society, in this redefinition of Special as both “special” and “general,” is parsing distinctions in the student population where none exist by statute; but the Society, with its cadre of true “specialists” in its ranks, clearly had a reason for the distinction. This was becoming increasingly important as the lines between advanced study and general undergraduate study were reflected in the disparate academic profiles of the students within the Society itself, especially as the numbers of Special “general students” resembling the four-year students grew. One way to read this identification of the
‘generalist” was that the fears of 1882 mentioned at the beginning of this chapter had come true: that women were in fact beginning to use the “Special” line in an attempt to gain entrance to the four-year course, and their coursework in general lines began to overtake the work by the advanced students, those who had made the Society a success.

The Society introduced this new term, “generalist,” into the discussion as distinct from the “special” from Harvard, and also distinct from the regular undergraduate. At the Society, “special” had truly come to mean “advanced” or “graduate.” Harvard’s contemporary understanding of “special” was inadequate to describe the diversity that the Society had in its midst, especially at the upper end of its classes. Described using the other statistics above, those intending to leave for teaching or professional work numbered 33 (Specials including the specialists), and those “apparently studying for the advantages of thorough mental cultivation only” numbered 22 (the generalists, both four-year and Specials). They see the need to describe a difference between the Special Students admitted under Harvard’s rules who arrived with previous work experience or education, from those who wanted to be undergraduates but were unqualified to pursue the four-year course. This term “generalist” became necessary by 1885 to describe the equivalent of the Harvard Special within the Society, if only to protect the stature of the Specials who still comprised the strongest of their students, the core of their success, even if they were no longer a majority. It would become increasingly important as a sub-category as the distinction between undergraduate and graduate education solidified in the next five years, on the way to the formation of Radcliffe, described earlier in this chapter.48

48 Besides demonstrating the graduated distinctions between graduate and undergraduate education, this is interesting as well because of the insight it gives to Gertrude Stein’s advancement through her education:
Soon after the Society began parsing its special population into “specialists” and “generalists” in order to acknowledge the real work being done by its advanced students, it saw an increase in the number of students choosing *not* to pursue specialist studies. The early expectation that the majority of women in Cambridge were there for training as teachers or for advanced studies gave way to a more collegiate reality: “The greater number of our students do not seek such [teaching] positions, however. They belong to the class of women who study for the simple purpose of self-improvement.”*49* These were women who best fit the mold of a traditional collegiate education. At the very same time, the number of “Special students” enrolling was still increasing more rapidly than regular candidates. So who were these students studying for the simple purpose of self-improvement? The generalist Specials. By this time, then, the “generalists” clearly outnumbered the “specialists” despite what the enrollment numbers showed in terms of the admissions stream. The Society was indeed beginning to resemble Harvard: it was throwing off its original identity as an institute for advanced study, and accumulating within its ranks a population of students whose qualifications may not allow them to pursue admission via the normal route, but whose academic ambitions and preparation aligned them with the core undergraduate population of Harvard College.

Shortly before becoming a College, then, the Society was beginning to replicate the student enrollment patterns more common to Harvard than to its founding as an institute for advances studies. Its core group of students were pursuing a true collegiate education rather than advanced studies. It appears through this change of student enrollments in the early 1890s that becoming Radcliffe College required the Society to

---

*49* *Society in Radcliffe*, 1890-91, p. 11, sequence 163.
take on more of Harvard’s patterns, especially in establishing more firmly the core nucleus of an undergraduate college. This of course was related to the work of the merged Academic Board; this section merely looks at the situation from the perspective of student enrollment rather than administrative oversight. But the sharing of Academic Boards is critical as the definitions are compared ever more closely by the faculty sharing responsibility for monitoring the student populations under them. With one set of faculty in charge of both men and women, the balance of “generalist” to “specialist” in the two Colleges became all the more obvious: in short, Radcliffe had specialists, and Harvard simply did not.

One year after the founding of Radcliffe, this term “generalist” appears in the Harvard College annual report, not as a distinction from the specialist but as an equivalence: at Harvard, the “specialist” is a “generalist” according to the assessments in 1894-95. This means that the average Harvard Special is less interested in the advanced studies that this category affords, than the introductory courses that were recently prescribed for the undergraduate, for example, English A, the freshman composition course. By 1894-95, the split between Harvard College and the Graduate Programs was fairly well-defined, but the student streamline that made graduate school growth possible (the advanced students, the Special Students) contained admits who were still straddling the institutional divide: using the Special Student category to enter, but primarily investing their time at Harvard College. The Special class was not one of distinction as it had become at Radcliffe College, a category needing preservation from the encroachment of low standards.

Where the Society had coined a term – generalist – to preserve the distinction of
its Special class, Harvard finally collapsed the two into one, acknowledging what the student numbers had been showing for years: that the true “specialist” at Harvard was a rare bird indeed:

“The courses in Harvard College,” says the University Catalogue of 1894-1895 (p.211), “are open to persons who give satisfactory evidence of their fitness to pursue the particular courses they elect, although they have not passed the usual examinations for admission to College. These students are known as Special Students; they are members of the College from the time of their admission, but are not candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.” In theory, then, the Special Student is a specialist, not attempting the regular College course and not looking for the regular College diploma; in reality, as a former chairman of the Committee on Special Students observers, “these specialists are generalists; they want introductory courses in various general lines, but pursue no subject very far. Real specialists are found chiefly in the Graduate School.” Moreover, the Special Student of to-day means to get the Bachelor’s degree if he can. The Special Student described in the University Catalogue is the rarest kind of Special Student to-day.50

This may very well have been true in Harvard College and all the Graduate Schools. It was not true at Radcliffe. In the very same year, even though the “generalist” at Radcliffe had grown in number, it was also clear that a distinction from Harvard was deemed necessary to assuage any confusion that Radcliffe’s Specials were of the same ilk as Harvard’s, or any other male college for that matter:

“…the class of students known as ‘Specials,’ a title little honored in colleges for men, but which in Radcliffe College has a signification that leads us to desire that more may be enrolled in it. Nearly two-thirds of the students of the year now under discussion belong to this class. They are women of more years and experience than the undergraduates, and they are apt to be the ones who soonest make a mark after leaving us. Indeed many of them have acquired distinction before coming to Cambridge.”51

At Radcliffe, the majority of Specials were still advanced, returning, and adult students, exactly the people for whom the category was created and perpetuated through the 19th century. We have already heard about those whose distinction came in their

50 Harvard, 1894-95, p. 81, sequence 3292; italics mine.
51 Radcliffe, 1894-95, p.16-17, sequence 16-17.
undergraduate work as scholars at women’s colleges, but there was one more group
whose distinction may not have been scholarly, but had much greater impact on the
educational system at large: the teachers who came to Harvard for professional
development. Alongside the specialists, and the newly growing crop of generalists, the
Society had a population of educators. What interests me most about these cohorts of
Specials is this: within the same small student body, there were women pursuing the
familiar female role of “teacher” and women who were pursuing a relatively new and
unfamiliar role of “scholar,” in unprecedented numbers. This is an exciting moment in
Radcliffe’s history because it imagined a place that privileged the teaching of teachers as
well as the teaching of scholars.

Teachers As Scholars, Teachers As Students

Scholarship does not make teachers, but a teacher without scholarship is an
anomaly.

- Society for the Collegiate Study for Women, 1887-1888

Though the first few years of the Annex’s operation attracted advanced students
from other colleges, and those interested in pursuing specific lines of study, they were not
the population originally considered as most likely to avail themselves of Harvard’s
opportunities. In the year of Radcliffe’s founding, reflecting on the origins of the new
College, President Elizabeth Agassiz wrote, “The first expectation had been that the
institution would be chiefly serviceable to young girls intending to be teachers. But soon
older teachers began to come in, not only from the neighborhood, but from distant parts
of the country, attracted by the wider opportunities, while young women who cared for

52 Society in Radcliffe, 1887-88, p. 9, sequence 73.
study simply for its own sake, without reference to any other object, joined our ranks.”53

It cannot be overestimated how powerful this first expectation would be in justifying the education of women in Cambridge. Strengthening women’s collegiate education meant strengthening the entire system of education. Here was the solution to the declining preparatory skills already noted at Harvard College: train the women at Harvard to train the men and women who were applying to study as undergraduates. The risk was that the Society could, by this move, become primarily a “teacher’s college” for women rather than a place of scholarly pursuits.54

The risk existed, of course, because, although there were male teachers at this time, men were not groomed for teaching at Harvard College. Women were operating under very restricted professional trajectories. Even as they availed themselves of new educational opportunities, there was to be a “reason” for their attendance in the college setting: “A number of them were teachers fitting themselves for more thorough work in their specialties, and others were seeking the cultivation of their faculties, in order that they might (as some of them stated) be better prepared to perform their duties as members of society.”55 That a “number of them were teachers” was a new factor in the

---

53 Radcliffe, 1893-94, p. 9, sequence 11. Given my focus on the early training of teachers, especially of women, in Cambridge, Catharine Stimpson suggested at my defense that I reference the founding of the Harvard Graduate School of Education (HGSE) in 1920. I am certain that histories of women’s education in Cambridge address the relationship between the founding of Radcliffe and the HGSE, but it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to make that fascinating connection more concrete.

54 The Society also provided an educational respite for local teachers by allowing them to take courses as Special Students. In 1885-86, for example, the same year that Harvard College introduced supervision of its Special students — who comprised only 10% of the population — no less than 66% of Radcliffe’s students were Specials “taking one or more undergraduate or advanced courses. Twenty-one are found to have taken but a single elective each. Some of these were teachers in the vicinity of Boston who had time to come to Cambridge for higher instruction, generally in the line of their own teaching, though sometimes in some other subject that promised to broaden their educational foundations, or afford them intellectual relief from the monotony of their own class-rooms” (Society in Radcliffe, 1885-96, p. 5, sequence 37).

55 Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-81, p. 8, sequence 8. I suspect that for many, if not most of these women, “their duties as members of society” included marriage and raising children. This suggests that college education was not only perceived as suited for those entering the workforce in some capacity,
educational equation, not comparable to anything at Harvard. The new student body also presented a new challenge to the building of curriculum, for this opportunity was not to become a teachers college any more than it was to become a four-year independent women’s college like Smith or Vassar. The Society needed to strike a balance at the outset. The Managers wanted to serve teachers, they wanted to serve scholars, and they already saw the opportunities and risks inherent in appealing to one and neglecting the other. If they brought women to Cambridge, “teaching” would immediately become a part of the vocabulary of higher education, not only of the faculty, but of the students as well. Because of this new awareness of educating teachers as part of its mission, the Society was very conscious of the potential for double standards for its male and female students, and it positioned itself so as not to be held to a more restrictive standard because of the split between these roles of teacher and scholar. The Society Managers saw the risk early on of developing a curriculum specifically for women:

The teachers of America are to a large degree women, and it is desirable that all women who select this profession should be as well prepared to perform its duties as the men are who are engaged in similar work. But it is not teachers only who wish the highest cultivation of mental powers. Many women study with us for the sake of the general addition to their knowledge. It is not demanded that every man who takes a collegiate course shall become a teacher, and more must not be expected of women.

but also as enriching the home. Higher education thus extends its influence not only backwards into secondary education, but also into the domestic space. President Eliot, apparently, felt very strongly about this domestic purpose for the women, presented as an obstacle to the women’s education movement in the 19th century, according to Sally Schwager in her essay on the origins of Radcliffe College, “Taking Up The Challenges: The Origins of Radcliffe.” From Eliot: “‘The prime motive of the higher education of women should be recognized as the development in women of the capacities and powers which will fit them to make family life and social life more intelligent, more enjoyable, happier, and more productive’” (Charles W. Eliot, Radcliffe Commencement Address, 1894, in Schwager, “Taking up the Challenge,” 106).

This was never the objective in Cambridge. With Harvard’s faculty in residence, the scheme of a coordinate college rather than an independent college made financial and educational sense.

Society in Radcliffe, 1881-82, p. 4, sequence 17. So much here to be cognizant of: argument against the feminization of teaching at the moment that composition studies is introduced into the college curriculum; ergo risk inherent in the feminization of composition; not that feminization and/or composition is good or bad, but in consort they are perceived as restrictive and potentially anti-scholarly.
And yet, this was to be expected, for a woman’s opportunities in the workforce remained limited at this time. Regardless of how successfully a woman might demonstrate her “cultivation of mental powers,” a teaching position was one of the few for which a Harvard imprint would carry extra professional weight, and for which there would always be demand.

As early as 1882, women were already being recruited to preparatory schools from the Society, so that those prep schools could serve as feeder institutions to Harvard and to the women’s colleges. The 1882 report mentions schools in Cleveland, Indianapolis, and New York City, cities where they established an exam preparatory school for women wanting to take Harvard examinations. As the opportunities for women in Cambridge become wider known, the demand for teachers trained in what were known as the “Harvard methods” was expected to increase, thus creating an educational loop: educated at Harvard, sent out to prepare more men and women to be educated at Harvard. The 1886 Society report explicitly addresses this loop, outlining the growing relationship between the Harvard Exam – the same Exam mentioned earlier in this chapter – and the training of secondary school teachers by the Society itself:

In a former Report it was remarked that there would be a gradual increase in the number of women seeking higher education as the grade of the lower schools should rise, and that the tendency in this direction would be still farther quickened as it should become known that there is a demand for teachers who have passed through such a course as is provided by our Society.

In no year has the truth of this remark been so evident as in the past [1885-1886]. Not only have many letters been received from principals of schools for young women who wished to set the Harvard Examination for Women before their pupils as a standard, but we have learned that in some cases diplomas are

---

58 Ibid., p. 13, sequence 26.
59 As early as 1882, as well, the sustainability of this educational loop was linked to the need for an Endowment fund. For more information on the calls for increasing the endowment, see the following Society/Radcliffe reports in Radcliffe: 1884-85 p. 5, sequence 21; 1886-87 p. 8, sequence 56; 1887-88 p. 14, sequence 78; 1895-96 (Dean’s Report), 1896-97 p. 20, sequence 22.
offered to such pupils only after passing that examination. These facts show not only an appreciation of the value of the Harvard Examination in furnishing an educational standard, but they also indicate that the advance in the education of women is going on.

It was, of course, an inevitable result of this progress that there should be an increasing demand for teachers trained in the Harvard methods, and accordingly schools are constantly applying to us for our graduates that they may enter upon the work of preparing candidates for our classes and for the Harvard Examinations.

Besides this, there is a growing demand for our students as teachers in schools not setting up this standard, where it is thought that their training will add to the strength and efficiency of the corps of instructors.

During the year we have, as heretofore, sent our graduates and students to a number of schools of high grade as teachers. These women are doing credit to themselves and to us. They only difficulty experienced last year was in finding a sufficient number to take the positions offered.\(^6^0\)

There is real urgency at the Society in matching the entrance-level requirements to the preparation for admission; this urgency was not yet matched at Harvard, though it would be within five years, as I will explain in chapter 3, when discussing the Harvard English Reports of the 1890s. Harvard College, in 1885, was still pretty much consumed with developing its advising system for those already admitted, whether prepared or not.

Rather than using the exams to serve as a gate-keeping function, Harvard admitted students, then dealt with them within the Harvard system. At the women’s institution, the focus – perhaps, not surprisingly, because of the number of teachers by profession – turned, within a few years of its launch, to preparation for college, on that transition between secondary and tertiary education, and on bringing the applicants up to a standard that would warrant their attendance at Harvard: “During all the previous history of the institution there has never been so much demand for information in regard to our work

\(^6^0\) Society in Radcliffe, 1885-1886, pp. 6-7, sequence 38-39. Consider, too from more than a decade later: “Many of our graduates are now married and have households and domestic interests of their own … Others who are not married are scattered over the country, finding employment mostly in teaching, but also in various work, as secretaries, or in libraries and museums. I think that those of our graduates who wish to turn their education to account in earning a livelihood have usually been successful in finding occupation, and have given satisfaction to their employers” (1897-98, p. 11, sequence 141).
from possible candidates for admission, from teachers wishing to bring their institutions into line with the requirements of our admission examination, and from actual candidates.\textsuperscript{61} In a real sense, the Society was able to use the class of Special Students at the Society to mitigate the need for an expanding class of Specials at Harvard.

The Society for the Collegiate Education of Women, with its population of teachers in attendance, brought the issue of “college preparation” to the forefront, at the very time when President Eliot was most interested in raising the standards for Harvard’s men. This can have been no coincidence, especially as the acceptance of women within the Harvard system began to justify itself, not only for women’s education, but also, perhaps even more importantly from the perspective of Harvard University, for its men. The fact that Harvard had survived up to this point without training women as educators seems almost shocking based on the logic presented by Society Secretary, Arthur Gilman, in 1888:

\begin{quote}
Scholarship does not make teachers, but a teacher without scholarship is an anomaly, and the consideration of the fact that more than eighty per cent of the teachers of Massachusetts are women, and that women have in this State far less opportunity to obtain the full collegiate instruction than is afforded to the favored twenty per cent of men remaining, emphasizes the usefulness of such courses of instruction as we offer. The “eighty per cent” are educators of our \textit{men} in the most impressionable period of their lives, and if they are not themselves thoroughly taught, how can we expect our boys to come up to the college well-prepared, or, if they never go to college, how are we to expect them to equal those whom they meet in business life who have been taught by the well-educated twenty per cent? There is an inequality here which this Society is doing much to remove, and the eighty per cent of women teachers are always before your Secretary, furnishing him at once an incentive to and an object for diligence.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Radcliffe College thus serves a valuable role for Harvard in producing more qualified students from secondary schools; it becomes the teaching service school, useful in

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{61} Society in \textit{Radcliffe}, 1885-86, p. 8, sequence 40.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 1887-88, p. 9, sequence 73.}
increasing the qualifications of students applying from secondary schools. Teachers prepared at Harvard are assumed to benefit from the education for its own merit, and perhaps, too, the students who learn from them will be more prepared to arrive at Harvard as Undergraduates. Not surprisingly, this was the case, as reported by Secretary Gilman in 1889:

That those who have become teachers have been benefited by their institution here is shown by the quality of the students that they have sent back to us, by the testimony of those persons for whom they have taught, and, perhaps more than by any other single indication, by the demand that comes to your Secretary increasingly for the services of others who have been under the same training.63

Within the first decade of educating women in Cambridge, then, it had become clear in the exchange between secondary and tertiary education that the presence of teachers at Radcliffe had affected preparatory schools by creating an open educational loop. It had also altered the curriculum and landscape of undergraduate education within Cambridge, especially, as we will see in the next section, for the classical versus the modern curriculum, and by modern in this context, I mean specifically the study of English. This would have been a boon for President Eliot, who had been working for a more modern curriculum since the beginning of his tenure in 1869. Harvard, by all accounts, was more forward than most of the nation’s colleges for men, but it must be said that Radcliffe was in front of Harvard as far as sheer numbers of students taking the modern curriculum were concerned. Why? It was not because of a faculty outcry in the women’s classrooms, or pressure from the Board of Overseers. It was because the special student population of female teachers was driving the growth of English Composition courses within the English Department.

63 Ibid., 1888-89, p. 5, sequence 93.
Radcliffe Specials and the Rise of English Composition

President Eliot, the faculty, and the Board of Overseers at Harvard had since his arrival in 1869 been bemoaning in unison the decline of standards for incoming students at Harvard College. Eliot had also been agitating for increased attention to the study of English, never a part of the classical curriculum, and never considered on par with Greek or Latin which were understood – because of their systems of declension – to be superior in teaching “mental discipline.”\(^{64}\) We can see the remains of this bias in the kinds of curricular decisions being made by the first women at the Annex in 1879 who, given freedom of choice in their studies through the elective system still inclined towards the traditional classical curriculum.

In the first few years of the Society, there were, perhaps surprisingly, more electives and more instructors than there were women to take the courses. The women were not limited by the courses offered; rather, the small numbers enrolled in the beginning limited the courses that could be subscribed. After the first few years, in which instructors almost equaled students in number, they required a course to have at least 3 students to run, unless a student needed the course during that year. The Society’s Managers did not want to limit the number of courses offered even though they could not anticipate what the students would enroll in this early in the existence of the opportunity. Since the female student body was small, many courses which had been offered were unsubscribed in these first few years. This was the assessment of courses taken at the end of year two:

A comparison of the studies actually pursued by the young ladies and the electives offered in the circular at the beginning of the year shows that thirty-one courses of instruction, offered by twenty-three instructors, were not called for by

---

actual students. Though some of the present students will take some of these courses at other stages of their progress, the comparison seems to indicate on the part of women seeking the higher education a tendency towards the traditional classical curriculum and not towards science, and that the preparatory schools offer advantages for obtaining a knowledge of French and Italian sufficient for most women. All the courses in Greek were taken.65

The curriculum was therefore shaped largely by what the women themselves wanted, not by what the professors were inclined to teach, and women initially wanted the traditional classical curriculum. Given access to Harvard, they gravitated to the standard education granted previously only to men. This included at its heart, ancient languages, for Greek was required for admission to the regular course.66 It is very likely that these women were studying Greek in order to sit their entrance examinations for regular admission to the undergraduate course. Secondly, it is notable that women are not interested in “science,” which today resonates with a century and more of debate about women’s pursuit of science education. It may also have been noted because of the history of Special Students, who were to be admitted for the study of “science” originally. Finally, it is important that at this time, with the elective courses opening in the 1870s, that women given the opportunity to study with Harvard professors would pursue the most traditional of traditional educations, while the undergraduate men at this time were beginning to specialize through the freedom of elective choice.

This inclination of women towards the classical course did not start, of course, upon their arrival at Cambridge. With the opportunities for higher education came a new interest at the secondary level in a college prep curriculum, which at that time would still

65 Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-1881, p. 5, sequence 5; italics mine. In the following year, 1881-82, 28 courses were given, 27 others were offered but undersubscribed.
66 See Kitzhaber’s discussion, pages 1-19, on these competing educational philosophies; religious to scientific. He addresses the origins as clerical colleges, and influence of Darwin post-1850.
be a classical education. This was not only due to Harvard’s welcome, but also to the
women's colleges, which were providing multiple opportunities for higher education:

The preparatory schools find that there is an increase in the number of young
women taking the classical course, and they will soon become more effectual
feeders to our classes. The prospect seems to be that the number of students
entering for the course of four years will regularly increase, but a rapid
augmentation of numbers can hardly be expected …" 67

The opportunity for women to study in Cambridge – and most certainly at the 4-year
women’s colleges opened near this time – altered the preferred curriculum at preparatory
schools. Though this is noted as a sign of promise for incoming students to the Society, it
is for my purposes also a sign of the power of Harvard’s curriculum to change secondary
education; this relationship between Harvard’s expectations and the secondary schools
takes a central role in my discussion of the special student population entering the Society
and Radcliffe in the 1880s and 1890s. The move towards classical education in the prep
schools for girls was happening even at a time when Harvard’s curriculum was opening
up more opportunities to its male students to diverge from the classical curriculum
through elective courses. These particular women aspiring to the 4-year course were, in
that sense, opting for the Harvard of the 1850s and 60s, not the Harvard of the 1880s.
This was in part by necessity, for if they wanted to pursue the four-year course, and had
not received the college prep courses allowing them to enter as regulars, they needed to
take these traditional courses in order to gain regular admission.

But their peers entering as Specials along those “advanced lines,” as graduate
students or as secondary teachers, had no need for the undergraduate classical curriculum.
The advanced students were instrumental in ushering in a formalized system for graduate
study, and the teachers were helping to reform the curriculum of preparatory education.

67 Private Collegiate Instruction in Radcliffe, 1880-1881, pp. 10-11, sequence 10-11.
The shift from the classical to the elective paralleled the increase in teachers who were coming to Cambridge to become better instructors in the study of English rather than Latin or Greek. What we see in the following quote is not only the exportation of teachers from Radcliffe to the prep schools, but a very specific reason for the growth of English – not English Literature, but rather English Composition – within the Radcliffe curriculum. This distinction is as vital to understanding what Radcliffe was “giving” to Harvard at this time as is the observation that its teachers were preparing the new arrivals to Harvard College:

*The increased attention that has of late years been given to the study of our own language has had its natural effect upon our classes, and they have increased in the department of English more than in others. To this fact is to be attributed the growing demand for teachers from our classes who have learned the ‘Harvard methods.’ This demand has in fact become larger than the supply. As the lower schools reach up to the standard that is presented to them by President Eliot, and endeavor to do in their classes some of the work that is usually accomplished in the Freshmen year in college, the demand for teachers who are able to direct the scientific study of English will continue to increase.*

Why had the study of English become so important? Because of the implementation of English A as the prescribed freshman course in 1885. Both men and women were required to take this course; for the men, it was to benefit their educations and for the women it was *also* to benefit the men’s educations. The desire was to mold the beginnings of composition in the late 19th century scientific model; there was no denying that women were at the center of its successful expansion, an interesting role given their disinterest in the scientific courses themselves. These English Composition courses may have been preparing male editors and writers for their creative careers, but they were more likely to affect the general population through the women who took them and then went out into the teaching force.

---

68 *Society in Radcliffe*, 1892-93, p. 6-7, sequence 238-39; italics mine.
In 1892-93, however, regardless of what the women were teaching, the vestiges of classics remained in the Cambridge classroom, as evidence by the very next section following the previous quote. This passage shows the pressure on the Society, as it neared becoming Radcliffe College, to emphasize that its students were not only teachers, but also scholars:

To succeed in work of this grade it is required that the teacher should not only have pursued the elementary college courses, but should know how to give thorough philological instruction in Early English and Anglo-Saxon, and should be familiar with the great body of our later literature. She ought to possess some acquaintance with the authors of other countries as well as with the literatures of other periods. The graduate who has taken courses in Greek and Latin as well as in the modern languages has a consciousness of power, and ranks higher among teachers, if teaching is to be her profession, than any one can whose cultivation is limited to what she obtains through the medium of her native tongue.69

According to the final few sentences of this paragraph, the value added of a Harvard preparation for the English teacher is not training in “English Composition” or “Forensics,” but in Latin or Greek.70 This of course makes the argument for these female teachers to study at Harvard. But the enrollment numbers show that women are not coming to the Society for Latin or Greek, but for English, and not the Englishes that are mentioned in this paragraph of the report. The enrollment statistics do not support this assessment of courses taken in the English Department either: the women are not taking Anglo-Saxon or philology or literature in large numbers. Why? Because most of these women are not in the four-year course, which was the only reason for proficiency in Greek and Latin, notwithstanding the eloquent argument above. So what are these women taking instead? English Composition.

69 Ibid.; italics mine.
70 Note: it was the Latin entrance exam that almost prevented Stein from taking her Radcliffe degree in 1898. Based on this criterion, she would barely have been qualified to teach secondary school.
Looking at the growth numbers in the English Department from 1888-1898 – that is, student enrollment, number of courses offered, and courses subscribed – it was English Composition which grew the English Department offerings to more than 3 times its closest departmental competitor: from Latin (which was, in 1887, the last department to have more students than English), to history, to German, to philosophy during this same period, all lingering around the same growth.\textsuperscript{71} At the same time, English ballooned in growth from 86 students in 1888 to 637 students in 1898. In that same year, German had 218, Philosophy 188, History 186, and French 185. At this time, it is also worth noting, that the total student population at the Harvard Annex was only 424: this means that numerically at least half of these students took more than one English course during the year. No other department had numbers close to this. Of course, the popularity of Harvard writing courses is well-known: English 12, English 22, English A, but that alone cannot account for the disparity in numbers. Why? Because teachers were Radcliffe’s biggest export, and the study of English Composition in the late 1890s was central to their educations.\textsuperscript{72} By 1898, 5 courses in English Composition (A, B, C, 22, and 12, the most popular courses also at Harvard during this time) accounted for 240 students, while the rest of the departments’ 16 courses accounted for the remaining 397. Some of these

\textsuperscript{71} 1884-85 was the first year at Radcliffe in which English enrollments were the highest of the courses offered; this was also the first year that A.S. Hill did \textit{not} teach the women the course in Rhetoric and English Composition that would become English A, and the year in which enrollment in that course jumped from 11 to 23; the top enrollments across the curriculum would fluctuate over the next three years before settling firmly in English in 1888. It is worth noting that 1885 was the year that English A became a requirement. See appendices for table of English Department courses offered at Radcliffe 1879-98.

\textsuperscript{72} This may be one of the primary reasons that the study of English was of little interest to Stein: she at no time in her life expressed any interest in teaching, and that was the main professional path which the department of English offered to her cohort. Useful also to note that while Stein was a self-proclaimed reader, she was not a proclaimed writer at this point in her life. And yet, she had enrolled in a writing composition course. She was a guinea pig, as were all students in this era, for the systematic development of a new Rhetoric; and it may be that the curricular move towards the “scientific study of English” seemed to Stein the wrong field for the application of such science. On the other hand, we may understand in hindsight Stein’s application of Jamesian philosophy in her mature writing as the most committed of scientific applications to the study of the English language.
courses in 1898 were designated undergraduate, some undergraduate and graduate, and some primarily for graduates, though the reality was that any course could have a combination of graduates, undergraduates and specials.\textsuperscript{73}

As English is becoming more essential for the Harvard man to remediate what he may not have learned in secondary school, it is also becoming more popular for the Annex Girl, but for completely different reasons: for the Harvard man, the skills of the entering freshmen have been in decline and so the argument for the emergence of English A. For the Annex Girl, however, who was studying composition in order to teach it, one might say the opposite: the skills of the entering Harvard freshmen have been in decline, and so the argument for the emergence of the Annex Girl. In other words, the Society, and then Radcliffe after 1894, justified itself in large part to improve the preparation of those entering higher education.

The irony of this growth in English Composition as remediation is that the weakest students at Harvard were the Specials, who were denied admission to English A because they were taking seats from regular undergrads who needed the new requirement in order to graduate.\textsuperscript{74} Harvard Specials were invited into the institution, then shut out of the very course that may have helped them in the most basic college skills of reading and writing. Over at Radcliffe, we have an entirely different story: the Specials include some of the weakest students, but also the strongest, for they are many graduates from other four-year colleges, or secondary school teachers. So those most invested in the teaching of English – not the learning of English, but the teaching – are the Radcliffe Specials, who come for the express purpose of learning the “Harvard methods” so that they may

\textsuperscript{73} They began tracking this breakdown in the 1896-97 report.
\textsuperscript{74} My next chapter details the complications arising specifically in this course.
return to their secondary school jobs, to train students to prepare for Harvard admission.

Radcliffe created a fully open educational loop, in which the Special Students already teaching in the workforce were educated at Harvard, which later invited their students to apply having been educated in the Harvard methods. The Specials at Harvard, on the other hand, had been invited without preparation, and maybe, if they could survive the rigor, will have learned those methods by the time they graduate. Same standards, different student populations, unbelievably different outcomes.

Radcliffe College and The Birth of Student Life

For Radcliffe, the day of small things is over.
– Agnes Irwin, Dean of Radcliffe College, 1898\textsuperscript{75}

Beyond raising an endowment and making a case for women’s education, for Radcliffe, becoming a college came down to a balance between maintaining academic standards and developing student life. It is said in the early 21\textsuperscript{st} century that undergraduates remember more of their life outside of the college classroom than within it. Gertrude Stein and her peers were, in that sense, very much 21\textsuperscript{st} century women. After all of the institutional requirements were worked out, the standards set, the traditions nudged aside, the female students having proved that they were academically capable of the rigors of college, the idea of a “collegiate life” remained.

In order to become a true college, the foundations for that institute for advanced studies had to give way to a more collegiate vision: one which saw 18-22 year olds as the core nucleus of the college, for whom undergraduate coursework rather than advanced studies were the center of education; where the students were not primarily the teachers

\textsuperscript{75} Radcliffe, 1897-98, p. 23, sequence 153.
of the next generation, but the scholars; a place where the social life, the dormitories, the presence of clubs and societies were also central to the idea of the education at large. In short, in order to become a college, Radcliffe needed to adjust its academic standards to the mission of undergraduate education as it was conceived at Harvard. For Radcliffe, given its unique history, this meant, in fact, lowering its standards of education to that of Harvard College, and increasing its focus and attention on student life. Was this a worthy sacrifice? For the women of Gertrude Stein’s generation, absolutely; for the Radcliffe College degree did for them what no Institute for Advanced Studies could: it gave them the undergraduate education that their brothers had, and *that* – as young women – is what they wanted.
Chapter 3 – English Composition at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1880s and 1890s

Introduction

In *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925*, John Brereton reproduces a number of student papers as part of his “documentary history.” Presented as a necessary correction to histories of American composition that privileged theory over practice, he explains in his preface,

… we rarely looked at the writing itself … what often got left out was the detail, the everyday fabric of history as lived by the student, the teacher, and the general public … The lack of these [student] papers in the histories is something of a scandal; even though any piece of student writing cannot fully be understood outside of its context, it seems crucial to know what students were writing, what examples of student prose nineteenth-century scholars and administrators were discussing, and how the writing itself was represented to contemporary eyes.¹

The context he provides is eye-opening on this period of immense change in undergraduate curriculum especially between 1890-1910: damning reports from Harvard’s “Committee on Composition and Rhetoric” in 1892 and 1897 that could be mistaken – but for the dialectal idiosyncrasies – for late 20th century diatribes against secondary school preparation; multiple *PMLA* reports from the turn of the century on pedagogy, rhetoric, teaching writing, and English composition; style manuals, grammar handbooks, and textbook excerpts.

Into this context of “major documents in the establishment of composition studies,”² Brereton introduces “specimens” of student work, facsimile themes written by students including the hand-markings by their professors, with the student work transcribed by Brereton into typescript. When known, he provides a brief biography of the student-writers preceding the facsimile theme. Brereton does not provide critical commentary on these student themes, or any assessment of them as texts. Rather, he sets the stage of educational

---

² Ibid., xi.
history with this collection of archival sources, chooses his student samples from those periods, and then leaves his readers to interpret how these students texts represent as products of their own time, how they reflect their educational moment. In this valuable volume, the student work stands as a by-product, or a symptom, of the educational system. Brereton has compiled a documentary history of the field of composition, the very period in which Gertrude Stein was a student.

My project in this chapter is to locate Stein’s undergraduate writing experience within that history, to place her student themes within the development of composition at Radcliffe, to understand Stein’s writing in the context of her own reading and writing education within that system. We begin this chapter with details of Stein’s pre-college and collegiate education, placing her within the special student populations at Harvard and Radcliffe, and looking at how this special status affected her coursework, especially in Psychology and English Composition. We then move through the curricular innovation and development of composition at Harvard and Radcliffe, addressing the impact of composition studies on both female and male students. We end with a general description of the daily themes Gertrude Stein wrote in English 22. This chapter functions as institutional history, educational biography, feminist critique, and finally, as an introduction to the primary documents which occupy the final chapters of this dissertation, the daily themes that Stein produced within her educational moment, and that she saved for posterity.

---

3 Courses in the newly developing field of Psychology were offered through the Department of Philosophy, and listed thus, as Philosophy courses on Stein’s academic transcript. For a brief history of the founding of Psychology at Harvard under William James and Hugo Münsterberg, see http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k3007&tabgroupid=icb.tabgroup5800.

4 When referring to the “daily themes” as a general form of writing or pedagogy, I represent them in lower case; when referring to the specific courses created by Barrett Wendell, English 22 and English 12, I use uppercase: i.e., Daily Themes is another name for the course English 22 that Stein took in her sophomore year.
Gertrude Stein, Harvard Man

Reflecting on his relationship with Gertrude Stein in the 1920s, composer Virgil Thomson wrote, “Gertrude and I got on like Harvard men.” Even as a youth in her corset, though, Stein had as much the making of a Harvard Man as an Annex Girl, especially when understood as a Special Student at Radcliffe. Stein was an anomaly amongst her female peers, not because she was exceptional or “special” as has been suggested by Stein scholars who have commented, but because she was in the minority of the female specials at her entrance, neither a teacher nor a graduate student, more akin by incoming profile to the Harvard Special than to her same-sexed peers. Stein arrived at Harvard the most “general” of “special” students, with no clear academic reason for being in Cambridge other than to follow in her brother’s educational footsteps.

Stein was one of only two women from California in her entering class of 255, a regionally attractive candidate at a time of purposeful geographic expansion in the student body. Both Gertrude and Leo demonstrated that Harvard’s reach had extended all the way to the Pacific Ocean. Of her entering cohort, 100 women were regulars, enrolled in the

---

5 Thomson, Virgil Thomson Reader, 54. See also Anthony Tommasini’s biography, Virgil Thomson: Composer on the Aisle, where he quotes from Virgil Thomson at 90, a film by produced and directed by John Huszar (Film America, 1991): “Gertrude and Virgil had much in common. ‘We had both enjoyed Harvard. We had both enjoyed World War I, which, many people don’t understand, was a very popular war. We got on like a couple of Harvard boys.’” (135). Thomson attended Harvard from 1919-1924, taking a year in Paris before graduation.
6 For example, from Barbara Wineapple in Sister Brother: Gertrude and Leo Stein: “[Gertrude] applied for admission to the Harvard Annex as a special student and, reportedly on the strength of an application letter full of bluff, was admitted to the class of ‘97” (54). Brinn offers more detail, but just as apocryphal an account: “Since [Stein] was not interested in working toward a degree, her case was somewhat unusual, and she had to convince the Academic Board of her serious interest in doing ‘independent’ college work. The letter she addressed to the authorities disappeared form the files of Radcliffe College as early as 1915, but it must have been a persuasive appeal; she was allowed to enter in good standing after passing only a part of the required entrance examination” (26). Neither of these stories presents an accurate picture of the admissions process for Stein or her cohort, and yet they have become the standard narrative of Stein’s acceptance at Radcliffe as somehow exceptional. See also, Sprigge, Gertrude Stein: Her Life and Work, 23, referenced in introduction.
7 This brother-sister dyad is well-documented in Steinian biographies. See James Mellow, Charmed Circle; Jane Palatini Bowers, Gertrude Stein; Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces; Shari Benstock takes a different viewpoint in Women of the Left Bank, suggesting that “Leo Stein may have needed to be central to Gertrude’s life, rather than she to his” (145-46).
bachelor’s degree program. The remaining 155 were Specials. Amongst this majority of female Specials, Stein would have appeared unique. Her preparation at Oakland High School is not documented, but most biographies conclude that Stein had a partial preparatory education at best, and suggest she may not have obtained her high school diploma before heading East.8 Michaela Giesenkirchen describes Stein’s pre-college education, referencing Alice B. Toklas’ recollections:

Stein’s education before Radcliffe had been rather inconsistent and informal. As a young child she had been privately tutored, but her high school years had been disrupted by unsettled familial circumstances. Her most focused, sustained endeavor was her reading of historical and fictional narratives in English. In an interview in 1952, Toklas clarified that Stein had had “grammar school, one year at high school, her reading at the library in San Francisco, and Radcliffe and Johns Hopkins,” stressing that “[y]ou might even say that if she hadn’t been schooled, she would have had no education at all. She would have just been literate, and that’s all . . . . Her German was . . . one thing, and the rest was English – English literature, history.”9

Here, then, is Gertrude Stein’s student profile upon arriving in Cambridge: mostly self-educated, nineteen years old, slightly older than the traditional age of incoming college students,10 partial training at a public high school, no work experience, regional diversity from California, no intention of obtaining a degree, looking for collegiate experience. Reduced to this applicant profile, Stein resembled the majority of Harvard Specials, not Annex Girls. She could have easily come in through the back door, hung about for a few years, and called herself a Harvard Man for life. She did not, Virgil Thomson’s extension of the brotherhood to her notwithstanding. But as my first and second chapters detailed, the excellence gap between the majority of Harvard Specials and the majority of Radcliffe Specials was wide, and would have presented to Stein both an opportunity and a challenge.

---

8 For example, Sprigge offers the following: “[Stein’s] reading had been wide but her education ragged; she had been to high school for only one year” (23).
10 At nineteen years old, Stein was the same age as the majority of Harvard Specials. See chapter 1.
Being a female Special Student grouped her with a promising cohort at the Annex, but her pre-college profile grouped her with the under-prepared of Harvard.

Stein’s opportunities of course can be linked back to Eliot’s reforms, primarily the elective system which encouraged early specialization, but also the friendliness to expansion of the special student populations throughout the university, most immediately for the women at the Annex. As I detailed in chapters 1 and 2, these two reforms were mutually beneficial and reinforcing, but they did have a negative consequence: the category of “Special Students” which had originally been associated exclusively with “specialization” had evolved also to denote special circumstances which recommended admission via nontraditional standards. This alternate route was taken as a “back-door” for unqualified applicants, but for a variety of justifiable reasons: a type of 19th-century affirmative action, expanding opportunity for people who did not have the advantages of mainstream preparatory schools; allowing women who wanted to be secondary school teachers to deepen their own skills and credentials without conferring on them a Radcliffe degree; or, as with Gertrude Stein, an opportunity to live and learn, as if a regular college student, how to be a college student. In truth, the 19-year-old Stein was afforded a backwards education: to use college courses and the world of Cambridge to prepare for the entrance exams that would allow her to credential the education she already had. She began with the profile of a Harvard Special and graduated the epitome of a Radcliffe Special; an indicator of the possibilities that this co-ordinate relationship offered to all women, even those whose qualifications were less than stellar upon entrance.

Being a Special gave her privileges in taking higher level courses without necessarily demonstrating prior proficiency in them; acceptance into these courses was based purely on
the goodwill of the professor with whom she was studying. Though Stein was able to take these advanced courses because of her special status, the Harvard professorate was not necessarily impressed by this designation. In fact, being a Special Student even at the Annex may have been for some faculty as much a marker of unpreparedness for college-level courses as it was a license to take courses at will. Given the freedom to take the courses of her interest and preparation, she inclined towards her areas of strength, those areas which Toklas later described as her native schooling prior to college: German and history, branching out with economics and psychology, listed on her transcript below as Philosophy, the department in which psychology was at that time being developed as a discipline. Taking the path of familiarity and inclination, she was quite a successful student in her freshman year, enrolling in the following courses and receiving the grades in parentheses:

1893-1894:
- German 7 (B plus)
- Philosophy 1 (A)
- Philosophy 7 (A)
- Economics 1 (B plus)
- History 11 (A)\(^1\)

As a Sophomore, Gertrude Stein enrolled in three Philosophy courses, a French course, and English 22. Her sophomore year brought more specialization, but less success in her grades, with her lowest grade in English 22, Daily Themes:

1894-1895:
- Philosophy 9 (B plus)
- Philosophy 20a (B) (B)\(^2\)
- English 22 (C)
- French 2 (C plus)
- Philosophy 13 (A)

In total, in her first two years at Radcliffe, Stein took eight Philosophy courses focusing on the new branch of Philosophy called Psychology. She followed this her junior and senior

\(^{1}\) Bridgman, *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, 357.

\(^{2}\) Bridgman, *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, 357. Bridgman’s note regarding the grades: “Where there are two grades in parenthesis, GS took the course twice, or received double credit for it.”
years with a heavy schedule of science. The standard biography of Stein’s college years emphasizes this “specialist” aspect of her education under the guidance of William James, George Santayana, and Hugo Münsterberg. She pursued with vigor an elective schedule which allowed her to specialize almost immediately under these professors, to the exclusion of a general college education. Stein may have seemed a non-conformist, bending the rules as she wished, but she was following almost to the letter the ideals of specialist education set forth in 1825, and fulfilled with such success by the women of Radcliffe pursuing advanced studies, especially those in the sciences, which at that point began to include the study of psychology. While this is often contextualized as a sign of her distinction and precociousness, her pursuits in the field of philosophy and psychology actually put her more in line with her female peers pursuing advanced studies, and away from the regular undergraduate pathway that she would need to obtain a degree. In this sense, though she entered like a Harvard man, she took courses like a Radcliffe woman, especially those who had come from other institutions with degree in hand.

She did not have that degree, however, and so part of her Radcliffe education was to obtain the general education befitting a bachelor’s degree. That general education is less understood as having an impact on her future, which has always seemed surprising to me given her ultimate rejection of higher studies in psychology and medicine, and her chosen profession as a writer, a decidedly non-scientific career. Part of this lack of discussion may

---

13 A full list of Stein’s Radcliffe and Johns Hopkins grades can be found in Appendix A of Bridgman, *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, 357-359.
14 Writing may seem to be a non-scientific career, but at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1880s and 1890s, the scientific method was beginning to inform the teaching and practice of rhetoric and composition. My section in this chapter, “A.S. Hill and English A at Harvard” offers background on the scientific underpinnings of the rhetorical pedagogies employed at Harvard. Stein attended Radcliffe just as the process of writing began to adopt these scientific methods in its pedagogies. That Stein chose writing as her profession, after abandoning her studies in the sciences, is less surprising if we consider that she came of age just as the “scientific study of English” was brought into the curriculum of Harvard and Radcliffe. Granted, the scientific study of English as
stem from Stein’s stated lack of interest in studying English while at Radcliffe.\(^\text{15}\) She took no formal English literature courses, and only two English composition classes during her four years at Harvard: English 22, also known as “Daily Themes,” in her sophomore year, and English C, Forensics, in her junior year. Her greatest influence as an undergraduate, recorded in one of her themes from her sophomore year (dated April 25, 1895) and also later in her life in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* and *Everybody’s Autobiography*, was William James, who encouraged her to pursue medical school, where she could do research or perhaps become a doctor. And yet, we have no written work from her courses with James.\(^\text{16}\) However, she saved her Third Theme from Forensics (dated March 7, 1896).\(^\text{17}\) Furthermore, her Daily Themes from English 22 are the first collection of Stein’s writing she preserved. She kept these themes from 1894-95 until 1939 when she sent them along with all of her other manuscripts to Thornton Wilder, who deposited them in the American literature collection of Yale’s Beinecke library. The preservation of these themes is one issue I address in this chapter, the extant themes serving as evidence of her self-identity and ambition as a writer while she was in college. While it is not necessarily important to our understanding of Stein that she intended to become a writer at this point, I think it *is* an important question to consider because it affects how we place her themes in the context of her writing life. It was well-known amongst the Harvard and Radcliffe students that English 22, Daily Themes was a writing-intensive course whose pedagogy was intended to create student writers.

pursued in the 19th century resembled in no way Stein’s transformation of the English language in the 20th. And yet, the idea that language even deserved such study was inculcated by the professoriate in the late 19th century.\(^\text{15}\) Stein explains in *Everybody’s Autobiography* in 1934: “…I read everything that was natural enough and not a thing to be studied, I knew what writing was and if you read it and could read it you know it so there was no use having any one teach you anything about it, I suppose about all these things I have not changed much” (272).

\(^\text{16}\) From her work in Psychology, we have only two articles, extant because they were published in the Journal of the Harvard Psychology Lab. She saved no unpublished work from her student coursework in psychology.

\(^\text{17}\) Transcribed in my appendices.
But it was also assumed that those who enrolled in English 22 were already advanced, that they had already taken the freshman course, English A. As the transcript of her first two years shows, Stein had not taken this course prior to enrolling in English 22. One might presume that if Stein had enrolled in English A, she may have had more success in her Daily Themes course. Gertrude Stein ended up taking the examination for English A in September of 1895, the fall after she completed English 22.18 The fact that Stein was able to ‘skip’ English A and register for English 22, without having passed an examination, is not necessarily due to a lack of supervision or a lack of credentialing. As a Special she was not required to take English A, and nothing prevented her from enrolling in any course she wished with the professor’s approval. Regular candidates for degree, on the other hand, would have been required to take English A in the freshman year, and so would have had the prerequisite for English 22 by nature of their enrollment pathway. At Harvard, in fact, the administration did not want Specials in the prerequisite courses for college degree candidates. Harvard Specials were not only exempted, but actually prevented, from taking English A, not because of demonstrated skill or lack thereof, but for the pedestrian reason that another student – a student enrolled as a degree-candidate – likely needed the seat. A Special’s enrollment in English A, from this cynical but pragmatic perspective, was not so much about learning to write, but about being admitted to the regular undergraduate community of Harvard-Radcliffe. Stein says she had no intention of doing so until William James suggested that she pursue graduate school. At that point, she retrenched.

Stein occupied her status as a Special to great advantage throughout her four years at Radcliffe, but part of her history as well, and essential to the standard narrative of her

18 “Miss Stein passed admission examination sept. 1893 in English El & adv German and History; in June and Sept 1895 in Elementary Algebra, Geometry and English A – A; in Sept 97 in Elementary Latin B. Received the A.B. degree M.C.L. 1898” (note on Stein’s transcript for Radcliffe College)
education, is that she obtained her undergraduate degree. The problem is that these two pathways are essentially incompatible: one being the course towards advanced or graduate study, and the other the course towards a traditional undergraduate degree. Stein clearly inclined towards the former. While her specialization and success in philosophy and psychology did her and Radcliffe credit, it was not enough for her to obtain that degree. The degree required that she fulfill the requirements of a regular undergraduate as well as an advanced student. This required passing the entrance examinations that she had delayed, and fulfilling the required courses for graduation, which, by the time she graduated, had been reduced to only one course: English A. She never took the course, not in her first two years with her regular student cohort, nor in her last two years of advanced study. It has often been noted by Stein scholars that Latin almost caused her not to take her degree, and at the very least, delayed her award until the fall of 1898. But that is not the real story: the real story is English A, the required course missing from her transcript.

As interesting as Stein’s transcript is for what she took, then, it is equally compelling for what she did not take. The singular absence of English A from her transcript has been a driving question for me behind this entire dissertation. First, how did she manage to enroll in English 22 without the prerequisite? We can answer that through her special student status. But she did not graduate as a Special, she graduated as a regular undergraduate; but without English A, I simply cannot account for why she received her degree. She was, of course, not the only Special Student navigating the system of electives and required courses. She was emblematic of this navigation. For this reason, we will look first at English A as a route to regular status at Harvard, and the complications that raised for the institution as a result, 1) overcrowding in the classrooms, and 2) scrutiny of declining student performance through
the Harvard Reports of the 1890s. Following this critique of the institutional historian, we will turn for the rest of the chapter to the discussion of the courses themselves – English A, English 12 and 22 – through the eyes of the compositionist and the feminist, and finally close by focusing the lens around Stein the student-writer and her themes from English 22.

\section*{A.S. Hill and English A at Harvard}

English A at Harvard in the 1870s and 1880s is synonymous with its creator, Adams Sherman Hill. Hill began teaching at Harvard, at Eliot’s request, in 1872. In 1876 he became the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and immediately began pushing Eliot’s agenda of raising the stature of English studies. Kitzhaber writers that “in 1879 he published an article in which he urged that English be put on a par with Latin and Greek, and that students be given more frequent opportunities for practice in speaking and writing English.” In making this claim, he contributed directly to Eliot’s ambitious program of curricular expansion with English studies as one prominent feature. Hill was behind the push towards increased scientific study of the “mother-tongue.” He taught Rhetoric to sophomores until 1885, a year of substantial statutory changes in undergraduate education, and the year in which English A became the required freshman course. Hill had petitioned as early as 1879 to move English A to freshman year to respond to the issues in student preparation that had been gathering, and by 1885 the change was made. After that point, English A was the only required course for undergraduates.

The course was known simply as “Hill’s Rhetoric,” and the textbook from which it was taught, \textit{The Principles of Rhetoric, and Their Application} (1878/1895), was one of the

\textsuperscript{19} Kitzhaber, \textit{Rhetoric in American Colleges}, 60. The article by Hill quoted by Kitzhaber was entitled “An Answer to the Cry for More English” (published 1879). This article is reprinted in Brereton, \textit{Origins of Composition Studies}, 45-57.
most influential of the period. In late 20th century composition theory, the pedagogies espoused in this textbook came to be known as “current-traditional rhetoric.” As defined by Berlin: “…current-traditional rhetoric reduces the composing act to a concern for exposition – for ‘setting forth’ the rational and empirical in an appeal to the reason and understanding.”

Berlin’s study of 19th century writing instruction details the progression from 18th century Scottish rhetoric through 19th century Emersonian influence, and finally to the current-traditional rhetoric of late-19th century Harvard as typified by A.S. Hill. He sees this progression as a stripping down of the moral-ethical concerns of the 18th century to the purely mechanistic and scientific approach found in Hill; furthermore, he connects it with the rise of the elective system:

Accepting the faculty psychology of eighteenth-century rhetoric, current-traditional rhetoric takes the most mechanical features of Campbell, Blair, and Whately and makes them the sole concern of the writing teacher. This view of writing instruction is also an extension of the elective system in the American college, with the various concerns included in eighteenth-century rhetoric relegated to their appropriate places in the college curriculum. From another point of view, it can be regarded as the manifestation of the assembly line in education. Current-traditional rhetoric is the triumph of the scientific and technical world view.”

The idea of composition as a “content-less” discipline also finds its origin in the definitions of rhetoric articulated by late-19th century rhetoricians. Berlin quotes Hill’s Principles of Rhetoric and Their Application (1878): “‘Being the art of communication by language, Rhetoric applies to any subject-matter that can be treated in words, but as no subject-matter peculiar to itself. It does not undertake to furnish a person with something to say; but it does undertake to tell him how best to say that which he has provided himself.’” As a consequence to this approach, there were no assigned texts, as Brereton highlights in his

---

20 Berlin, Writing Instruction, 66.
21 Ibid., 62.
22 Ibid., 65.
study of the history of composition at Harvard: “Two characteristics marked English A and most other writing courses at Harvard: the insistence that students develop their own topics, and the absence of extended readings outside the textbook; hardly any teachers assigned essays or poems or plays for reactions. In fact, in contrast to other contemporary rhetoric programs … there was hardly any emphasis upon reading at all.”

In lieu of readings, students were encouraged to bring in topics of discussion from their other courses. This pedagogically sound idea – which would help students to use writing to deepen their understanding of other coursework – inevitably had its downside: professors of writing could not address the content of student essays with any sure sense of authority, except as they were expressed through writing.

That students took thematic material from the work in their other classes presented a commenting challenge to their professors. A writing instructor could easily be required to comment on a specialized subject about which he knew nothing. Sue Carter Simmons suggests that the thematic approach designed to get students to integrate their coursework with their composition class actually hampered any substantial exchange of ideas between student and teacher when the topics were chosen by the students: “The writing teachers would have been hard pressed to comment upon anything other than the superficial errors and style.”

Berlin approaches this new concentration on the surface of the writing from a slightly different direction, placing responsibility for the shift less on the superfluity of topics than on fundamental use of the modes of discourse to structure the course. He calls the use of these modes of discourse – description, narration, exposition, and argument – a “managerial invention.” That is, rhetoric “cannot teach the discovery of the content of discourse, but it can

---

23 Brereton, Origins of Composition Instruction, 11-12.
24 Simmons, “Constructing Writers,” 329.
teach students to manage it, once found, so that it appeals to the appropriate faculty. This new invention is thus made a part of the arrangement. Since language must be chosen to embody the content of thought, the study of diction and sentence structure becomes an abiding concern, both resting on eighteenth-century theories of language.”\textsuperscript{25} The “study of diction and sentence structure,” however removed from the ethical and moral concerns of 18th century rhetoric, is reduced to a concern about error and style.

English A was part of Eliot’s idea of introducing the scientific study of English into the core curriculum of the regular undergraduates. The gradual expansion of English A through Hill’s \textit{Rhetoric} was a natural and desired effect of Eliot and the Board of Governors’ institutional goals. Beyond its narrow approach to writing within the English Department, there were larger institutional demands contributing to its structure. One consequence of the centrality of this course for all undergraduates was that it inevitably lead to massive growth in student numbers, classroom capacity problems, consequent labor issues, and finally, problems maintaining the standards desired by the institution. So while this was to be the gateway course for setting and maintaining standards as the curriculum changed, the very scope of accommodating all freshmen in the only required course became a weight almost too heavy to bear. The problems with English A, like so many issues at Harvard, all came to a head in the late 1880s.\textsuperscript{26} All of these issues contributed to what would become a scathing series of reports in the 1890s about the limitations of English A, the decline of college student literacy, the failure of secondary education, and the need to reform college English admissions standards. It is to the role of Special Students in these issues that we now turn.

\textsuperscript{25} Berlin, \textit{Writing Instruction}, 64.
\textsuperscript{26} See timeline of relevant 19th century events in appendices.
Harvard’s Curricular Reform, Special Students, and English A

Kitzhaber’s discussion of English at Harvard between 1850-1875 is really a discussion of English studies in America from 1850 to 1900, for the course that Harvard set in those 25 years – emerging largely from English A – was followed by the rest of America in the following 25 years until the turn of the century. But to discuss English studies at Harvard without addressing the growth of Special Students – male and female – is to leave out a significant piece of the story and influence, especially as regards the growth of composition in response to new standards for admission via entrance exams, and a new emphasis within the field of English. Kitzhaber sets the stage without drawing these connections:

Perhaps the most far-reaching development in English to come out of Harvard in this period was the requiring of entrance examinations in English – far-reaching because the action set the precedent for similar moves later by many other colleges and also because these examinations had certain consequences that finally came to a boil in the 1890s.

Kitzhaber later in this chapter describes the “boil” as a result of several confluent events: the implementation of the Harvard exams, the adoption of these exams as preparatory guidance in the secondary schools such that education there became what we now call “teaching to the test,” and finally, most relevant at the College itself, a high failure rate for the entrance exams in English coupled with an incredible increase in college numbers, especially those needing remediation in college-level English.

---

27 See Russell, Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 46-56, which tells the story of English A, B, and C at Harvard, and its influence on colleges and universities across the U.S. prior to 1900. See also Brereton for whom the history of composition in the American College from 1875-1925 emanates from “The First Composition Program: Harvard, 1870-1900.” His documentary history highlights the primacy of the Harvard program such that colleges were either replicating their pedagogies or pushing against them, or both.

28 Kitzhaber, Rhetoric in American Colleges, 34.

29 In his sweeping history of curriculum in American undergraduate study, Frederick Rudolph calls the chapter dedicated to this period, “Disarray” (151-202).
As my exploration of Special Students has revealed, just because applicants failed the exams did not mean they were rejected from Harvard. To the contrary, they could then stay and take courses in those areas in which they had just failed the exams. Without referencing the Specials, Kitzhaber describes the ballooning student population thus: “The matter was aggravated by sharp increases in college attendance, especially in the 1890s, that were making classes unusually large.”30 This was especially a problem in those courses that had become required of all regular students, the composition courses, English A, B, and C, but mostly English A. If we add to this that Special Students were often aiming for English A in order to prepare themselves for the entrance exams they had either already taken and failed, or not taken (as was the case with Gertrude Stein), we can see how this confluence of events created Kitzhaber’s boiling cauldron at Harvard.

Unlike Stein and many of the other Radcliffe women, these unpromising students were not taking advanced courses offered to graduate students. They were taking introductory courses in Harvard College, many in an effort to prepare for their entrance exams. With the adoption of the elective system, several of these introductory courses became prescribed for regular undergraduates, stretching the capacity of the teaching faculty, and leaving no more room for the Specials, some of the weakest students in the university, and those who would benefit most from introductory work. The “drones” and “dullards,” as Eliot had described them, had begun “clogging” the required courses of regular undergraduates, and the solution was to allow them to remain as students, but refuse them entry to the very courses that would have fitted them for College. As Kitzhaber describes: “…there was much dissatisfaction [at Harvard] over English A, the required course in freshman composition, which it was thought took a disproportionate amount of staff time and

30 Kitzhaber, *Rhetoric in American Colleges*, 43.
labor."\(^{31}\) Not only was this difficult for the professors, but it was a problem for the students as well, who had previously been given small classes and much professorial contact and were now the guinea pigs in the rise of the large lecture class.

It should be no surprise, given my histories in chapters 1 and 2, that the problems arising at Harvard during the 1880s were affected by the addition of the female population at Radcliffe, not, as might have been expected, by exacerbating them, adding more inexperience and lack of preparation to the mix, but to stand in cool contrast to the firestorm gathering at Harvard Yard. In this particular arena, the women were far more successful as a group in English than the men, certainly not an expectation or consequence anticipated during the long-running debate about educating women in Cambridge. Whether or not Harvard’s policies – begun before the arrival of women – were influenced by the women, it is clear enough that the attention focused on English at this time was given a clarity through the evaluations of the Harvard student body vis-à-vis the Radcliffe population, both at college in Cambridge and after college within the secondary schools where many of these women were then employed as teachers. That the consequences came to a boil in the 1890s as the women’s college became an integral part of the University’s identity, and given the prominence of the English curriculum within that College, the cross-fertilization of assessment cannot be denied; neither can the increased focus on the gap between secondary and higher education that the male students had seen widening, and the female students – as teachers – had begun to close.

According to Kitzhaber the impetus behind instituting the entrance examinations at Harvard was:

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 44.
to relegate to the lower schools the responsibility for the more mechanical details of writing so that the university could devote itself to higher instruction on the pattern of European institutions … The prestige of Harvard as a leader in educational reform helped to popularize the Harvard plan of entrance examinations, and so perhaps did the fact that college teachers were quite willing to let teachers in the lower schools have responsibility for teaching the elementary principles of correct writing.\textsuperscript{32}

This last point was especially true at Harvard once female students trained at the Annex in the “Harvard methods” became a popular export to the secondary schools. It was no wonder that these same schools began to teach their students not only those methods but also to focus on the preparation for the Harvard exams. The problem, as Kitzhaber describes it, is that the education in the secondary schools became reduced to this preparation: “As the 1880s advanced, the Harvard plan spread across the nation, bringing with it the same problem that Harvard was encountering: the lower schools were obediently reorienting their English courses to meet college entrance requirements, but were doing little more.”\textsuperscript{33} Who better to train them to be admitted to Harvard than the women who had been trained by the Harvard faculty?

The addition of women to the Harvard scene was the most visible – and controversial – reform of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, but it plays, literally, no role in Kitzhaber’s composition history of this period. Rather, he focuses on the other major reform to affect Harvard undergraduates at the time and to affect educational curricula across the country well into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Charles Eliot’s curricular reforms beginning in 1869 and continuing through the end of his presidency in 1909 meant that new courses were being added and old standards revised throughout the 1890s. There were two causes/effects of these reforms most important to this dissertation: 1) the creation of “freshman composition” – at Harvard called English A – to insure that all students could write in standard written English at the college level; 2) the

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 43.
creation of elective courses that would allow for more specialization for the stronger students. The general reform was from a traditional curriculum required by all students, to one offering electives, which allowed students to design their own courses of study with more flexibility. With this flexibility, however, came the need to insure that all students had at least basic skills in reading and writing before beginning to specialize. Hence the implementation of English A in freshman year, to be followed by English B and English C in sophomore and junior years, called the “forensic system” by David Russell.\textsuperscript{34} Previously, it was assumed that these skills would be addressed through the four-year curriculum, but A, B, and C localized them in the English Department in a three-year series, only the first of which was required after 1885; secondly, because of the increased focus on the entrance exam, faculty presumed a basic competence once enrolled, but the special student population at Harvard ensured that that expectation could not possibly be met. More publicly debated than the special populations, however, was the declining preparation of incoming students.\textsuperscript{35} But the story of this declining preparation cannot be historically separated from the student management policies without diluting the complexity of the problem. The policies governing Special Students fed directly into the problems of managing English A, the perception of declining standards of the college population, and the widely-publicized Harvard Reports on Composition and Rhetoric, whose criticism of secondary education and college-level writing pedagogies would reverberate for decades and decades. We turn now to those Reports, bringing the crucial history of Special Students into the narrative.

\textsuperscript{34} See Russell, \textit{Writing in the Academic Disciplines}, 51-52: “As its name implies, the forensic system continued the old tradition of debate in the final years of the curriculum, but it was a written adaptation of oral debate.” Stein enrolled in English C, the final course in the series, entitled Forensics. She excelled in this course receiving an A.

\textsuperscript{35} The circumstances of declining reading and writing abilities of the incoming freshman, and/or the faculty’s beginning to address an already present problem, (this is much more likely, given how long it took them to address the problem with Special Students) around the same time that women were beginning to attend Harvard courses, is a fascinating comparison, but is not one that will be taken up explicitly in this dissertation.
Special Students and the Crisis of English Literacy

Special Students had one thing in common with the students admitted to Harvard or Radcliffe from other colleges, whom we would now call transfer students. Neither group was required to take an admissions exam to be accepted at the school. For transfer students, though, the only question was about what class year they would be permitted to join, their credentials and courses having been accepted from the previous institutions. This was far more complicated for the Special Students, and played out prominently in English A. The story is not what you might think from a 21st century perspective, that is, that they wanted exemption from English A. Rather, they were clamoring for it, stressing a system which had already increased its faculty to handle the increasing study body. This reveals the early complications of providing education to those who are not prepared for college, but are given access to the institution, and then told they cannot take the courses which would prepare them for admission to the institution.36 The conflict is between allowing students – who have not proven worthy of admission by any standard – to take courses that are required of those students who have been admitted, and, refusing to let unworthy students take the courses they most need. The conflict for English A: seats in the classroom vs. adequate preparation. Here is how the Harvard President describes the conflict in his annual report in 1890:

[Students admitted from other colleges] have, as a rule, no serious difficulty in discovering what College courses they are qualified to pursue. Not so the Special Students. They too are admitted with incomplete examination; and they work under the constant supervision of the committee that admits them. This committee does its best to improve the quality of our Special Students without denying to any industrious man admission to such College courses as he may take with profit. Yet many Special Students mean in time to work their way into regular standing; and for this reason, if

---

36 As detailed in the Harvard Reports of the 1890s, yet another problem group comprised those who had already proven worthy by sitting their exams, but whose English skills were not considered up to the standards of the Board of Overseers. See Brereton’s full reprinting of two of these reports (1892 and 1897) in Origins, 73-126.
for no other, ask admission to the courses prescribed for Freshmen. One of these
courses, “English A,” is designed for students who have had a good deal of training in
the subject, and have shown, by examination, their fitness for the course. It is not, and
should not be, designed for those who, like many of our Special Students, have
passed no examination in English and have had little or no training in English
Composition. To debar such men from the most elementary course that the College
offers in the study of their mother-tongue, is ungracious; yet they are not fit for the
teaching that legitimate members of the course demand. Their written work claims
more than a fair share of the instructors’ time; they fail in their examinations; they are
a disappointment to themselves and a clog to their fellows. In spite of this, they may
be so industrious that the process of getting rid of them is embarrassing, and even
heartless. There is no escape from the conclusion that these men should not be
admitted to a course already too crowded for efficient teaching. The same is true of
Freshmen who have failed at the admission examination in English; since to prescribe
for a man a course for which he has just proved himself unfit is no less illogical than
to admit to it a man whose fitness has not been tested.37

The remedy to this was “postponement of Freshman English till the second year,” the first
year to then spend in preparation for the admission examination on their own time and dollar.

The administration explicitly chose not to create a preparatory class for them, relegating that
again to preparatory school, whose work the College did not want to assume. They
recommend, in fact, no internal administrative solution, suggesting that a “private tutor”
might be able to serve both the secondary schools and the College, and they assured the
Board that delaying the “Freshman English” course by one year would not postpone
graduation, as the prescribed courses – A, B, and C – only numbered three not four.

After moving English A from sophomore year to freshman year in 1885 specifically
to enforce the gate-keeping at admission, they undercut their initiative for those students
most needing it by moving it back to sophomore year to accommodate the Specials rather
than address the problem at its source. Additionally astounding about this ‘remedy’ in 1890
is that it recognizes, in the same way the earliest reports of Special Students noticed, a
problem, but instead of attacking the problem – which I’ve understood as admitting students

37 Harvard, 1890-91, p. 77-78, sequence 2359-60; italics mine.
who are inadequately prepared without any structural way of supporting them in the
institution – they shift the response back onto the student financially (hire a tutor, if in a
group, they might find someone who would “take each pupil at a moderate price”\(^{38}\)), do not
acknowledge that a lack of preparation in “English” could perhaps contribute to a lack of
preparation in other courses they may be taking, essentially setting these students up for one
semester at Harvard, after which the majority – as their statistics have already shown – will
leave the school and not return. Even in 1890, five years after the implementation of
freshman advising at Harvard College, and establishing a Committee on Special Students,
they abdicate their role in educating fully the students they serve. They acknowledge and
allow individuals within institution without giving them the resources they need to succeed,
and then refer those individuals outside the institution to secure help.

The problem identified by Eliot in 1890 was perpetuated into the following year,
resulting in “the clogging of Freshman courses with untrained persons” which, given the
context, may as well have substituted “untrained persons” with “Special Students.” This was
seen in 1891 as “so serious an evil” as to restrict access of students who had not
demonstrated proficiency in introductory courses from taking the prescribed Freshman
courses, of which there was only truly one: the “largest Freshman course, ‘English A.’” The
result in 1891 was to propose that Special Students should \( \text{not} \) be permitted to enroll in
English A without taking the entrance exam and passing. If a student had not taken the exam,
however, he would be permitted to study so as to subject him to “some test of fitness for the
Freshman work.”\(^{39}\) For students who imagined themselves to be unprepared for school, \( \text{not} \)
taking the exam was better. For if they took the exam and received an “F” they would not be

\(^{38}\) Ibid., p. 78, sequence 2360.
\(^{39}\) Harvard, 1891-92, p. 80, sequence 2584.
permitted to take the prescribed Freshman Course. If they did not sit the exam, they might still be able to argue their way in. The machinations of the administration were a way of maintaining that the Freshman Course was “College level” and not somehow a remnant of poor training in secondary school. After 60 years of working with this population, and finally coming to an oversight committee as the solution, and after years of determining the elective vs. prescribed courses, they surrender the most basic skill of writing in the “mother-tongue” to the course that Special Students are not permitted to take.

But it was too late to save English A from these untrained persons. One year later, in 1892, the first of four reports by an independent committee of three laymen skewered the performance of students in English A. This occurred after English A had been made the prescribed course for Freshmen specifically to satisfy a growing need for writing instruction of incoming freshmen, and just as the “untrained persons” – the Specials – had been isolated and targeted against enrollment. The impact of this Committee’s reports on subsequent composition practices is well-documented (Kitzhaber, Brereton), but the accepted narrative deals only with the regular undergraduates, the ones supposedly prepared to be at college. But just as the prescription for English A is being handed out, and the Board of Overseers is damning the measures taken to address declining skills, the institution is entrenching a parallel class of less-educated students – the Specials – that they have so hard been trying to remediate, and even to assimilate to some extent. The main story in the 1890s may have been the regular undergraduates – 90% of the Harvard population – but the back-story continued to be the shadow class of Specials – 10% with some of the weakest students – mixed in with the regular candidates, clogging the prescribed course in English, and drawing attention to the increasing problem of compositional literacy in higher education. Without archival
research on individual students and course grade sheets, it is impossible to separate out the untrained Specials from the untrained regulars in telling this story. For that very reason, the Specials must be written in to our understanding of what followed: the first of the Harvard Reports in 1892.

The Harvard Reports on Composition and Rhetoric

What is English Composition? It is the art of writing the mother-tongue.
- Report of the Harvard Committee on Composition and Rhetoric, 1892

In 1891, in response to the president’s annual reports detailing the growing problems in English A at Harvard, the Board of Overseers took matters into its own hands, appointing a committee of three laymen to produce its own report. According to Kitzhaber, “their findings, published in 1892 as the ‘Report of the Committee on Composition and Rhetoric,’ consisted mainly of complaints that have been heard periodically ever since, both from college administrators and from many college teachers of English.” The complaints could be distilled to the following: English A was not a suitable course for higher education, the work produced by the students was not satisfactory, and the problem was to be found both in the Harvard writing courses themselves and in the secondary schools who were not adequately preparing students for college. One recommendation was that “preparatory schools devote more time to English, and specifically to English composition.”

---

41 The Committee members were Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (1835-1915), Edwin Lawrence Godkin (1831-1902), and Josiah Quincy (1859-1919). Adams was a grandson of John Quincy Adams (Harvard’s first Boylston Professor of Rhetoric), and was president of Union Pacific Railroad. Godkin was a journalist and editor of the *New York Evening Post*. Quincy was a third generation mayor of Boston, great-grandson of a Harvard president, and Harvard College and Harvard Law alum. For more information on these gentlemen, see Brereton’s introduction to the full text reprint of the 1892 Report, 73-100.
42 Kitzhaber, *Rhetoric in American Colleges*, 44.
43 Ibid., 45.
work of “theme-writing” was to be relegated to the lower schools, and Harvard was urged to raise its admission standards in English to force the secondary schools to respond with curricular changes “or see most of their graduates barred from admission to Harvard College.”

Of course, we now know that may be true in reporting, but not in practice. Graduates of these secondary schools could attend Harvard, even sneak into English A, in hopes of preparing for those exams while enjoying college. Without changing the special student statues or truly enforcing a strict enrollment policy in English A – neither of which the administration had been inclined or able to do – there was no changing the student body itself or its educational needs at Harvard. We know, in fact, from the aforementioned crowding issues in English A that precipitated the Committee’s 1892 report, and the popularity of that course with Specials, what the successful implementation of that recommendation would be: merely to remove the point of contention from initial admissions and English A, and to spread it over the entire curriculum such that students could pursue any other course at Harvard until and unless he could pass that pesky English A exam. This report effectively recommended sending its most untrained students into higher-level courses. We can also anticipate one reason why theme-writing did not disappear from the English curriculum. Following English A, the courses in English 12 and English 22 – both courses in daily themes – served as alternative routes for the “required” course English B, creating a superfluity of themes courses that served the growing interest of both normal undergraduates and Specials practicing their writing skills.

We see the results of this dispersion from English A into the broader coursework with crystal clarity in the president’s annual report of 1893-1894, one year following the first of

44 Ibid., 45.
the Harvard Committee Reports. The focus in this critique is no longer restricted to English A, the threat of “untrained students” having been unleashed formally and deliberately on the community at large:

We have no worthier pupils than the best of our Special Students: if they have lacked early opportunities, they are the better able to appreciate the opportunities of the present; and whether pursuing a special course of study with no degree in view or studying for admission to a College class, they work with a will. On the other hand, many persons beg for Harvard privileges without earning them. Rejected candidates for admission to the Freshman class lay siege successively to the Dean of the College, to the Chairman of the Committee on Special Students, and even to the Dean of the Scientific School – for they will cheerfully acquire an ephemeral affection for Science rather than go back to school. College courses might soon be clogged with untrained students, and standards of College work might be seriously lowered, if the Committee on Special Students were not vigilant and firm.

Without a change in the statutes regulating Special Students, and regardless of its vigilance, the Committee on Special Students is powerless to prevent these untrained persons from enrolling in courses across the curriculum. From English A to “college courses” in general, the problem of untrained students has merely been displaced. Not just in English A now, but the threat of an epidemic of untrained persons at Harvard everywhere. This is not a new threat as I have already shown. But by localizing it in one of the president’s primary initiatives in English, it has risen to the level of governance concern. The underlying problem – invisible in the standard narrative of the Harvard Reports according to compositionists – is in the Special Student Statute of 1885. Harvard’s leadership is forced to redefine “education” because of its confrontation with its own students. What is a research institution to do? The College resists strongly allowing its introductory courses to become the finishing school of unprepared students out of the secondary system. And yet, it does not make stricter the admissions requirements of the special student population, which remains a back-door into

---

45 Regarding this “ephemeral affection for Science,” remember that at this time prospective students were still using Lawrence Scientific School as a back door into Harvard College. See my first chapter.
46 Harvard, 1893-94, p. 82, sequence 304.
the Harvard community. Unfortunately, the College has little influence over the preparation of its students, though it does have the ability to gate-keep at the door. And yet, it chooses not to, struggling against such a function – perpetuating its institutional ambivalence, as seen clearly in the quote above – in order to maintain what had been compromised policy for the majority of the century. The main institutional reason, I would argue, was that the presence of this population contributed more to the University’s mission of expansion – in growth but also in opportunity for the public – than detracted from the College’s.

Rather than expose this underlying problem, Harvard Committee Reports shifted responsibility for declining standards of English from the University to secondary education. This was the narrative told by the Harvard Committee Reports, accepted locally, debated nationally, and repeated in composition histories ever since. The problem, as told in the 1890s, is not perceived primarily at the College itself, but in college preparation. It is no coincidence, as I read this history, that they came upon this root cause, shifting the responsibility to secondary education, just as Radcliffe College was to be chartered. The preparation problem documented in these student themes from English A, had a built-in Harvard solution: Harvard-educated women. As I addressed in the previous chapter, one solution was to train the teachers in the Harvard methods, and since secondary education was primarily the domain of women teachers, the Radcliffe women could contribute to the solution. With women building a critical mass at the Society in the 1880s, the Harvard Reports could deliver a blow to secondary education just as the institution could mitigate the problem with its own Radcliffe population. This was much more convenient than addressing the institutional root causes of the Harvard Special Student. As an added bonus, most of women who would solve this problem were also Special Students. They became, as
emissaries of the Harvard methods, the preparers for English A, the keepers of the gate, and finally, an excuse to keep the special student statutes exactly as they were.

James Berlin notes as much in his placement of composition at the center of professional advancement in the 19th century. And yet, his version of this takes no notice of the role that women played in the broader scheme of shifting composition study from the college-level to secondary level. Pointing to the textbook writers at Harvard such as A.S. Hill and Barrett Wendell, he writes, “Composition teachers became the caretakers of the English tongue, and more important, the gatekeepers on the road to the good things in life, as defined by the professional class.”47 Following the Harvard Reports, however, and the influence of Radcliffe’s Specials, the largest force to perpetuate these methods in the secondary schools were women. This meant by extension that the caretakers responsible for this gate-keeping, especially between secondary and college education where the cracks had been exposed, and just as Hill and Wendell were at their height, the “caretakers of the English tongue” were not the writers of the text books, but the women carrying out the pedagogies of English A.

Though it may seem obvious, it should be said directly, that the problems in English A at Harvard – overcrowding and declining standards at the top – did not occur at the Society or at Radcliffe. As shown in the previous chapter, many of the female students were pursuing teacher education, that is, English Composition courses, specifically, English A. Whereas the male courses in English A were clogged, the women were spread out quite evenly between the required course for regular undergraduates and the electives. Female Specials were not prevented from taking English A because it was one of the courses the institution needed them to take, not simply for themselves, but for the advancement of higher education. But for those who did not intend to take their degree – like Gertrude Stein for most of her
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undergraduate education – they were just as content taking the electives such as English 22. At this point for the women, all of the courses offered as English Composition were identified as the Harvard methods, though in fact, the two main courses, English A (Rhetoric) and English 12 (Daily Themes) were already beginning to split the pedagogy of composition in two. As we will explore in the next section, the “Harvard Methods,” so espoused, were not monolithic even in the first years of their founding.

The exportation of female teachers to the secondary schools, of course, did nothing to solve the problems of English A and the Special Students already at Harvard who were forced to take upper-level courses or electives in lieu of Freshman Composition. Beyond the promotion of this systemic problem in undergraduate education, the Harvard Reports originated one of the greatest burdens to composition studies in the public debate to follow:

The Reports emphasized only one aspect of composition – mechanical correctness. This was perhaps natural since the authors of the reports were not teachers themselves but only interested laymen; they had no real firsthand knowledge of what was involved. This emphasis on superficial correctness, however, contributed in no small measure to the ideal of superficial correctness that was to dominate composition instruction for many years thereafter.48

The Harvard Reports exacerbated that issue by entrenching it in the public discourse. James Berlin echoes this assessment of their broader affect, laying out the two main consequences as follows: 1) “Everyone agreed that the deplorable situation was the fault of the secondary schools and should be corrected there” – except of course the secondary school leaders, who mounted an aggressive anti-blame campaign in the press; and 2) “The larger affects of the Harvard Reports were unfortunate. Knowing nothing about writing instruction, the Committee members focused on the most obvious features of the essays they read, the errors in spelling, grammar, usage, and even handwriting. They thus gave support to the view that
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has haunted writing classes ever since: learning to write is learning matters of superficial correctness.” By identifying the main problem, the Harvard Report Committee was of course assuming the pedagogical response. If the teachers of English A had any freedom to affect their pedagogy in English A before the Reports, that freedom was gone after them. Drawing from Sharon Crowley’s work on the erosion of teacher authority in the late 19th century classroom, Sue Carter Simmons describes the catch-22 of both faculty and students during the 1880s and 1890s: “Much importance was claimed for the teaching of writing – [President] Eliot had even lauded it as one of the key accomplishments of college education in his 1869 inaugural address – yet the upper-level administrators blamed the writing teachers (who later blamed secondary school teachers) for perceived problems in the writing of Harvard students.”

We can see the authority of the composition faculty eroding just as it has been lauded as central to the future of higher education. Caught in the admissions debate, the special student debate, and now in the derisive spotlight of public condemnation, English A could serve only one purpose, as James Berlin wryly concludes: “the Harvard Reports made the ability to write correctly, if not necessarily with intelligence, an important rite in the entrance process for college.” Thus evacuating English A of any role but mechanical correctness and admissions gate-keeping – especially following the scrutiny of these Reports and the need to respond to the central criticisms – composition instructors were left to address “intelligence” in writing elsewhere. Barrett Wendell had already begun fashioning his own courses in English Composition, called Daily Themes, in the mid-1880s. According to Simmons, “Wendell, drawing on his own experience as a writer and his growing experiences as a
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teacher, designed a course and a pedagogy to counter such narrow perceptions of what composition could be.”52 And so, as the elective system gave rise to English A, localizing the required writing course to the freshman year and localizing the evaluation on surface rather than on content, so the strictures of English A, and the jolt caused by the Harvard Reports, gave rise to more elective courses that could offer a different approach. In the next section, we explore how the institutionalization of English A, and the problems leading up to the Harvard Reports, not only set the stage for freshman composition for the next century, but how it gave rise to two strains of compositional pedagogies. Just A.S. Hill became associated with English A, Barrett Wendell became synonymous with the Daily Themes Courses, English 12 and English 22.

**Barrett Wendell, English 12, and English 22 at Harvard**

Barrett Wendell graduated from Harvard College in 1877. After discovering that law was not to his liking, he returned to Harvard three years later, in 1880, to teach courses in writing composition. He took the next year off, beginning his full-time appointment in composition instruction in 1882. Those five years at Harvard between his graduation and instructorship were a period of palpable – and, for him, not entirely desirable – change. Wendell had graduated from an all-male institution which had not yet felt the full effects of elective education. He found himself returning to a different place: one with a cohort of women on campus and substantial support for elective reform, with neither change sitting well with him. By all accounts he was a character, known for his affects of walking with a cane and twirling his watch on its fob during lectures. He was a prominent figure in Harvard’s growing composition program, and a vocal opponent of women’s education in
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Cambridge. In fact, his personal idiosyncrasies and strong opinions play into the critique of his methods in some prominent treatments, such as Douglas Wallace’s dismissive essay in Brereton’s *Traditions of Inquiry*.

And yet, Wendell’s influence on the future of composition, especially as a counterpoint to A.S. Hill, cannot be dismissed. Nor can his own trajectory of first launching the use of daily themes in writing courses, and later despairing of those very pedagogies having any positive or lasting affect for his students. Of Wendell’s impact through Daily Themes, and his subsequent departure from composition, Kitzhaber writes:

> In his later years Wendell abandoned work in composition as an impossible task. Students still wrote badly, and he lamented the years he had spent teaching the unteachable. He insisted that composition courses ought to be thrown out of the college curriculum. Yet he did a service for the cause of composition training. His book [*English Composition*] marked the transition from the massive, heavily formal texts of the earlier period to the simpler and more direct books that were to follow. Not the least important thing he did was to turn the attention of rhetoricians away from mere correctness in details to effectiveness of the larger units (paragraphs and whole compositions) as determined by what impression the writer is trying to make on the reader.”

As we can surmise from the previous section, this turn away from “correctness in details to effectiveness of the larger units” was no small thing. Wendell was almost single-handedly
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53 Douglas was professor of English at Northwestern University from 1945-1980. He was remembered in his NY Times obituary in 1995 as “an innovator in the teaching of English and an authority on the Romantic poets.” [http://query.nytimes.com](http://query.nytimes.com). He received his doctorate from Harvard. He was chair of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1969. I offer these historical touchstones because Douglas’ moment and stature in the field of composition in the mid-20th century clearly shaped his intense criticism of Barrett Wendell’s approach to teaching writing, and perhaps, too, his condescending style. For example: “The influence of legal training on the theories of our early masters has yet to be noticed. At any rate, if students follow such a contrived, mechanized procedure as Wendell recommended, young people, learners are bound to produce just what they do, ‘papers’ of generalities, thinly supported by largely imaginary illustrations and examples” (Wallace in Berlin, *Traditions of Inquiry*, 18). Even more biting is his conclusion: “According to Wendell, I should now be able to sum up all in a paragraph. But to sum up Wendell and his work were (to use one of his subjunctives) to attempt the impossible. So I shall simply borrow a bit of verse gently mocking Wendell’s values, his style, in a way, I suppose, his very being” (Ibid., 23). This is followed by clever doggerel written by one of Wendell’s students at the turn of the century, meant to caricature Wendell in a student publication, but read by Douglas to confirm “the essence of Wendell’s human and pedagogical characters.” This is the sort of intense (and highly personal) criticism of the process of daily theme writing and its early proponents that Sue Carter Simmons and other process-oriented theorists were responding to later in the 20th and early 21st centuries in their recuperation of Wendell’s daily themes pedagogy.
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working against the juggernaut of Harvard’s central administration, and the demands placed upon English to serve just that purpose. It should not be a surprise, then, that his rise to assistant professor (1888), and to full professor (1899), was slower than his colleagues. His courses were not necessarily offering to students what the administration thought they most needed. More than A.S. Hill, Wendell seems to be a polarizing figure even now in late 20th and early 21st century composition studies, with scholars lining up on one side or the other, depending upon their espousal of Wendell’s centerpiece pedagogy of themes. But all agree on one thing: his main textual contribution is *English Composition*, the result of his Lowell Lectures of 1890, and the textbook used in his Daily Themes courses, English 12 and English 22.

Both of these courses were electives, and used the writing of daily themes as their main activity and focus. Brereton’s general description of English 22 is as follows: “English 22 was a three-credit elective course for Sophomores. A product of Harvard President Eliot’s curricular reforms, electives allowed students to incline towards specialization, rather than take required courses by all students. English 22 was open only to the strongest writers, the weaker writers being required to take *English B*.”

English 22 at Harvard was explicitly not a course in Literature or in Rhetoric, as taught by Hill, these being saved for the required courses English A and English B or specific courses on authors or genres. English 22 and English 12 at Harvard was what we today might call a creative writing course. Here is Wendell’s description of English 22 at Harvard in 1893-94:

> In the two full elective courses given this year [English 22 and English 12] the students write both daily themes of about a hundred words and fortnightly themes of from five hundred to a thousand words. This work is frequently discussed in person with the teachers, who for this purpose keep office hours – quite distinct from regular classroom appointments – averaging five hours a week. It will be seen, then, that the
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use of text-books, as distinguished from personal instruction, is reduced to a minimum. The text-books actually in use have been written for the purposes in hand by the teachers who use them.\textsuperscript{56}

Though his textbook is used, he makes clear that writing of themes, personal instruction, and conferencing with students are the foundations of the course. We can see from this description a different emphasis than we saw in English A where mechanical correctness had become king. Here, the student – and the student’s writing – appears to be at the center of the course. This is, of course, a distinction which is of huge significance for composition in the 20th century.

Despite this clearly student-centered approach, Wendell became associated with current-traditional rhetoric because of the centrality of Harvard in educational reform and the rise of composition studies, and because the textbooks implemented by Hill and Wendell were published in rapid succession. According to a standard history of this period put forward by Kitzhaber, both courses and textbooks were mode-oriented and product-oriented.\textsuperscript{57} Likewise, James Berlin groups Barrett Wendell with A.S. Hill as a proponent of what he calls current-traditional rhetoric, the rhetoric of that period which persisted well into the 1960s. In his early years, Wendell taught all three of the main composition courses for Harvard students: English A, the required first-year course, English B, known as Sophomore Themes or Twelve Themes and fundamentally a course in expository writing, and English C, Forensics, which focused on written argument as descended from the traditional oral forensic. Of his involvement with these required courses, Simmons says the following:

“Wendell’s own authority as teacher was constrained by a variety of institutional forces that


\textsuperscript{57} Kitzhaber, \textit{Rhetoric}, 61-62.
exhorted him to ‘improve’ the teaching of writing while creating circumstances which made substantive change difficult if not impossible.” Simmons argues that those constraints were built into the pedagogy of English A, and that “Wendell’s own writing pedagogy [as expressed through the daily themes courses] was formed at least in part as a rejection of the pedagogy he helped shape in English A.” Simmons makes a compelling case that Wendell’s course in Daily Themes and his pedagogies were reactions against, rather than continuations of, the principles of rhetoric espoused by A.S. Hill.

Simmons argues that Barrett Wendell’s curriculum for English 12 was a direct response to the restrictive elements of AS Hill’s English A; that the elective freedom instituted by President Eliot allowed Wendell to innovate around the new prescriptive courses in English. Part of this argument states that though Wendell taught many different courses during his tenure at Harvard, Daily Themes was at the center of his pedagogy to develop the writer not simply the writing. This, of course, is also a late 20th century approach to composition, such that part of Simmons’ project is to push against the common understanding of Wendell as associated with “product-oriented current-traditional rhetoric” by Berlin and Kitzhaber. In her recuperative approach, Simmons claims that his actual practices align him much more closely with modern-day process-oriented pedagogy. She argues that “Wendell consciously attended not to the process of composing but to the process of creating writers – for him the necessary corrective to both the rhetoric of writers like Hill and the educational system which supported it.” In short, she argues that Wendell’s pedagogy in English 12 – and other daily themes courses like English 22 – were reactions against the prevailing product-oriented pedagogy practiced at Harvard in the late 19th century.
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century. Drawing on recent reassessments of Wendell which focus on his techniques and methods, Simmons’ argument can be distilled as follows: “These reassessments of Wendell indicate that much as the modern process movement arose out of opposition to existing product-oriented practices in teaching writing, Wendell’s pedagogy and discourse theory arose out of his own rejection of the dominant teaching practices of his day.”61 This is vital to our understanding of what Stein wrote and why, and also to determine whether these approaches, with Stein, were ultimately effective or not, and what that would mean for our evaluation of her writing as a student and as an adult. I take up these issues in chapter 5 and my Conclusion.

Simmons’ argument is that Wendell is pushing against the Hill model of rhetoric through his use of daily writing, peer review, and student-teacher conferencing. This is a valuable contribution to the complexity of Harvard in the 1890s, but her argument of Wendell as the process-oriented antidote to Hill’s product-orientation also feels laden with late 20th century models seeking their predecessors, bolstering one method of teaching by seeing the conflict emergent in an earlier time, and reclaiming in Barrett Wendell an influential advocate for her own pedagogical camp. Wendell’s principles of style, and those of current traditional rhetoric have been criticized as “needlessly abstract” according to Simmons. She points to Wallace Douglas’s critique of Wendell’s approach to style. Berlin, while acknowledging the innovation and successful marketing of his terms, describes Wendell’s principles of rhetoric as both an extension of 18th century-rhetoric, but also as derivative without any appreciable pedagogical utility. And yet, it was Wendell’s formulation of these ideas that gained traction: “The appearance of unity, coherence, and emphasis as principles of arrangement is closely related to the development of interest in the paragraph.
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Earlier forms of the three can be traced – first seen in Blair, developed by Bain, and then presented in a variety of ways by textbooks between 1870 and the end of the century. Barrett Wendell used the three in the form that finally caught on. While Hill had argued that the principles governing the sentence could be applied to the paragraph, Wendell extended the paragraph to an interest in the whole essay. Berlin is ultimately unconvinced by the utility of Wendell’s constructions for the actual teaching of writing. Wendell’s theory can be reduced, says Berlin, to the following principles, as taken from Wendell’s English Composition:

(1) Every composition should group itself about one central idea; (2) The chief part of every composition should be so placed as readily to catch the eye; (3) Finally, the relation of each part of a composition to its neighbors should be unmistakable. The first of these principles may conveniently be named the principle of Unity; the second, the principle of Mass; the third, the principle of Coherence.

Berlin’s response to this is cool: “It is difficult to disagree with this, but how it will help the student to write is an unresolved matter.” The debate is ultimately whether daily themes are of any use in making students better writers.

If we use Gertrude Stein as the test case for this question, I would suggest there are two answers, dependent upon what we are evaluating and when. During the course of the semester, Daily Themes gave her a sense of the possibility in the quotidian practice of writing. Did it improve her mechanical correctness, her “clearness”? Somewhat. Did it give her stylistic coherence, improve her sense of “unity”? Somewhat. Did it help her to become a more forceful writer? Somewhat. We can observe all of these in the extant themes themselves, as I do in chapter 5. But we cannot only judge success from the products of English 22, the themes evaluated with a C at the end of the semester. Rather, the impact of this course is evidenced long after Stein left academe, and emerged when she was an adult.
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writer, as I will show in my conclusion. Can we argue then that there is a direct link between her adult writing and her student daily themes? I would say yes. For one, she saved them. We can read them because she valued them. Beyond their very existence, the greatest evidence is that she returned to the subject of composition between 1927-1931, writing her own “textbook” called rather transparently, *How To Write*. The table of contents includes the following: “Sentences and Paragraphs,” “Sentences,” and “Forensics,” amongst other more obscure late-Steinian titles, such as “Arthur a Grammar” and “Finally George a Vocabulary.”

Certainly, Gertrude Stein’s approach in *How to Write*, which I address more fully in the conclusion of this dissertation, suggests that the categories of “words, sentences, and paragraphs” left an impact on the student writer that resonated decades later, and, in a belated coup for Barrett Wendell, provided proof that these building blocks of writing could mean far more in their application to the writing process for Stein than could the categories of argument or exposition, as understood historically.

Coming back to the more immediate context at Harvard, Wendell’s course is thus a focal point for arguing for and against these kinds of assignments. Wallace Douglas argues against their utility, taking a page out of Wendell’s own book later in his career when he rejected his previous innovation. Simmons, resurrecting the origins of process-oriented writing which Daily Themes introduced, argues for: “While Douglas sees both the functions and the value to students of the dailies as limited, in contrast I see them as the center of Wendell’s very innovative pedagogy, as an extremely flexible tool that served a variety of functions.” In fact, even Berlin makes an argument in favor of Simmons’ position when he acknowledges that A.S. Hill modified his approach in 1892 – one year following Wendell’s
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publication of *English Composition* – by taking up Wendell’s approach to the units of composition, and discarding his previous emphasis on the modes of discourse. As Berlin describes it: “…in his *Foundations of Rhetoric* of 1892, [Hill] turns his back on the modes altogether, focusing on words, sentences, and paragraphs, further limiting the scope of composition instruction.”67 This new approach does not limit the scope of composition instruction, so much as broaden it; where the modes propose specific types of writing for specific circumstances, this emphasis on the building-blocks of writing could be applied to any kind of prose, even if they were not.

The main point here, however, is that the rhetorics of Hill and Wendell in the 1880s and 90s were mutually informing; where Hill’s *Principles* (1878) laid out an influential new rubric now known as current-traditional rhetoric, Wendell’s *English Composition* (1890), shifted the terms to a functional and foundational relationship with the building-blocks of writing, influencing the next articulation of Hill in *Foundations of Rhetoric* (1892).

Simmons’ argument is especially compelling when we consider the function that English 22 played in the development of student writers: “The central aim of Wendell’s pedagogy was to help students learn to think of themselves as writers and his central method of doing so was the daily theme.”68 When Simmons writes that Wendell was “constructing writers” not “writing” she could not have been more accurate, as we’ll see in the next section. The student-teacher relationships that were solidified in the process of writing daily themes persisted well beyond the classroom. Though the influence of the English A curriculum endured into the 1960s while Daily Themes gradually diminished except at a few Ivies, it was Daily Themes – English 12 and English 22 – for which Harvard of the 1890s was most
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well-regarded (as opposed to copied), and remembered fondly by its former students. English 22 and English 12 were the courses through which the aspiring writers passed. However we assess Wendell’s own contributions to the field of composition, at Harvard in the 1890s, Daily Themes, English 22, was a course where writers were made.

Crimson Old Boys Network: English 22 at Harvard in 1894-1895


Course 22 is open to those only who, having attained Grade C in English A, prefer an elective course to English B. It is counted as the equivalent of English B and a half-course of elective study.70

At Harvard in the late 19th century, English 22 was one of the courses in which aspiring writers became published writers. Successful writers, publishers, editors – many now footnotes in American letters – emerged from English 22 with their first publications as revised drafts of their undergraduate work. One of these authors, novelist Frank Norris, was a Gertrude Stein contemporary in English 22 in 1894-1895. Franklin Walker, Norris’ biographer in 1932, records the following description of English 22 by Norris, who gives us a glimpse of the Harvard course from the undergraduate perspective:

“The literary student at Cambridge [Harvard] has but little to do with lectures, almost nothing at all with textbooks. He is sent away from the lecture room and told to look about him and think a little. Each day he writes a theme, a page if necessary, a single line or a dozen words if he likes; anything, so it is original, something he has seen or thought, not read of, not picked up at second hand. Once every two weeks he writes a longer theme, and during the last six weeks of the year, a still longer one, in six weekly instalments [sic]. Not a single suggestion is offered as to subject. The result of the system is a keenness of interest that draws three hundred men to the course and that fills the benches at every session of the class. The classroom work consists

69 This is the “examination group” number. Students cannot take any two courses that have the same roman numeral or the exam will conflict.
70 English 22 course description is on page 12 of the Harvard University Announcement of Courses of Instruction Provided by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for the Academic Year, 1894-1895 (HUA).
merely in the reading, by the instructor, of the best work done, together with his few critical comments upon it by the instructor in charge. The character of the themes produced under this system is of such a high order that it is not rare to come across one of them in the pages of the first-class magazines of the day.”

We have just such a publishing success-story from another of Frank Norris’s peers in English 22 in 1894-95, Melville Stone, whose full set of themes from English 22 is preserved in the Harvard University Archives. Melville Edwin Stone (1875-1918) was editor of the Harvard Crimson while an undergraduate, and later became a writer, editor, and publisher. The story of Melville Stone, and another Harvard colleague named Joseph Sharts, demonstrates that it was not only the “high order” of the themes themselves, but also the pedagogy of the course which encouraged the creation of student-writers, the network of students themselves, and the support of the professors who greased the wheels of publication.

As an undergraduate, Melville Stone followed the prescribed course, starting with English A, then opting for the two electives, English 22 and English 12, in lieu of English B. The content of Stone’s themes confirms Norris’ description: that English 22 at Harvard was a creative writing course structured around a presumed understanding of rhetorical modes: description, narration, argument, exposition, but without determined content. The theme material comes from the experiences of the student-writer. Stone wrote travel narratives, pithy daily observations, short position pieces, and several stories revised over a period of weeks, not unlike many of Gertrude Stein’s themes from the same course at Radcliffe.

Present in Stein’s themes, however, and conspicuously absent in Stone’s, are any themes that address readings; this again confirms Norris’ observation that books were not to be the subject matter of the men’s musings, and opens up a question I will address later in this
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chapter regarding Stein’s themes in the Radcliffe version of the course. What of the frequent references to texts in the women’s themes?

Read in consort, the Stone and Stein daily themes have allowed me to reconstruct the curriculum, pedagogy, teacher biases, and student experience in English 22 at Harvard and at Radcliffe. This is largely because Stone and Stein studied under the same three professors that year, as recorded in the course descriptions for both Harvard and Radcliffe: Professor Lewis E. Gates, Frank E. Farley, and William Vaughn Moody. Not only that, but W. V. Moody was the primary commenter on Stone’s themes as well as Stein’s, providing a gauge to re-read, and re-value, Stein’s work in this course by comparison with a peer who was evaluated by the same instructor. Finally, because the Stone daily themes are complete, they reveal just how incomplete the Stein holdings at Yale’s Beinecke library are. We have with these parallel student archives a stronger sense of the limitations of the Stein archive, but also a stronger understanding of Stein’s writing in the broader context of the course.

William Vaughn Moody’s responses to both Stone and Stein in his marginal and end-commenting reveal as much about the reading practices, teaching values, and expectations of students in English 22 – at Harvard and at Radcliffe – as they do about the students he was grading. Though Barrett Wendell was no longer teaching English 22, his textbook was used, and his pedagogy assumed by the teachers of record. The influence of Wendell’s terms – clearness, force, and elegance – is readily seen in Moody’s commenting on both students’ themes. Like Barrett Wendell, Moody also had been a Harvard undergraduate not long before becoming a composition instructor to Stone and Stein. Following his graduation, Moody spent 1893-94 in graduate study at Harvard, and was offered, along with fellow-student Frank Farley, an assistantship teaching English 22 for Professor Lewis E. Gates in 1894-95.
This was the first of many years of professional conflict between his artistic career and grading composition themes. Following his undergraduate and graduate work at Harvard, he enjoyed a celebrated, though tragically brief, career as a poet, dramatist, and literary historian. Moody was practically contemporary with Melville Stone and Gertrude Stein, but would play, in this one year of their writing lives, the role of graduate student mouthpiece for Barrett Wendell in English 22, a course Moody had not taken as an undergraduate himself.

William Vaughn Moody was born in Indiana, and entered Harvard as an undergraduate in 1889. His poetry frequently appeared in the undergraduate literary publication, the *Harvard Monthly*, and he was elected class poet upon his graduation with high honors in 1893. He studied classics, modern languages, and medieval literature. According to R.M. Lovett, a peer from the *Monthly*, Moody did not take any English literature or composition courses, “wisely […] avoiding any academic influence upon his own reading and writing.” Lovett also writes that Moody “was too critical of himself to preserve his juvenilia,” an interesting observation in the context of this dissertation. Despite his own educational leanings towards literature and poetry, Moody cut his teeth as an instructor in the composition courses he taught to Stein and Stone. He was an acolyte of Barrett Wendell’s pedagogy, and, at least by his peers, quite respected for his teaching. Moody was an attentive reader, direct in his commenting, sometimes sarcastic, but not without empathy. His own colleagues remembered his meticulous grading, and conscientious attention to his students. Of his composition teaching, R.M. Lovett writes:
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72 Moody’s year of teaching English 22 in 1894-95 was his last year in Cambridge. In the spring of 1895, he accepted a position at the University of Chicago where he taught English composition and specialized in 17th century poetry. During the next fifteen years, he published poetry, several dramas, and one book of criticism, *A History of English Literature*, co-authored in 1902 with Robert Morss Lovett. This influential volume remained in print until 1980. Moody was awarded a Litt.D by Yale in 1908. He died prematurely in 1910.
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In all ways, Moody was an admirable teacher. Whether tutoring individual pupils or conducting classes, he gave his full mind to every exercise. His lectures were carefully thought out and delivered in perfect form. I have seen hundreds of students’ themes, painfully corrected in red ink, with elaborate comment on the outside page written in his clear, beautiful hand.75

By my read, both Gertrude Stein and Melville Stone’s themes bear out Lovett’s assessment. Though his comments can seem perfunctory at times, they demonstrate a professorial engagement with the work and progress of the students. For our purposes here, it is a fortunate convenience that Stone and Stein shared Moody as their primary grader at the beginning of his short but distinguished career; it provides the possibility of even deeper comparative study of the writing and commenting in both archives, a worthwhile pursuit which may be of interest to another Steinian compositionist. For the present, our story continues with Melville Stone, Barrett Wendell, the force behind English 22, and the Crimson old boys network.

Melville Stone graduated Harvard with his AB in 1897, and went to work as an editor for his father’s publishing firm in Chicago, Herbert S. Stone & Company. In 1901, he had occasion to write to one of his other former English professors, Barrett Wendell with whom he took English 12, about the publication of a new book called *Ezra Caine*, by his Harvard peer, Joseph Sharts. This book by Sharts is also preserved in the Harvard Archives with the Stone papers, along with the letter below. They collectively show clearly that English 22 was to be for the men a networking course for future writers. Here is the letter of May 22, 1901 that Stone wrote to Barrett Wendell, Esq., Harvard University:
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75 Ibid., xxxv. Not all critics of Moody’s teaching and grading are so generous. Richard Bridgman’s assessment of both Stein’s student writing and Moody’s responsiveness as a teacher are damning. He is sympathetic to Moody for having to grade Stein’s papers, and critical for his failure to help her: “From the very beginning, Gertrude Stein distressed her readers. But minimal assistance had been forthcoming from William Vaughn Moody who had corrected her themes at Harvard” (*Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, 6).
Dear Mr. Wendell:-

I am sending you by same mail a book which we are about to publish and in which I think you may be interested. The author is J. W. Sharts of ’97, and the story was written for English 22.

With kind regards in which my brother joins me, I am,

Yours very truly,

Melville E. Stone, Jr. 76

The writing and publishing of *Ezra Caine* shows that English 22 was a course that nurtured the creative writer, a place where daily observations of life, often a page or less, would be rewritten and revised into a longer creative writing piece. This course was a perfect opportunity to explore any avenue of writing or observation of life, and as such would seem to be a perfect opportunity for Stein to write out her experiences for the purposes of seeking a wider audience. But Stein did not and, frankly, could not engage in this course in the same ways as her peers, Melville Stone or Joseph Sharts – these gentlemen, at the time of the course, clearly wanted to be writers, and used the daily writing to allow them to explore their observations and ideas in sentences and paragraphs, to prepare them for their post-graduate careers in the literary world. In each of the descriptions of English 22 at Harvard – from Wendell to Norris to Brereton – two observations stand out: first, the freedom that students in English 22 were given to write whatever they wanted, to explore their own perceptions of the world in daily themes, without strict curriculum or prompts from their instructors; second, that the personal contact between students and teachers, the influence of the instructor upon the students is strong; and not insignificantly, functioned as an old boys network that they could look forward to as writers upon graduation.

Melville Stone’s name would not be recognized on the spine of a book or perhaps noticed on a title page except as a citation, but the story of his enrollment in English 22 and his hand in the publication of stories that emerged from that course is instructive, not only for
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the comparison it affords us between Stein’s themes and his themes, between the English 22 course taught at Harvard, and the course taught at Radcliffe which we will explore presently; but it is also instructive for the culture which surrounded such courses for the women and men, not only while students at Harvard and Radcliffe, but in the world that awaited them upon graduation. As we have already seen, the women in Cambridge were encouraged to be teachers, not writers. The men could assume a direct path from student life to professional life, but unless a woman planned a teaching career, the same was simply not true: “At the turn of the century most colleges – especially the liberal arts women’s schools – provided little concrete support for those interested in professional work. Indeed, the notion of a planned, vertical career, systematically related to college and professional education, had little relevance in these years to women’s lives.”77 Though perfectly contemporary with Melville Stone, Joseph Sharts, and Frank Norris, Gertrude Stein was not a part of their world. She may have entered college with the profile of a Harvard man, may have exercised that persona in her 1920s salon living room with Virgil Thomson, but in 1894-95 as a Sophomore, she could not participate in the clear privileges of the Crimson old boys network, as much as she may have wanted to or believed she could. And so we turn to the disparity between opportunities for women and men as noted in educational and composition scholarship.

**Radcliffe Women, Feminism, Composition, and Gertrude Stein**

If, as Brereton suggested to us at the outset, finding student themes as representations of the development of composition is difficult for men, it is even more difficult for women. That we even have Gertrude Stein’s themes is a testament to her identification with the

success promised the Harvard male, as well as the very fact of that later success in her writing career. The commentaries on women’s experiences in late-19th century classrooms have mostly been pursued by feminist scholars of educational history, reconstructing generational experiences through the individual case studies of women whose voices resonated in higher education. These narratives generally find the arguments one would expect from a feminist recovery of history: that women experienced a hostility from their environment which they had either to overcome or reject by leaving.78

Joyce Antler’s educational biography of Lucy Sprague Mitchell offers insight into Stein’s generational experience, with Mitchell another contemporary graduating from Radcliffe in 1900, two years after Stein. What is most compelling about Mitchell’s experience, and Antler’s narrative of it, is that they don’t reflect the recorded experiences of Gertrude Stein as an Annex Girl or Radcliffe Woman. They support even more strongly my portrayal at the outset of this chapter – that Gertrude Stein identified personally, if not by her curricular path nor by her contemporary peers, as a Harvard Man.79 Stein expressed her recollection of the social-intellectual culture of Harvard-Radcliffe in those days in nostalgic terms:

She [Stein] was one of a group of Harvard men and Radcliffe women and they all lived very closely and very interestingly together … she enjoyed her life and herself. She was the secretary of the philosophical club and amused herself with all sorts of

78 It must be said that Stein’s departure from John Hopkins could easily be used as a case study for this position. She, however, in a classic Steinian explanation, declared that her reason for leaving was “boredom.” Though not the focus of this dissertation, I have an unpublished article on the relationship between Stein’s chosen profession of writing, and the strictures inherent in the pursuit of a science education and career. In short, her rebellion against the narrowness of both graduate education and the occupations available to women were most successfully waged outside of academe, and through the medium of language rather than science.

79 The main issue for feminist scholarship is that women are always marked. Thus they are left out of the history of composition when first written, and when written back in, are still separated from the main narrative. This is one problem I am trying to address in this dissertation. Especially as regards the birth of composition, we are misunderstanding its history if we do not include the women in the main narrative, not as a parallel history.
people. She liked making sport of question asking and she liked equally answering them. She liked it all.\textsuperscript{80}

Like Stein, Mitchell studied philosophy with William James, Josiah Royce, and George Santayana, and was, in fact, the first Radcliffe student to receive honors in Philosophy. But we could not characterize her experience, as expressed by Antler, at all as one of nostalgia:

Most Harvard professors, if not [Mitchell’s] own philosophy teachers, treated women students with a mixture of respect, contempt, and condescension. Some of them had been unalterably opposed to the establishment of the coordinate women’s college, Radcliffe, feeling that it could become “a vampire, sucking the lifeblood of the university.”\textsuperscript{81} Others treated women if not superciliously then differently, regarding them as delicate creatures of femininity, rather than simply as qualified students.\textsuperscript{82}

Stein and Mitchell had profoundly different experiences and memories of the Harvard-Radcliffe mix. To further illustrate these impressions of Mitchell, Joyce Antler records the following remembrance of Lucy Fuller, another Radcliffe colleague of both Lucy Sprague Mitchell and Gertrude Stein, who was also enrolled in English 22. Her narrative confirms at the outset that the rules were to be set equally for men and women. It also demonstrates both the wry contempt that the women had of their situation, as compared to their male cohort despite this supposed equality, and the pervasive attitudes of difference between the Harvard men and the Radcliffe women, not only with the professors, but with the president of Radcliffe herself. Finally it paints a vivid picture of President Elizabeth Agassiz, one of the driving forces behind the founding of Radcliffe College, as den mother of the young women:

\textsuperscript{80} Stein, \textit{The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas}, 73.
\textsuperscript{81} Internal quotation from William E. Byerly, “Radcliffe College Thirty Years After,” \textit{Harvard Graduate Magazine} (December 1909): 5. Byerly was a professor of mathematics at Harvard, and amongst the first professors to teach women in 1879-80. He joined the Executive Committee of the Society in 1881-82, served as Chairman of the Academic Board, and was an active member, and then ex-officio member, of the Corporation for the Society and Radcliffe through the turn of the century. Though he may have initially held this view – concern about the health of Harvard College with the arrival of women – it did not prevent him from becoming an active participant in the education of women.
\textsuperscript{82} Antler, “Educational Biography,” 48. Footnote in Antler text: “Lewis Gates, who taught the English composition course Lucy and her classmates were required to take, told his students, for example, that ‘women are lyrical interludes in a man’s strenuous existence,’ a statement that they mocked but resented.”
We had . . . the same examinations as the Lords of Creation – lasting something over three hours. On one occasion, Mrs. Agassiz wandered into the room and saw me at work. She came up and tentatively asked me if I wasn’t working too hard. I put my finger on my lips, shook my head, and pointed to the Proctor. “What is the matter?” she asked. I said, “You mustn’t talk to me. He’ll think you’re helping me.” “Bless you, my dear,” she laughed. “He knows I don’t know enough to help you.” She moved about through the room for a few moments, and then wandered out. Presently arrived some cups of hot soup, with instructions from her that girls ought not to work so long without nourishment.83

This passage gives a vivid sense of the opportunity that the girls had that their president did not. However, in comparing her own exam experience with her Harvard peers – the “Lords of Creation” – Fuller humorously undercuts any sense of their equality as students. They may have been given the same exams, but they were patently not the same, and she knew it.

Rather than conceiving of these educations as separate but equal, Fuller and Stein’s accounts paired suggest we should consider them as together and not equal. The difference between the accounts of Lucy Fuller and Gertrude Stein is based on a different experience of togetherness, separateness, equality, and expectation. As described broadly by Joyce Antler:

> For many women, Radcliffe did indeed provide a useful context for after-college lives of involvement, caring, and concern, whether within or outside the home. But for others, the failure to confront the discriminatory aspects of an education that was in many respects gender-linked simply masked the ambivalent messages of that education. The experience of being a Radcliffe-Harvard woman thus created high expectations for undergraduates, but it offered little preparation that might allow them to lead the active lives which they desired. Instead, it gave them a nagging sense of their difference from, and perhaps their inferiority to, men. Many Radcliffe women were to hold themselves accountable when they failed to produce the achievements which they desired.84

Clearly, none of that sense of inferiority permeated Gertrude Stein’s public persona, either as an undergraduate, or following her exit from academe. Neither did she prevent it from interfering with her ambitions. But it cannot be denied that she was living in the same culture as Lucy Fuller, even if she did not identify with the women around her. One problem,

---

83 Ibid., 49-50.
84 Ibid., 51.
however, was that male faculty teaching these courses and proctoring these exams were limited by their own understanding of what women could and should be, regardless of the opportunities they were opening up, regardless of how the women saw themselves. For example, Professor Lewis Gates, one of the teachers of record for both Stein and Fuller in English 22 at Radcliffe, and also for Melville Stone at Harvard, went so far as to describe women, with no apparent irony, as “‘lyrical interludes in a man’s strenuous existence.’”85

Melville Stone and Joseph Sharts were not contending with this kind of patronizing in their English 22 course. To return to the themes and the courses themselves, let’s reconsider the parallels between English 22 for Stone and Sharts vis-à-vis English 22 for Stein and Fuller. When I found the Melville Stone sources in the Harvard Archives, I had assumed—as every person who has addressed Stein’s themes must have assumed—that Stein was taking the same course as Stone. Taken as a whole, the Stone themes suggested that English 22 was offered by the same professors as the same course—though in different venues—to Harvard men and Radcliffe women. These facts would seem to support that men and women, indeed, were receiving the separate but equal educations that co-ordinate education promised, despite the hostility that the women may have experienced in the delivery. But like the inequity that I noted in the introduction of this dissertation, Sue Carter Simmons has argued that there was systemic inequity in the system, narrowing her claim specifically to writing instruction: “From the start, the goal of providing the ‘same’ education for Radcliffe women as for Harvard men was compromised in several ways, especially in writing instruction.”86 Her support for this is a claim for unequal number of hours per courses, the fact that women could not enter the Harvard yard and so may not have been able to conference with their

85 Ibid., 51.
86 Simmons, “Radcliffe Responses to Harvard Rhetoric,” 268.
instructors,\textsuperscript{87} and that class sizes for women were miniscule as compared to the men, making it awkward for them during the in-class reading of the work (the men’s work could be read anonymously). I would argue, to the contrary, that small class sizes actually assisted the female students, by providing them with more attention than the 500 men in English A or the 150 men in English 12 would have received. All this said, I too found inequity – quite independently from Simmons article – between the courses offered to the women and those offered to the men, and between the experiences of the regular undergraduates and those of the Specials. We must not forget that the majority of these women were Specials.

Sue Simmons gives us a longer look into the Radcliffe composition classroom in her article, “Radcliffe Responses to Harvard Rhetoric,” published in 1995. She begins by noting that research into the women’s experience in these courses is limited, and cites Joyce Antler and Joann Campbell’s work on case studies of individual students with the student-centered conclusion that these “indicate that Harvard pedagogy failed to meet these women’s needs as learners.”\textsuperscript{88} Using one case study and anonymous themes published in the Radcliffe Magazine the 1880s and 1890s, she argues that female students “developed discursive survival strategies that enabled [them] to transform the hostile educational environment into one more supportive of [their] needs as learner[s].”\textsuperscript{89} The fundamental problem with this argument is that neither the descriptions of the courses in the Harvard and Radcliffe listings, nor the examinations of the men’s themes, bear this out. These “discursive survival strategies” described by Simmons can also be found in themes by the Harvard men, as seen in Stone’s themes, and reported in Brereton and elsewhere. All students – male and female – seemed to

\textsuperscript{87} Not exactly an inequity; the women conferenced with their professors at Fay House on the Radcliffe quadrangle. For more information on the disparities between men and women in Cambridge over the years, see Yards and Gates: Gender in Harvard and Radcliffe History, ed. by Laurel Thatcher Ulrich.

\textsuperscript{88} Simmons, “Radcliffe,” 266

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 266.
resent the dailyness of the themes and to communicate directly with their professors of their displeasure.

What cannot be found in the themes of Melville Stone, and can be found in themes by Gertrude Stein, is a focus on literary texts, as I mentioned earlier. This may not be seen as inequity of a negative sort, but it is crucial to our understanding of women’s education at this time, and the state of composition at Radcliffe, specifically in the course Stein took. Only the women were compelled to learn their writing from the models of other writers. Simmons notes that Annie Ware Winsor Allen, student in late 1880s, took courses with Barrett Wendell – in fact, took Daily Themes several times – and “with a different plan of literary readings each time. Many of Annie’s longer themes, the fortnightlies, were written about the literature she had been reading and thus reflect Annie’s attempts to enter the discourse community of literary scholarship.”[^90] There was nothing like this attempt to teach literary criticism in Daily Themes for the men. This is the critical distinction that the next section of my chapter raises. I’ll note here, too, that Simmons’ description of Annie Ware Winsor’s education makes clear to me that she was a Special Student, though this detail is not noted by Simmons. Simmons explains that years after leaving Radcliffe without a degree, Winsor petitioned Radcliffe to receive a diploma retroactively and was denied for she had taken only English 22 multiple times, rather than other courses, and so did not have enough credits to graduate. I surmise that amongst the “other courses” she did not take was English A; so her denial was not merely for a lack of credits, but a lack of this required course for graduates.

My work can shed light on the important archival work of Simmons, Antler, and Campbell, who looked at student themes from Radcliffe in the 1880s and 1890s, but without the context of the Special Students. If you overlay my historical research onto the category of

[^90] Ibid., 278.
students that these women were – regular students such as Lucy Sprague Mitchell (Antler), as compared with Special Students such as Annie Ware Winsor Allen (Campbell and Simmons) and Gertrude Stein, who was in her five-year education actually both – we see that the institutional markers made a difference in the kinds of courses they took, their experiences as undergraduates, and their relationships with their professors. That Allen was to become a schoolteacher and Mitchell to become first a scholar and higher education administrator, then after leaving academe, a powerful advocate in elementary education, speaks directly to the pathways they entered, and those they left. Allen was not a degree candidate, and was following, in that sense, the primary path for Specials towards secondary teaching; Mitchell was a regular student and took the path through Philosophy that led her to scholarly recognition. Stein – and here is the one way she really was unique – was enrolled as a Special, took courses like a Special, but graduated as a regular, and not a regular Annex Girl, but a regular Harvard Man, one who somehow managed to slip English A.

To return to the course that Stein took, English 22 at Radcliffe may have been born of the ideal of equivalent education for men and women, may even have had the same name and the same professors teaching it, but it was not the same course as English 22 at Harvard. The course descriptions of English 22 from Harvard and from Radcliffe in 1894-1895 tell a different story. The next section begins with a description of the course in English Composition that Gertrude Stein took as a Sophomore – as compared with the course her Harvard peer Melville Stone took – and posits why English 22 in 1894-1895 was structured differently for the Annex Girl than for the Harvard man. As we started the origins of English 22 at Harvard with English A, we must do the same at Radcliffe. For none of these courses was created in a vacuum, but in direct response to the needs of the students, and the demands
of Harvard’s faculty and administrators. And so we turn in the next section to the unique history of the curriculum development of English Composition at Radcliffe.

**English A, English 12, and English 22 at Radcliffe**

The three main challenges of describing the development of the English composition curriculum for the women of the Society from 1879 to 1896 – two years after it had become Radcliffe College – were as follows: 1) none of the courses had numbers which corresponded with Harvard’s course-listings; 2) many of the writing courses were simply called “English Composition;” and 3) even those courses which can be traced fairly clearly from year to year may be listed with different names, for example, “Themes,” “Sophomore Themes” and “Twelve Sophomore Themes” were all the same course – English B – taught in different years to the women from 1883 to 1896. So the first challenge – even before trying to determine whether men and women were in fact taking the same courses – was to determine what courses the women were actually taking. The curriculum itself was in the process of being formed around the women who attended. As I noted in chapter 2, some courses that were undersubscribed simply did not run. We can, however, by looking at the instructors of record, begin to piece together the curriculum based on what we know of those professors’ Harvard courses and pedagogies. The addition of course descriptions in 1889 in the Society reports gives us an even clearer window into what was included in the course itself.91

According to the Radcliffe course listings, A.S. Hill taught “English Composition” or “Composition” to the women from 1879 to 1884. In 1884-1885, the course was renamed

---

91 I have created a table of this entire curriculum, English Department courses at Radcliffe from 1879-1898 drawn from the Society and Radcliffe annual reports. It is included in the appendix as a reference.
“Hill’s Rhetoric” and taught by Le Baron Russell Briggs. It is fairly clear based on the course name-change and the passing of the professorial torch from Hill to Briggs that this course was the precursor to English A, which became in 1885 the required course for Harvard’s freshman. But it was not until 10 years later, in 1895-96, the year after the Harvard Annex had been chartered as Radcliffe College, that “English A” appeared in the course listings for the women at Radcliffe. During those ten years, the course can be traced through the curricular offerings as “Rhetoric and English Composition” or “Lectures based on AS Hill’s Principles of Rhetoric.” Likewise, the required courses for Sophomores and Juniors in 1883-84 were first taught as “Themes” and “Forensics” by Barrett Wendell, and by 1885-86, were listed as “Sophomore Themes” and “Junior Forensics.” Along with English A, these courses were identified in 1885 in the Harvard annual reports as English B and English C respectively, but that did not occur formally in the Radcliffe reports until ten years later, in 1895-96. Even before the clarity that the naming of English A, B, and C brought to these courses, it is fairly easy to trace these three courses as they developed at Radcliffe.

Not so the two electives taught by Wendell, English 12 and English 22. During that same ten years, Barrett Wendell – who had been teaching English A, B, and C to both the men and the women – began developing his elective courses to run parallel with Hill’s Rhetoric. English 12 was first offered to the Harvard men by Wendell in 1884, the same year he began teaching to the women “Themes/Forensics,” what appears to be a joint course of what would later split to become for the women English B and English C. Barrett Wendell first taught “English Composition” to the women in 1886. As you’ll recall, “English

---

92 Briggs is a fascinating figure in Radcliffe history; an early opponent of women’s education, he became, in 1903, president of Radcliffe and served for two decades in that capacity. Prior to serving as president of Radcliffe, he was dean of Harvard College (beginning in 1891), and according to Brereton, his tenure as dean “marked the entrenchment of the composition system, despite the growing emphasis on literature in the English department” (Brereton, Origins, 57).
Composition” – so named – had been offered previously by Hill. But in 1886-87, there were clearly two distinct courses being taught simultaneously, one called “Rhetoric and English Composition” taught by Hill’s successor Briggs, and the other course called simply “English Composition” taught by Wendell. There is no course description provided for Wendell’s course in 1886, but based on his introduction of English 12 to the men two years earlier, it is likely that this course in 1886 was the first of what would become English 12. Briggs also, in this year, taught “Sophomore Themes” to the women, the course which had already been named English B at Harvard. I should note here that it is my belief that the course Stein took, English 22, had not yet made its way into the women’s curriculum in the 1880s or early 90s. That would not happen until 1894-95, the very year Stein took the course. The first description of “English Composition,” the course I identify as English 12, as offered by Barrett Wendell, was in 1888-1889:

This course consisted of discussions of various matters connected with the art of English Composition; of detailed criticism before the class of representative themes, good and bad; and of two distinct kinds of writing: 1. Daily themes; 2. Fortnightly themes.

1. The object of daily themes was to cultivate ease of expression and regular habits of work. A daily theme, covering one page of theme paper, was deposited with the instructor on the day when it was written. The subject was chosen by the student, who was recommended to write of matters that she observed from day to day.

2. The object of fortnightly themes was to cultivate correctness and vigor of expression. These themes were in all respects treated like those in English 11. (Milton and Dryden.) *During the first half-year they dealt with subjects announced by the instructor. During the second half-year all the themes of each student dealt with a single topic (or with a series of closely-related topics), selected by the student with the approval of the instructor. Under this plan a student was able to connect her training in English with a favorite study, and at the same time to tighten her grasp of that study.* – 6 students

---

93 *Society in Radcliffe*, 1888-89, pp. 12-13, sequence 100-101; italics mine.
To clarify once more: this is the course description, I believe, for English 12. In this early incarnation of the course for the women, I’d like to note a number of observations: first, as with the men, the only named readings in this course are the themes themselves; second, that the daily themes and the fortnightly themes serve two distinct purposes for Wendell, the first “to cultivate ease of expression and regular habits of work,” and the second “to cultivate correctness and vigor of expression”; third, that Wendell chose the topics for the fortnightly themes during the first half of the year, and that the women chose their own subjects for the rest of the year. During the 1880s, this appears to have been true for the men as well – not only in English 12 but also in English A – leading of course to the dilemma of writing instructors being forced to grade content that they could not evaluate intellectually.

Wendell, while teaching these courses parallel to English A, began writing a textbook of his own, which may help explain why his course persisted as “English Composition” during this period, for it was eponymous with his textbook, *English Composition*, first published in 1891, the year, if you recall, that the Harvard Committee on Composition and Rhetoric was formed, and adopted for the women in 1892-1893 as the textbook for “English Composition” (which in that year was taught by Mr. Lamont). The Radcliffe Annual Report indicates in the course listings the following: “English Composition: Asst. Professor Wendell’s English Composition was used as a textbook.”

94 I believe Wendell’s textbook was used for both English 12, and when it began to be offered, English 22. It was the one constant in the development of both of Wendell’s Daily Themes courses. Why is this so

94 Ibid., 1892-1893, p. 23, sequence 255.
95 This is supported by the end comment on Stein’s daily theme dated November 7th, 1894, and titled “Only a Question of Rent.” It is the only end comment signed by “F.E.F.”, Frank E. Farley, one of Moody’s colleagues team-teaching English 22 along with Professor Lewis Gates. The last sentence of Farley’s comment reads: “It will pay you to review those parts of the textbook which treat of sentences and paragraphs.” Given that Wendell’s textbook is based on sentence and paragraph structure, it suggests that her English 22 class was using the Wendell textbook, *English Composition*. 
important? Because that textbook, the pedagogy, the philosophy of writing espoused by
Wendell was the foundation for Moody’s pedagogy, and as such, was Stein’s introduction to
formal writing and formal writing instruction. It is clear from archival studies of the themes
of this period, that Wendell’s terms and vocabulary became the basis for writing instruction
in Daily Themes. The investment of the individual teacher may have varied but there was one
constant in the grading in English 12. As described by Simmons who also worked
extensively with student papers in the Harvard archives: “One constant …. is the vocabulary
used in teachers’ comments: Wendell’s terms are used consistently in the papers for all
writing courses and requirements.”96 Because Stein did not have a formal education in
writing or composition as a high school student, and because she did not take any writing
course as a freshman, Wendell Barrett’s *English Composition* was her first taste of college
writing, indeed, of any writing instruction at all.

In fact, I believe that the course in which Stein was enrolled – also called “English
Composition” of course – was the very first offering to the women of English 22. But it was
not the same English 22 offered to the men; rather it was a new hybrid alternative to English
B and English 12 which incorporated aspects of Wendell’s new textbook, literary study, and
the practice of writing daily themes into one course. Wendell, it should be noted, was by this
time teaching Shakespeare, having despaired of his own pedagogies in the teaching of
writing to college students. The lead professor in Stein’s course was Professor Gates, noted
earlier in this chapter as the big draw to English 22 by Norris and the man who saw women
as “lyrical interludes in a man’s strenuous existence” by Fuller. Somehow, despite this
utilitarian attitude towards women, he must have, by sheer popularity and word-of-mouth
from the Harvard men, been responsible for the enrollment in his course to exceed that of

96 Simmons, “Constructing Writers,” 334.
Rhetoric and Composition for the first time at the Society. In this year, Hill’s course taught by Mr. Hurlbut had 56 students, while Gates’ English Composition had 61. It was either Gate’s magnetism or Hurlbut’s lack thereof that flipped the enrollments. It is even possible that Stein took English 22 for Gates, and got William Vaughn Moody and Frank E. Farley, their third, with the package.

We know from the headers on Stein’s themes, and from the grade sheet on record at Radcliffe (see appendices), that she took the course called English 22. Cross-listed with the professors’ names, and the enrollment of 61, we can also be certain that this is the same English 22 that was listed simply as “English Composition” in the course catalogue of the annual reports. The course description in the Radcliffe reports is as follows:

Messrs. Gates, Farley, and Moody. – English Composition. This course was open to those only who, having attained Grade C in English A, preferred an elective course to Sophomore Themes [English B]. It was counted as the equivalent of Sophomore Themes and a half-course of elective study.

97 There is, in the Beinecke archives of Gertrude Stein, an undated “portrait” – a form she pursued her entire writing life beginning about 1910 – called “Hurlbut.” I have included the text of this portrait in the appendices. As with many of Stein’s portraits, it is mostly evocative, presenting us with a scenario rather than a clear picture of its subject. It is my suspicion that I am the first one to know the origin and object of this particular portrait. It is not, in fact, included in either Richard Bridgman or Wendy Steiner’s lists of Stein’s portraits. For more information on the portrait form as practiced by Stein, see Steiner, Exact Resemblance to Exact Resemblance: The Literary Portraiture of Gertrude Stein.

98 There was also during this year a course in “English Composition (advanced course).” The Radcliffe Report of 1893-1894 describes English Composition (advanced course) as follows: “This course was strictly limited as to numbers. It was intended for students who already wrote well but who desired practice under criticism, and for those who had shown exceptional literary faculty in the courses in prescribed English...” The course was taught by Mr. Lamont who had taught English Composition the year before using Wendell’s English Composition as a textbook. It is my belief that after teaching English Composition in 1892-1893, Lamont proposed this advanced course with reduced numbers, and that this “new” advanced English Composition either was discontinued or was reabsorbed into English 22 when English 12 was introduced formally in 1895-1896. I make this judgment based in part on the professors listed, the enrollment numbers, and the proof offered by Stein’s themes that the course she took, English 22, was not the advanced course, but the standard course. Using only the course descriptions offered in the Society and Radcliffe Reports, it becomes clear that the development of curriculum is not a science as much as a delivery of what courses the students will take; that is, because these courses did not have a numbering system until 1895, and because, frankly, the courses themselves were being developed in part based upon the skills of the students taking them, these two electives, English 22 and English 12, bear many of the same markers, and it is not easy to trace their development confidently as separate. Rather, they seem to have developed on parallel courses until 1893-94 when they separated into standard and advanced streams.

99 Listed in the Radcliffe catalogue of courses as “Rhetoric and English Composition” and in this year taught by Mr. Hurlbut.
The course was primarily intended for Sophomores who, having acquired a fair measure of technical proficiency in English composition, wished, while perfecting their technique, to study more distinctively literary questions, – questions of method, of form, and of effect. Accordingly, the lectures and class-room discussions take for granted a thorough command of the elements of style – the word, the sentence, the paragraph – and deal chiefly with the problems in literary method involved in four kinds of writing, – Description, Narration, Exposition, and Argument. Selections from standard authors were examined in detail in the class-room with a view to determining the various effects secured and the methods and principles involved. Special attention was devoted during the last half-year to the Short Story. Class-room discussion was encouraged, and the constant aim was to secure for the student a thorough comprehension of the theory and principles of Rhetoric and of Literary Art, while at the same time giving her practical skill in composition and a feeling for style.

The written work of the course consisted of sixteen fortnightly themes and one hundred daily themes. The fortnightly themes were criticised [sic] by the instructors, both marginally as regards the details of technique, and also on the final page with reference to method, structure, and effect; the themes were usually to be rewritten. The daily themes were criticized more briefly and were meant to give a continuous life to the course, and to develop facility and sensitiveness to literary effect.

Conference hours were appointed for each student, at which attendance was required. – 61 students.  

The first paragraph is a duplication of the course description of English 22 for the Harvard men, suggesting it is the same course. But the Harvard description for English 22 ends there.  

If you recall Frank Norris’ memory of English 22, and believe that memory, then there is at least one very important departure in this course from the men’s course at Harvard. Again, according to Norris: “Each day he writes a theme, a page if necessary, a single line or a dozen words if he likes; anything, so it is original, something he has seen or thought, not read of, not picked up at second hand.” For the men, English 22, was decidedly not a course using “standard authors” for literary study. The themes of the men themselves were the objects of study. Melville Stone’s themes also bear this out; and it is clear from Barrett Wendell’s descriptions of his daily themes courses for the men that books were considered  

100 Radcliffe, 1894-95, pp. 30-31; sequence 30-31; italics mine.  
101 You can revisit that description which served as the epigraph of my section, “Crimson Old Boys Network: English 22 at Harvard in 1894-1895,” earlier in this chapter.
detrimental to the writer-in-progress. Wendell’s early rebellion against book-learning was an argument for the importance of the dailies:

The boys who come [to Harvard] have been trained chiefly in books; and not trained that they realize what good books really are, – honest expressions of what, in one form or another, real human life has once meant to living human beings … For some years it has been my custom to ask these boys, in one of my courses, to write for me some record of every day in the college year. What I bid them chiefly try for is that each record shall tell something that makes the day on which it is made different from the day before.”

The boys were trained “chiefly in books.” The girls, not so much. Here again, however, Stein’s early education, with its emphasis on reading, resembled her brother’s not her female peers. Whereas the only texts for the Harvard course were the themes the men had written themselves, the women were given “selections from standard authors” as exemplary of the kinds of rhetorical and literary moves they made. It may seem improbable that one line about reading “standard authors” and a focus on “literary effect” could make such a difference in our understanding of the course values and goals, but consider the implications: 1) These two differences in curriculum turned essentially a creative writing class into a literary style or theory class: from emphasizing observational, descriptive writing to emphasizing imitative writing; 2) Whereas the authorities in the Harvard course were the students themselves, the authorities in the Radcliffe course were the authors they read. The women’s writing, while integral to the daily themes part of the course, were not exclusively the subject of the course. This shifted the focus implicitly from the “writer” and “writing” – the individual expression of her observations – to “reading” – learning what the experts had written and incorporating their style into theirs.

102 Wendell, English Composition, 265. According to Sue Carter Simmons, “The daily themes provided one means of giving Harvard students a broader culture than could be obtained through books alone. In this regard, the daily themes functioned as part of Wendell’s critique of changes in his time of higher education” (336). Simmons further argues that this critique was directed against increased specialization in higher education, and the rise of college athletics as the primary vehicle for socialization of the young men.
It was around this time 1893-1895 that the course listings begin to confirm that a new discipline had arisen with the English Department, that “English Composition” was not merely a single course in writing, or even a set of developmental courses to be taken in succession, but a category of courses addressing various aspects of a discipline in itself. This indicates that Composition as a study – a scientific study if you will – had emerged as a field, a sub-field, within English, and yet quite separate from it. That these disciplinary lines began to be drawn just as Radcliffe formally became a College in its own right is significant. The female students were dividing between those invested in the teaching of composition – driven in large part by the secondary school teachers enrolled as Specials – and those who were pursuing literary or dramatic studies as undergraduates in the general course. Here in English 22 we see the professors addressing both of these in one course for the women.

It is in 1895-96 and 1896-97, the two years after Stein’s first writing course in English 22 that Radcliffe college joined Harvard in expressing its division of English Studies as separate studies of “English Composition,” “English Literature” and “English Drama.” Along with these sturdy lines of demarcation, each course was formally identified, for the first time, by a letter or number, making it easy to track the curriculum from year to year. In this year, we have English A, English B, English C, and for the first time in the records, also English 22 and English 12. Stein, in her junior year, took English C: Forensics. So while there is historical digging necessary to determine her coursework prior to her junior year, there is no question by 1896 what kind of course Stein was taking. Part of this standardization surely came with the merging of the Academic Boards, and with the formal alignment of Radcliffe courses with Harvard courses, confirming that the curricula were in fact “repetitions” of one another. So these changes in the Radcliffe Reports reflect that co-
ordinate commitment that becoming a College guaranteed. But it was not merely in the representation of the courses that these few years between 1893-1896 were important. They helped to establish the divide in composition studies that persists in the 21st century between product-oriented and process-oriented writing, and it is no understatement that the Radcliffe women, and their heavy enrollment in both required and elective English Composition courses made possible the simultaneous growth in courses offered, even though during this time they were being used as well to remediate their literary deficiencies in the same courses. With each subsequent incoming class, there was a need to expand the offerings, as well as align them with Harvard’s, and in this sense, the women of the Harvard Annex and Radcliffe College were yet another population on which to practice the new pedagogies and methods being developed by Harvard’s English faculty.

Beyond the clarification that numbering the courses provided, there were a multitude of vital changes to the representation of English Courses in 1896, signaling that Radcliffe, indeed, that Harvard, was about to leave the 19th century behind: 1) The lengthy course descriptions disappeared from the Radcliffe annual reports such that the course listing now resembled almost exactly the course book for Harvard; 2) The number of students in each course now included a breakdown of Undergraduates, Graduates, and Special Students, in addition to a total number; 3) The courses were now grouped under two main categories: “English Composition” and “English Literature;” 4) Even more specifically, the courses now began to be grouped truly by “periods” rather than simply by individual authors. We can see clearly the beginnings of 20th century periodization of the discipline, and true specialization within the discipline as well. Prior to this a professor might cover both poetry and prose of the 19th century. With the curriculum becoming more specialized, more specificity could be
provided because these were now “electives” rather than required courses. So the elective system gave rise to greater variety in the offerings, which lead in turn to more specialization earlier in a student’s career; and thus, more narrow education within the individual discipline.

Regarding the bifurcation of “English Composition” and “English Literature,” we see for the first time a clear distinction between writing or speech-based content, and literary content, the split in the English curriculum between creative/expository writing and the study of literature. This accompanies what can only be called a “boom” in the number of students enrolling in these courses. So the expansion of English A that is so bemoaned in Harvard’s reports, is also reflected here in Radcliffe’s. But the deep problems with English A did not also extend to the Radcliffe population: the only signal we have that Radcliffe was aware of the problem was that they began to print the breakdown of Specials, Undergraduates, and Graduates to track whether Special Students are occupying seats in “required” courses that the Undergraduates must be able to take. And that is why Radcliffe’s English course-listings begin to resemble Harvard’s only at this time: it is the increasing prominence of English Composition within the overall curriculum, even as literary studies were becoming the primary focus of the English department itself. We can see it all in the shaping of the curriculum, with a rapid shift in the balance of courses and enrollments from 1893-1897, the very years of Stein’s attendance. In those four years, the 20th century curriculum model in English, retained until at least mid-century, became solidified at Radcliffe.

What we can see so clearly just by looking at these course titles at Radcliffe in 1896, is a preview of the scenario described by James Berlin: a movement starting at the “new American university” but becoming the dominant influence on the kinds of rhetoric practiced in the 20th century, and the siloed departments in which they flourished. He, too, sees this
emergent from the elective system, with its end – as far as discourse and departmental structures – as creating the distinctions within academic community which persist today:

In the [eighteen] eighties and nineties, the elective system at the new American university – based, itself on a faculty psychology – divided the entire academic community into discrete parts, leading to an assembly-line conception of education. As far as rhetoric is concerned, this meant that persuasive discourse – the appeal to the emotions and the will – was now seen to be possible only in oratory, and concern for it was thus relegated to the speech department. Discourse dealing with imagination was made the concern of the newly developed literature department. The writing course was left to attend to the understanding of reason, deprived of all but the barest emotional content. Encouraged by the business community, with the tacit approval of science departments, composition courses became positivistic in spirit and method.103

He calls this “romantic rhetoric,” the last of the contexts that can enrich our understanding of what course Stein was taking, what she was writing, and as Berlin would describe it, the way in which the four elements of rhetoric – “reality, writer or speaker, audience, and language” – interacted with one another in a social – in this case, classroom – context.

Reflecting on the Course of Stein’s Writing Life Beginning in English 22

Gertrude Stein, and all of her female peers, were enrolled at Radcliffe on the cusp of the formalization of English Composition; guinea pigs in this new method of teaching writing, where one faction, as smartly argued by Simmons, was lead by A.S. Hill and the Rhetoric/product-oriented writing that would typify English A; and on the other hand, Barrett Wendell with his method of English Composition in the elective Daily Themes of English 22 and English 12, which Simmons argues was far more process-oriented, writer-oriented, than the required courses initiated by Hill. What does this mean for Stein’s writing experiences in English 22? If Sue Carter Simmons is correct in her reassessment of Wendell and his

103 Berlin, Writing Instruction, 9. Berlin explains that these ideas came out of the work of Emerson, Thoreau and others in the transcendental movement, though their impact on rhetoric and composition did not emerge until late in the 19th century.
influence on pushing against current-traditional rhetorics, it was not merely William James
who influenced Stein’s perspective on the subjects of psychological typology, on the fluidity
and functionality of language, on the fundamentals of identity as expressed through narrative,
a process, and yet one which could be categorized. In short, we could almost argue that
Wendell’s philosophy of writing – a process which could be taught within a rubric – is not
far from Stein’s earliest writing in *The Making of Americans* – expressed as narrative within
the categorical rubrics she saw within human nature. We might call it process-oriented
typology, and it began not in Stein’s head, or exclusively in the Psychology Lab with
James and Münsterberg, but also in English 22, where she was urged to contemplate her
daily living and to write about it.

This observation allows us to connect the dots I have seen missing between Stein’s
work with William James, the influence he had on her early writing, and the influence I have
wanted to find from her actual writing courses, the places where writing was in fact practiced
as both a science and an art. It is no understatement, I think, to suggest that Barrett Wendell’s
*English Composition*, and the solidification of both the textbook and the pedagogy just as
Stein was beginning to write, has as much a profound influence – if invisible in the histories
of her life thus far – as her work in the Psychology Laboratory. The William Jamesian
influence is obvious, and Stein herself remarked upon it quite enough, but we are missing
profoundly the educational influence of late-19th century composition, hidden from the story
such that Stein’s “unique” form of writing, her modernist innovation appears to emerge from
an entirely different field, translated – as the story goes – through her genius into literary
narrative. What if, in fact, it was composition, the confluence of Hill and Wendell’s scientific

---

104 In fact Michaela Giesenkirchen pursues this connection between realist typology and narrative in her article
on Stein’s themes. See “Ethnic Types and Problems of Characterization in Gertrude Stein’s Radcliffe Themes,”
58-72.
rendering of language – so that it could be taught as a discipline, with a rich history in rhetoric, and a new respect, even a necessity, for prioritizing the English language – what if, it was this small slice of Stein’s undergraduate education that piqued her interest in killing off the 19th century, not just the literary-historical part, but the part that emphasized both the new field of composition, and all of its restrictions and confines on linguistic expression in writing?

Why would Stein even want to credit the composition courses through which she gained an understanding of the discipline of writing and against whose rules and limitations she was also pushing? A genius conjures brilliance as if by magic, or is able to see the average in a new light. Why should she want to credit the compositionists for her new kind of composition, especially, when her origins of it were evaluated within their context as mediocre? We can see, if we imagine this hidden influence, that Stein’s radical composition of the early 20th century was far more connected than has been understood to her assimilation and rejection of the academic writing of her Radcliffe years, to the stylistic restrictions and categories of Hill and Wendell, but also to her attentiveness to the scientific underpinnings of this new form of teaching writing, and the pedagogies of Daily Themes that taught her to value observation, description, narrative, and the units of language. This confluence needs to be included in the history of Stein’s decision to pick up her pen again after her departure from academe, after the study of science officially ended, to pursue writing without the constraints of the writing classroom.
Gertrude Stein’s Daily Themes in English 22 – Manuscripts and Transcriptions

In the final section of this chapter, I provide a general description of the manuscript themes, a few notes on the archive, and the story of my own introduction to them, to give a sense of how Stein preserved her themes for posterity, how scholars have accessed and used those themes, and how my own scholarly contribution can shape future research on them. The story of my initial research into them serves as immediate background to my new edition of the themes as transcribed and annotated in Appendix A of this dissertation.

General Description of the Manuscript Archive

Gertrude Stein’s Daily Themes from English 22 in 1894-95 are held at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library in the Yale Catalogue of American Literature, YCAL MSS 76, Box 10, Folders 238 & 239. They are identified in the catalogue as “Daily Themes for English 22 at Radcliffe.” The 47 themes Stein saved are archived as follows:

Folder 238: 26 pages, double-sided
Folder 239: 42 pages, double-sided

Stein’s daily themes are loose-leaf, lined, paper on which she wrote, double-sided, always in black pen, cursive writing. She dates each one on the top right hand corner with the following information, sometimes in a different order, and sometimes missing the theme number:

English 22
Gertrude Stein Special
October 10, 1894
Theme I

When there is an extended final comment, it is written on the title page, beneath and beside Stein’s header. She numbers the pages in the upper right-hand corner for each theme. She uses the vertical red line on the left hand margin as the edge of her essays. She pays attention
to paragraph indentation, clearly marking where one paragraph ends and the next begins. Her professor marks usually in some form of red pen, now faded to pink. The first semester of writing [box 238] is subject to much more editing and commenting than the second semester.

**Introduction to Brazier Transcription**

Having completed the historical narrative I’ve found so essential to understanding the context of Gertrude Stein’s Daily Themes in English 22, and her preservation of them, I conclude with the story of my own introduction to them by way of a Mellon Summer Research Grant through my department. I devoted my first week of research in 2006 to creating a catalogue of Gertrude Stein’s Daily Themes in English 22 by date, theme number, title, description of instructor signature, and full text of instructor end comment when provided. The purpose of this catalogue was to see at a glance Stein’s entire year in English 22 as preserved in the extant themes. I have included this catalogue table in the appendices.

The completed catalogue revealed several vital pieces of information for my broader research:

- The Beinecke archives of Stein’s Daily Themes are incomplete: either Stein did not complete all of the assignments, or, more likely, given her numbering of themes, she did not choose to save all of them.\(^\text{105}\)

- Very few of the instructor comments are initialed; most are anonymous. By scrutinizing ink types and individual scripts visible on the manuscripts, and compiling idiosyncratic handwriting and vocabulary, I determined that William Vaughn Moody graded most of Stein’s work throughout the year. This observation corrects Rosalind Miller’s claim (1949) that many different instructors graded these essays. In fact, there were only three instructors according to curriculum records at Harvard University Archives, and William Vaughn Moody appears to be Stein’s primary contact. This finding was important to my research because it established a ‘writing relationship’ between teacher and student throughout the academic year.

\(^{105}\) This observation prompted me to prioritize my research trip to the Harvard University Archives to look at the English 22 Daily Themes of Melville E. Stone, one of Stein’s peers in English 22 in 1894-1895. His full set of themes confirmed my hypothesis about Stein’s incomplete set.
• Including the full text of every end comment in this catalogue allowed me to observe at a glance the development of this writing relationship: what kinds of suggestions Stein was receiving from Moody at different times of the academic year; the balance between formal and content-related comments; the balance of praise and critique; and the relationship between one end comment and Stein’s attack in the following theme. With these cumulative observations, we can begin to determine how much effect these teacher comments had on Stein’s writing: her choices of thematic content, her control of grammar, her progress from theme to theme, her revisions, or lack thereof.

In sum, this catalogue drawn directly from the manuscripts allowed me to construct a theory of the teaching of writing over this year-long course, and the consequences of that pedagogy on Stein’s development as a student writer. Moody was a close-reader with whom Stein had direct and extended contact; my analysis suggests that this contact was not productive for Stein in a way that academe validates, even in the context of a course such as Daily Themes, where formal expectations were somewhat flexible. Because of this flexibility, each theme can be read as a point of departure for Stein’s early thinking and practice with writing. But these Daily Themes were also a response to, and consequence of, the pedagogy employed in English 22. This catalogue and my subsequent work at Harvard’s Archives and Yale’s Beinecke Library opened up my study on the impact of that pedagogy on Stein’s writing, which resulted in chapter 3 of this dissertation.

My intense research with the manuscript themes also revealed that they had not been exported from the library and into scholarly treatments with integrity. They had become, in scholarly contexts, something other than what Stein left us, as I will explore in chapter 4. Fundamental to this problem in their handling by Steinian biographers and critics, is that they had become, within scholarship, identified with the transcription that first made them public, a monograph by Rosalind Miller, published in 1949, in which Stein’s Daily Themes are called the “Radcliffe Manuscripts.” I discovered very quickly working in tandem with both
Stein’s manuscripts and Miller’s transcription, that this print source which had singularly served scholars since the mid-20th century is corrupted with serious transcription and publishing errors that had gone unnoticed. My dissertation offers a corrected transcription of the themes in Appendix A, and offers the digitized manuscripts in another appendix, so that scholars can work in tandem with the manuscripts and my transcription as I did with the original manuscripts at Beinecke and Rosalind Miller’s treatment of them.

Secondly, my transcription, which represents with color-coding both Stein’s writing and her professor’s comments as they appear visually in the originals, allows us to read the themes more clearly and easily in their educational context, in a way that Miller’s transcription with its system of symbols, endnotes, and key could not.

Finally, these themes “became” the “Radcliffe Manuscripts” first and foremost as a result of Rosalind Miller’s context. The Yale Catalogue, indeed, calls them “Daily Themes for English 22 at Radcliffe.” I would like very much for us to return to thinking of them as “daily themes.” I introduce them here in their new environment, as an archive of manuscripts, yes, but primarily as an archive of student themes.

Why scholars had not noticed the errors within the Miller transcription in their research on Stein’s undergraduate writing deserves further consideration. It suggests first of all, relative disinterest in her juvenilia, surprising given her stature as a modernist; not that scholars have ignored the student writing. Stein’s Daily Themes from English 22 have served as autobiographical fodder since the 1950s, the decade after they were first published by Miller, part of the reception history I explore in the next chapter. The critical interest has focused far more on the autobiographical content than on the textual form of the writing. There is uneasiness amongst scholars about the utility of examining Stein’s student work for
the insight it provides into her adult writing, or as a place of origin for her writing life.

Scholars have looked to Stein’s juvenilia for the story it can tell about the writer, but not for the writing itself. How these scholars have read Gertrude Stein’s undergraduate writing has largely determined where we begin her writing life. The power of their autobiographical optic, their lack of context which my third chapter now provides, and the role of reading these student themes in the “making” of Gertrude Stein, are the concerns of my next chapter.
Chapter 4 – Reading Gertrude Stein Reading

Introduction: Reading the Radcliffe Manuscripts, Writing Gertrude Stein

As I have shown in the previous chapter, Gertrude Stein’s daily themes are a product of a late 19th-century women’s composition classroom, where there existed a tension between the observational, descriptive writing of the standard Harvard English 22 course, and the modeling of authors and texts in the curriculum of the Radcliffe English 22 course. They are also the product of a Special Student who would later – much later – declare herself a genius; a product of Stein before she declared an intention to be a writer, despite having picked up her pen in a writing course. By laying out these contexts for her themes, I am able to look at the nexus between consumption (reading) and production (writing) of texts; to show Stein’s early development as a writer through her handling of textual engagement; and finally, to make the case that we understand Stein the student and the writer far more through her handling of these texts than through the autobiographical gleaning of these themes for information about her collegiate life.

These themes are a body of work selectively preserved by Stein, an archive determined by her own preservation, choosing some themes for us to read, and eliminating others. They need to be read as an archive, only part of their original context, but complete as Stein intended them for posterity. Without proper historical context, the reading of any archive can only be an overlay of the reader’s expectations, assumptions, and argument. This has been the case in nearly every treatment of Stein’s undergraduate themes until this dissertation, where we finally have substantial background to the themes – not just Stein’s social life or her interest in William James and psychology – but of the course in which they were written and the context of writing composition in the 1890s,
specifically for the women at Radcliffe college rather than the men of Harvard, and specifically for the female Special Student. These themes have been appropriated by readers since their publication in 1949 to shed light on Stein’s life without proper reading of the history and educational context that produced them.

As a result of this appropriation, these themes have largely been *misread* rather than *read*, for they have been addressed primarily by literary scholars of Stein, not those familiar or, quite frankly, invested in the history of American writing composition. They have peered backwards at Gertrude Stein’s student themes through the lens of the adult Stein. And yet, their misreading has been predicated, interestingly, on a divide within composition studies itself which expresses itself in a fundamental bias for one of two kinds of writing: between expressive writing and textually engaged writing, between the personal essay or the expository essay, at its broadest distinction, between creative writing and academic writing. Given the hybridized structure of Radcliffe’s English 22 course, Stein’s themes were produced out of this tension between self-expression and textual engagement. As a result, they also raise the question of how to read these themes: to what extent are they personal expressions of Stein’s lived experience in college, and to what the first drafts of a writing career emergent out of the texture of 19th century fiction?

At this point in her education, Stein does not write like a writer who reads critically. She uses her descriptions of what has been written about in texts, and her descriptions of her experience of reading these texts to generate her writing. To show the beginning relationship between Stein’s reading and her writing, I focus in this chapter on her first daily theme, “In the Red Deeps.” I use this theme to demonstrate Stein’s early struggle to move between the consumption of text and the production of texts – the move
between reading and writing. As an apprentice-writer in English 22, her first model is George Eliot, and her second model is herself reading George Eliot. Gertrude Stein’s dilemma – and that of all her female colleagues in English 22 – is that she is in a creative writing course in which she is told to work from models of reading. The women – not the men – of English 22 were required to balance self-expression with textual modeling; personal writing with textual engagement. English 22, for Stein and her female colleagues, was an exercise in finding her own way through other’s words, and it took the full year for Stein to figure out this balance.

In the first sections of this chapter, I propose what these daily themes show us about the relationship for Stein between reading and writing, and show her experience of moving from being a reader to becoming a writer. In the following sections, I show what has happened to that relationship in the hands of critics. I continue the reading of Stein’s archive by reading the critical reception history of these themes – the treatment of these themes from first reader to first publisher to late 20th century criticism – and in so doing expose the power of self-interest in the study of these themes as texts, indeed, in the self-interest of all writers’ textual manipulation, even of Gertrude Stein’s as a student. In order to provide this discussion of how different readers are implicated, we must look at Gertrude Stein’s use of text, we must look at her readers’ use of her text, and we must consider the intentions of all of them as writers.

“Under the Influence”: Gertrude Stein “In the Red Deeps”

I wrote a little story about that when I went to Radcliffe and being still under the influence of George Eliot I called it the Red Deeps.
- Gertrude Stein, Everybody’s Autobiography, 157
In her childish days Maggie held this place, called the Red Deeps, in very great awe, and needed all her confidence in Tom’s bravery to reconcile her to an excursion thither,—visions of robbers and fierce animals haunting every hollow. But now it had the charm for her which any broken ground, any mimic rock and ravine, have for the eyes that rest habitually on the level […] In this June time, too, the dog-roses were in their glory, and that was an additional reason why Maggie should direct her walk to the Red Deeps, rather than to any other spot, on the first day she was free to wander at her will,—a pleasure she loved so well, that sometimes, in her ardors of renunciation, she thought she ought to deny herself the frequent indulgence in it.


The influence of Stein’s reading of George Eliot on Stein’s writing in the daily themes cannot be over-estimated, not only in this first theme, but throughout the yearlong course. Stein’s two central concerns expressed throughout these themes, by my read – sympathy and struggle – are borrowed almost wholesale from Eliot, and transcribed upon Stein’s own experiences as a young woman at Radcliffe. In Eliot’s writing Stein found someone who had given narrative examples for her own life, and thematic vocabulary to describe them. She borrowed from these liberally throughout her semester of Daily Themes, the ideals of “human sympathy” in Eliotic terms and “struggle” creating a through-line for the semester. In many ways, Eliot is a key to understanding Stein’s early approach to writing in this course; and while most influences on Stein are not actually identifiable in her style of writing, the influence of ideas is very clear. It is true that nobody would confuse the adult writing of Stein and Eliot, so this statement should not be surprising. What is surprising, however, is how thoroughly Stein the student floated on the texts of authors whose style retained none of its power in her own prose, even as she herself claimed to be under that influence.

Stein’s first theme, “In the Red Deeps” is an apprentice piece “under the influence of Eliot” but not successful stylistically. If we recognized Eliot’s style in Stein’s writing,
we would naturally claim apprenticeship through imitation, a well-worn strategy in
composition classes.1 But Stein’s use of Eliot suggests a different kind of apprenticeship,
one based upon ideas rather than style. To engage in an expansion of the ideas of an
author, to create an extension of those ideas in another context is the mark of someone
whose apprenticeship is less about the writing itself and more about the reading. This is
important because we are discussing the beginnings of a writer whose reading
background was very deep and traditional, and whose student prose is startlingly
disconnected from the stylistic marks of a well-read apprentice writer: that is, stylistic
imitation of her reading sources. I could argue that this demonstrates Stein’s superior
stylistic control, the development of a sense of her own “style” even as a young writer,
but I will not, because I do not see evidence of that in the actual prose. Told by her
professors to read literary models, Stein chose George Eliot. Let’s call her an accidental
stylist, the poverty of whose stylistic imitation ultimately may have lead to a style of her
own, but not in any direct line.

Why was Stein “under the influence” of George Eliot? What about this author and
her novel in particular created the kind of screen upon which Stein, the Annex Girl, could
project her own experiences or fantasies? We can trace through the novel the elements
that correspond with Stein’s own background, the elements that Stein would identify
with, and which would most likely become fodder for her own writing – thus explaining
why Eliot, of all authors, would be the one Stein fixes on in this first theme. In doing so,
we are drawing a parallel between the young Stein and the heroine she has chosen to

---

1 See Bartholomae’s essay, “Living in Style,” in which he takes Stein as a model in his expository writing
classes. Imitation is supposed to open up a student’s eyes to possibility in writing. Stein, Bartholomae argues,
quoting from the students in his classes, does so in a way that is “‘very exciting, and productive,
and annoying’” (Writing on the Margins, 7). I address Bartholomae’s essay at length in my Conclusion.
identify with, even if obliquely, asserting still as strongly in this literary approach that we resist the idea that one writer – Eliot – produces fiction about Maggie Tulliver, and the other writer – Stein – produces fact about Gertrude Stein. This exercise in literary analysis is only useful, or accurate, if we understand both to be characters from a particular moment, and for particular ends. That is to say, if we find similarities between the protagonist of *Mill on the Floss*, and her imitator, Stein, we are creating a story as well. If we do not acknowledge this, we create a fiction about the young Stein that tries to pass as biography.

In order to see how thoroughly Stein has inserted herself in place of Eliot’s characters, let’s look more closely at the original “In the Red Deeps” written by Eliot. Here, the feelings of the Eliotic heroine resonate with what Stein has written in her first theme: heroine Maggie Tulliver experiences “a sense of opposing elements, of which a fierce collision is imminent.”² The “Red Deeps” is a rocky area of woods near Maggie Tulliver’s house, and it is here “in the Red Deeps” that she meets with former suitor, Philip Wakem. At this point in the novel, she has matured because of her decision to pursue a life of asceticism, self-deprivation, and to put others’ happiness before her own. It’s the struggle of late adolescence, and becoming a woman – the struggle of maturity, from childhood to adult – resonant for Stein in the context of academe – where she was leaving behind her childhood, and yet did not demonstrate any living sense of identification with women – there were no female mentors for her at Harvard-Radcliffe at that time and female family and friends, even fellow Radcliffe students, discouraged her

from pursuing academe. Given Eliot’s characterization of women at that time, the duty to family, the sense that they have no will of their own, and that their destiny is made for them, not by them, Eliot’s novel described a life and a future that Stein would both identify with and want to reject.

It’s not surprising that a year into her Radcliffe education, Stein should feel a kinship with both the author and the heroine of this novel. Like Maggie Tulliver, her father had died, and she found herself leaving her home for more opportunity. Stein at that point would also have felt that her own intelligence and emotional capacity were far greater than that of her family, excepting her older brother, Leo, whom she idolized, another similarity with the heroine of the novel, as well as George Eliot herself. These qualities she also shared with Maggie: devotion to her brother, expectation of marriage – if not necessarily by Stein herself, than by her cohort for her – that would define who she could be, a search in vain for sympathy, and a sense of melodramatic fate; feelings that men in general were disappointments; and finally, the family concerns with money. Like her chosen prototype, Maggie Tulliver, Stein rejects the details of the outer world for her own rich inner one. There is some of the impetuous child in the persona she is writing –

---

3 Margaret Sterling Snyder was an 1895 graduate of Radcliffe and friend of Stein’s. In a letter dated April, 1896 (Stein’s junior year at Radcliffe), she discouraged Stein from her plan to attend Johns Hopkins: “Will it do you one bit of good as a deterrent if I tell you . . . that I now see I was one of the most deluded and pitiable of all these many young women who are aspiring after what is beyond them in our own day . . . I will say in a word that a sheltered life, domestic tastes, maternity, and faith are all I could ask for myself or you or the great mass of womankind . . . Of course everybody wants you to be useful. I frankly tell you Gertrude I doubt your fitness for what you propose. I could give you detailed reasons from what I know of your temperament and tastes and what I know of myself. It is not my purpose or place to do so. If you go through happily I shall rejoice of course. If you chose a less ambitious way to be useful I should think you more prudent” (Gallup, *The Flowers of Friendship*, 8). Stein’s sister-in-law, Sally, also encouraged Gertrude to pursue motherhood rather than academe: “There certainly is nothing in the line of happiness to compare with that which a mother derives from the contemplation of her first-born and even the agony which she endures from the moment of its birth does not seem to mar it, therefore my dear and beloved sister in law go and get married, for there is nothing in this whole wide world like babies – Leo [Stein, Gertrude’s brother] to the contrary, notwithstanding” (Gallup, *The Flowers of Friendship*, 14).

4 These financial concerns show up in Stein’s story “Only a Question of Rent” about a family quarrel between her character’s father and uncle; in fact, many of these concerns figure in Stein’s daily themes.
an imitation of Eliot’s character, translated through Steinian experience. Even the playing out of self-abnegation over self-love is an Eliotic flourish that appeals to the young Stein, and finds its way into her strongest assertions of independence. But how much can we really claim these as assertions of independence when they are based almost entirely on her reading, and recycled as an imitation? These early declarations of self-hood and uniqueness in this theme are not truly independent. They are based upon Eliot’s text, lifted from text, and translated through text.

Stein announces her engagement with reading in the title of her essay, “In the Red Deeps,” borrowed from the title of Chapter 1, Book V of George Eliot’s *Mill on the Floss*. And yet, neither Eliot’s name, nor that of her central character, Maggie Tulliver, appears anywhere in the body of Stein’s essay. Instead, the five-paragraph theme is a pot pourri of reading and theater references that Stein uses to translate her own experience of being “in the red deeps.” Structurally for Stein, Eliot’s idea of being “in the deeps” frames the theme, and each of the other sources serves to punctuate Stein’s description of life experience through a literary example and to enhance her narrative of self:

P1: rejects outer for inner world (Eliot influenced)
P2: moves from inner world to physical experience of pain/pleasure (Eliot influenced)
P3: moves to inflicting pain on others (examples: Richard III, Gessler)
P4: horror of being forced to inflict pain on others (Jekyll/Hyde – Mansfield)
P5: reading-induced imaginary horror episode, forced to stop writing (Eliot/Shelley)

The arc of the theme shows Stein’s own interpretation of what being “in the red deeps” means in the context of her own experience. Rather than offering a reading of Eliot, then, Stein uses Eliot’s context in this first theme to offer a reading of herself. That she uses fiction to do so reflects the course focus on literary example, but should also give us pause about reading Stein’s experiences transparently. To say she offers a reading of

---

herself does not mean that the reading is any less fictionalized than the texts upon which she bases it. She offers her reading by referencing widely and without focus, creating disjointed flashpoints between self-expressive and textually engaged writing, what we might also call, using Stein’s terms, a conflict between the inner and outer world.

The first two paragraphs set up her ‘problem’ – the conflict between inner world and outer world, borrowed from Mill on the Floss – and demonstrate her response, which is melodramatic and shockingly masochistic:

The (more or less) common-place incidents of the outer world are well enough for those (poor, unfortunate) whom nature has given no inner one. As for me who have lived in my short life all the intensest pains and pleasures that human nature is capable of experiencing, I disdain to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details.

My mind from childhood was one which constantly fed on itself. I would seize every possible excuse to be alone so that I might dream, might lose myself in intense emotions by the side of which all else paled into insignificance. How I loved even the cold piercing air that made my flesh quiver and tingle, and the delight of crouching down behind some shelter to feel the returning warmth and

---

6 All references to Stein’s daily themes or comments by English 22 instructors are snapshots from Brazier edition of the themes in Appendix A. See Appendix for full explanation of editorial markings and for annotations corresponding to internal footnotes. Brief explanation of colored inks: the red ink represents the instructors’ edits, marginal and end comments; the green ink represents Stein’s edits, either before or after the themes were submitted for evaluation; blue ink represents Stein’s edits at a later time, after the conclusion of the course.
Stein opens up her writing in one area – described by her as an “inner one” – by rejecting writing in another area – described by her as the “outer world.” This was first and foremost a strategy to assert control over her writing by turning to the only subject in which she was an expert at that time, one over which nobody else could claim authority regardless of their credentials: herself. In other words, Stein was inclined towards self-expression, though she validated that expression with the texts she read. These opening paragraphs are consumed with a narrative of self and sensuous experience, such that “all else paled into insignificance,” including, one might observe, George Eliot. While Eliot is useful for Stein as a sounding board, she is not useful to Stein as an open reference; her purpose is to provide the weather, so to speak, so that Stein may introduce her own tale into the climate. Stein’s description of her childhood bears little real resemblance to what Eliot has provided in *The Mill on the Floss*. This effort cannot be described, then, as an imitation of Eliot, certainly not stylistically, nor even as a resonance with the content of the text.

And yet, she is clearly in some kind of dialogue with her texts. We could also say quite reasonably that she was in dialogue with her professor, but I prefer to think of it as a

---

7 This is Stein’s term from her own reading of this theme later in life. See the section “Reading Bridgman Reading Stein” in this chapter for context.
performance. The final sentence of paragraph one is Stein throwing down the gauntlet to her professor: I will not write description; I will not write of the “outer world.” The heightened drama of the prose that follows carries the weight of proving to her professor that her rejection is justified. Consider the chutzpah, the impertinence, of this writer in her debut performance in English 22. The opening suggests that Stein feels some compunction to describe an experience she has had of the “outer world.” Instead, Stein expresses disdain for the “common-place incidents of the outer world” and pity for the “poor unfortunates” who take an interest in them. In their place, she expresses a keen interest in human nature, especially her own, which she regards as capable of representing all the “pains and pleasures that human nature is capable of experiencing.” So she begins her semester by refusing to describe the outer world, insulting the people whose experience of the outer world she finds lacking, dismissing the “paltry details” that she associates with the outer world rather than the “inner one,” and finally, proposing that her own rich inner life justifies her total self-absorption. Her first strokes, by this reading, are part manifesto, part melodrama, all attitude. In particular, her “disdain to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details” announces a resistance to conform to some pre-conceived notion of what her writing should be.

But for the borrowed title, Stein’s claims in “In the Red Deeps” would appear to be the strongest assertions of individuality. Given the signal of Maggie Tulliver and George Eliot behind the assertions, they appear much meeker, less individualistic, downright derivative. To return to the Eliotic epigraph that began this section, we can observe that “on the first day she was free to wander at her will,” Stein chose to wander
“In the Red Deeps,” that is, to walk in the footsteps of Eliot. The possibility of choice open to her in this elective Daily Themes course allowed her to chart her own path entirely or to use the blueprint of a great author, as she might wish. In this sense, then, Stein was indeed, as Hugo Munsterberg wrote, “the ideal student, just as a female student ought to be:” when faced with both a model of writing and freedom in how to respond, she had the sense to turn to a model that was already proven.

Following her adolescent reclamation of “outer” and “inner” worlds from Eliot in the first two paragraphs, Stein then introduces a new literary, historical or dramatic example in each paragraph: following the reference to Eliot’s *Mill on the Floss*, she turns in rapid succession to the tragic historical figures of Richard III and Gessler, R.L. Stevenson’s *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, ending dramatically with P.B. Shelley’s *The Cenci*. Read with attention to Stein’s references, the full theme is a disorganized survey of a few of the greatest hits of English literature, drama, and history. The sheer name-dropping in this first theme indicates one aspect of Stein’s relationship to text: she prefers breadth over depth. Any of these sources might serve Stein in her first essay, to open up an inquiry into the text itself, or, even into the kind of self-exploration she professes most interesting. Instead, they open up the reading relationship to maneuver

---

8 The bookish reliance in “In the Red Deeps” would give way to the next stage of her writing life in English 22: when the models are replaced by wanderings of her own, and that will only happen when her inner life as defined by books is replaced by an inner life defined by her experience, and by an engagement with books as external to that experience; in other words, when books become part of the outer world rather than extensions of the inner one.

9 Letter from Harvard Psychology Professor Hugo Münsterberg to Gertrude Stein, dated June 10th, 1895, reprinted in Donald Gallup, *The Flowers of Friendship*, 4. Interestingly enough, Münsterberg in this letter expressed gratitude for another kind of modeling Stein had done in Cambridge, and that is far more well-known in her biographies. She had done brain-model work in Münsterberg’s lab for which he was grateful. Here is the relevant context in this letter: “…I thank you above all for that model-work you have done in the laboratory and the other courses wherever I met you. My contact with Radcliffe was in every way a most charming part of my Cambridge experiences. But while I met there all types and kinds of students, you were to me the ideal student, just as a female student out to be, and if in later years you look into printed discussions which I have in mind to publish about students in America, I hope you will then pardon me if you recognize some features of my ideal student picture as your own.”
the texts into some purpose that serves only Stein in her relationship with her professor: they establish the breadth of her cultural and reading knowledge of literature and history, they project forward all the resonance that literature and history can provide, an attempt at extending the self-importance in this short theme into a full-blown late 19th-century aesthetic commentary that Stein’s melodramatic vernacular attempts, but fails to achieve.

In the third paragraph, Stein brings in her first direct citation within the theme, dropping the names of two figures from 15th century European history, turning from the subject of masochism to sadism, and from the physical to the mental world. These contexts, according to the theme itself, are still used to process her own experiences as a child. The telescoping from historical sources back to her own experiences is quite jarring, not to mention how melodramatic is her continued exploration of suffering. The result is a performance of her “self” through the dramas she had read:

As in the physical so in the mental world did I revel in the joy of suffering. I was never content to rest with the cruelties that Richards the Thirds and Gesslers could invent, but while dreaming over their torture, I would invent others even worse and enjoy inflicting them. Thus I came to feel keenly every possible delight to be found in the sufferings of others.

Here, Stein claims to outdo the historical torturers at their own game. It is worth noting at this moment in the theme that her instructor questions the actuality of this occurrence by writing “Actually?” in the margin. He is not convinced this is a real episode, but he takes
her description of it seriously enough to engage rather than dismiss the content. But even this is a mere set-up for the transformation which follows in the next paragraph. None of these paragraphs is particularly developed, none even when referencing an historical character actually explains the relationship between what Stein has read and what she experiences – the history and reading exist merely for Stein to set a stage for her performance, and that performance is framed around processing a morbid fascination with pleasure and pain, on the one hand, and suffering and sympathy on the other. From start to finish, her use of texts in this theme is internally directed; they exist only for her to produce writing about herself which demonstrates her sympathy with the texts.

The main moment of growth, the one “turn” if we can call it that, occurs between paragraphs 3 and 4 where Stein describes an “unconscious” move from her previously sadistic delight in “the pains of others” to a “horror of being possibly forced to inflict them.” These new feelings, according to Stein’s narrative in this theme, happened without her choosing, and at the same time, she writes, “with this came a terrible and haunting fear of loss of self-control and consequent indulgence in those enormities I once dreamed of with so much delight.” So she is now afraid, for unaccountable reasons, that her imagination will prompt her to act beyond what she wants to do. This, she says is confirmed when she sees Mansfield play Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.10 In this sense, the literary-dramatic references serve as confirmation of fears she already held, fears that pre-date her re-experiencing of them in a cultural or academic setting. She suggests that they mirror her experience, and most importantly, that despite being written down and then acted, they are actually inexpressible:

---

10 Note, yet another reference to demonstrate her cultural knowledge, and a touchstone for what she claims as a previous experience to the play itself.
Stein’s fears are so profound, she writes, that they cannot be expressed in writing: “No pen can describe the torments I endured during the nights that followed.” As soon as making that statement, though, she describes the traumatic response she had to this theatrical experience. In this paragraph, too, she gives another disturbed example, of
knocking her head against a wall, as if to convince her teacher that her feelings are authentic, her sympathies complete with Stevenson’s novella. We can see in this ramped-up paragraph Stein the reader confronting Stein the writer; just as she invests in the height of melodrama, she sees a conflict with the expression of experience.

The final paragraph turns directly to the role that reading plays in the young Stein’s experience. If the previous paragraphs show a young reader totally subsuming her texts within her own experience, then the final paragraph shows the opposite: of a young reader subsumed by the text she is reading, Shelley’s *The Cenci*:

One night I was alone down-stairs reading a practice

I loved to read in spite of the fact that often when thus engaged there came suddenly into my consciousness (without my being able to explain why) a sudden fear of something unknown, intangible, that seemed to be around me everywhere. This night it was the Cenci of Shelly, that I was reading. I went on and on until I came to the passage where Beatrice having just left her father returns to her mother and brother fear, horror, almost madness in her face; I dropped the book, for before my eyes, shrinking toward the wall was the veritable Beatrice in her flowing white robes. This was truly the most horrid of the deeps. Oh her beautiful face! I can never
This concluding paragraph introduces a connection between love of reading and fear of the unknown. Stein then dramatizes this connection through her description of reading *The Cenci*.\(^1\) As she tells it in the theme, the suggestion of incest (Beatrice returning from her father to her mother and brother) breaks into Stein’s consciousness and takes over her present reality; at this point, Stein obliquely references George Eliot with her claim, “This was truly the most horrid of the deeps,” recontextualizing the reference, stripping it from any connection it may have initially had with Eliot. Stein uses Eliot’s term to explain her own break-down, her inability to read the Shelley text, her inability even to write about the experience. But instead of creating literary resonance, or re-contextualizing and creating distance from the horrific reading experience, she claims to re-experience those original feelings in her re-writing of them. So powerful, she writes, was that first experience of reading that she recreates it again in the process of writing about it – she is overcome by the writing of her own imagination, which had prevented

---

\(^1\) *The Cenci* was quite scandalous in its day. “Trelawny records Shelley’s last, and most condensed judgment: ‘In writing *The Cenci* my object was to see how I could succeed in describing passions I have never felt, and to tell the most dreadful story in pure and refined language. The image of Beatrice haunted me after seeing her portrait. The story is well authenticated, and the details far more horrible than I have painted them. *The Cenci* is a work of art; it is not colored by my feelings nor obscured by my metaphysics. I don't think much of it. It gave me less trouble than anything I have written of the same length’” http://www.bartleby.com/139/shel1170.html. It is quite possible that Stein knew about Shelley’s motivation as recorded here, to describe “passions [he] had never felt,” and that Stein is doing something similar in this theme. If not describing passions she hadn’t felt, then perhaps describing them beyond what she had felt.
her from continuing to read the book in the first place when she had dropped it and conjured up the vision of Beatrice.

Harkening back to her opening paragraph of this theme, Stein’s bizarre reaction to *The Cenci* is offered as proof that her “inner life” is so rich that she cannot contain it inside of her. It actually takes over her writing, the expression of this powerful inner self. Her experience of reading becomes a narrative of her complete immersion in Shelley’s text; secondly, the effects of this immersion on her writing produce melodrama, an overblown attempt at sincere imitation; and finally, it produces a desire to portray the effects the reading has on her to her own audience, but she gets carried away by her own description of her inner state, so much that she *stages* an end to her ability to write about it. This is a reader who is not separated from the text she reads, and doesn’t appear to want to be. She uses them to filter through her own experience, but in so doing, she loses the distinction of original text, and reads her own life through the books. Where she might have used the writing to reflect and re-contextualize the experience on more objective terms, she doesn’t. Instead she uses the traumatic re-enactment as a pretext to conclude the theme, dramatically describing the apparition she had conjured up at the time, and is conjuring up yet again in the re-telling.¹²

The first point here is that reading, which is framed here to produce writing, instead produces fear and inability to write. What has happened to Eliot? “The most horrid of the deeps” – the assignation spot for lovers – becomes an apparition of a victim of incest, whose “beautiful face” gazes on the fearful Stein. But how far we’ve gotten from the expectations set up by the Eliotic title! We have entered by paragraph 4 an

¹² Stein could also be imitating the performative element of the dramatic poem by Shelley, as described in the previous footnote.
entirely different genre of writing, that of Gothic novel, and by paragraph V, the text referenced is the unstageable verse-drama tragedy by Shelley. So where does “reading” fit into Stein’s distinction between the “outer world” and the “inner world”? Reading starts, I believe, as the outer world – and becomes the inner world – as Stein induces herself to be overtaken by the reading. She stages this as fear: “enough! enough! I cannot tell you more. I fear it, I fear it still.” When the outer world becomes the inner world, her own self-hood is both validated and threatened, and she must cut off the connection made in both reading and writing.

Stein herself has begun the semester of writing with a story about reading – her own reading – and has externalized that reading practice in a gothic tale in which she spooks herself, in an attempt to externalize the bits of her inner mind: her reading of Eliot and Shelley, on the one hand, and her own fears and morbidity, which Eliot and Shelley help her to frame into a written scene, a performance guaranteed to exemplify her claims to have “lived in [her] short life all the intensest pains and pleasures that human nature is capable of experiencing.” By merging herself with the characters in her books – by taking on their own trials, foibles, evils, and making them hers, by admitting to being overtaken by the lives of the characters to the point of being unable to separate their lives from her own, she has taken to an extreme the balancing act between self-expression and text, turning both into a performance where she is writer, director, and actor of her own version of Eliot’s “red deeps.”
A Word About First Person Point of View

First person is very important early in the semester for Stein because it allows her to write from a position of authority that no other point of view can. In the genre of student themes, it is also the most transparent position from which she could choose to write. But it is complicated for her readers, especially those who are reading her work outside of the context of English 22, because it invites equating the story told with the reality of the writer, whether or not what is written is actually true. It openly invites reading autobiographically. More important, it collapses any distance a writer might create between the subject matter of the theme and the experience of the author. The first-person point of view is especially useful in collapsing the writer into the texts because it does not maintain any pretense of objectivity. Stein is living through her reading and that is manifest in the themes because of the first person point of view. Writer and textual figures merge in each example that Stein chooses in this first theme. And this, I argue, is supposed to give the theme resonance and credibility – without removing the real focus from the experiences she describes.

We can see this merge operating because none of the texts she has chosen are the actual subjects of her essay. They serve only to open up the experiences of the “I” who interprets them. The reading that she references serves to validate the overblown experiences she says she had as a child. They validate them by showing how they are both examples of the kinds of fears she may have had, but also to show how she was responding to the reading – a demonstration of her literacy, her ability to see in her inner life the subjects of history and literature.
This first-person point of view has been the primary source, I think, for mining these themes for personal references and background, in essence the first person as instigator of this autobiographical reading, and also, as I will argue later in this chapter, as the protector of Stein’s adult writing. To think of these as a young woman’s confessions disconnects them generically from the deliberate writing of the elder Stein; indeed, suggests that as confession they are not deliberate writing at all in the sense of being composed. Looking at this theme, it is easy – too easy – to assume that Stein was simply using her writing in English 22 as a way to work through emotional issues – the “I,” the connections that we can see between Stein’s own life and the life of George Eliot’s Maggie Tulliver, and so on. But while these connections clearly exist, it is a mistake to read Stein’s themes as transparently autobiographical. We may certainly speculate about such connections, maybe even read through them, but when a writer uses the first person, we do not assume, unless specifically directed, that “I” = “author.” And yet, this is what even the most scholarly biographers and critics of Stein have done with these themes – and the first theme in particular – some with more conviction and skill than others, but all assuming that the writer of these themes is writing honestly and openly about her own life experiences, perhaps with some exaggeration for effect. But why? These are themes for a college course, not diary entries, nor are they private journals. They were written for a singular audience whose responsibility was to judge

---

13 I address the most prominent of these critics, Richard Bridgman, in the last section of this chapter. Other critics and biographers who use these themes largely to enhance their stories about Stein’s collegiate life include Mellow, Sutherland, Sprigge, Ruddick, Wineapple. Indeed, all biographers who have addressed Stein’s college life have based some of their reading on Rosalind’s Miller’s transcriptions of Stein’s daily themes, and used the themes to plum Stein’s psychological state and her experience as a college student.  
14 The outpourings of college students in English classes have, sadly, become a periodic national topic as a result of the Columbine and the Virginia Tech shootings. When a tragedy of this sort occurs, we can expect the writings of these students, regardless of context, to be subject to psychological examination and review, not unlike what biographers of Stein have done with her college writing. We examine these student
their merit as writing. They are themselves a performance, an enactment of what Stein believes to be an appropriate submission for a course at Harvard-Radcliffe. William Vaughn Moody, Stein’s first reader, whose response we turn to now, appears to be the only reader in the history of addressing these themes who took this performative “I” with a grain of salt.

**Reading Moody Reading Stein**

Gertrude Stein’s documented writing life began in her composition class, English 22. So also began her lifetime relationship with readers. When reading her daily themes and the comments of her composition instructor, William Vaughn Moody, it’s clear that her road to success as a writer was not going to be easy. In his written response to Stein’s first daily theme Moody was cautious with his praise and blunt with his criticism:

An extraordinary composition. One is puzzled to decide whether it is a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms, or a study from an objective standpoint of a morbid psychologic state. In either case, it has possesses no inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force. It is marred by awkward and unidiomatic uses of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional patches of melodramatic writing which give a jarring effect of bathos. Rewrite.

W.V. Moody.

writings publicly only in retrospect: either when a tragedy occurs, or in the case of Stein, when she becomes famous enough to warrant taking a peek at student work. When taken in these contexts, the reading of student work is already embedded in expectation: the project of looking for seeds of violent behavior, or with Stein, evidence for her idiosyncratic style, or her own psychological stability or instability as a young college woman. Student texts, when examined at all, are always laden with expectation.
Moody’s comment is, historically speaking, the first recorded reader-response to Gertrude Stein’s writing, and an ambivalent opener at best. Moody starts with praise but is also “puzzled” by what Stein has written, it seems, because it does not fit into a generic description he recognizes. This is either “a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms” – confessional or autobiographical writing with a melodramatic flair – or a “study from an objective stand point of a morbid psychological state” – something more akin to gothic narrative. Moody cannot tell which. But because of the mitigating factors of “vividness” and “imaginative force,” it seems, he is willing to venture beyond his own puzzlement to regard this first effort as “an extraordinary composition,” one that, with some generic categorization, would make more sense to its readers.

But this is only half – the more complimentary half – of Moody’s end-comment. The rest of his reading of Stein’s first effort comes down rather hard on the details of refined college writing. The undergraduate Stein cannot control her sentences. She has a problem, according to Moody, with grammar, sentence-construction, vocabulary, punctuation, what I will call in this chapter the “surface” or “form” of the writing; that is, what we see on the page, the actual sentences as they appear. While Moody notices the power of Stein’s thought, he concludes that this extraordinary composition by Stein “is marred by awkward and unidiomatic uses of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional patches of melodramatic writing which give a jarring effect of pathos.” He instructs her to rewrite, presumably, to clean up her sentences so as to bring her “inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force” to its full potential. The surface of her writing is not up to par with the ideas she is trying to express. Or, we might
say that the form of what she has written hampers the intelligibility of what Moody can take away confidently from the prose, what he can understand about her intentions in writing this piece.

We see in Moody’s first assessment of Stein’s composition skills a reflection of some of the values of composition instruction at Harvard-Radcliffe in 1894 (as addressed in the previous chapter): attention to forms of writing, vividness and force of expression, and clarity of sentences. As Stein’s writing instructor, Moody has a particular relationship with Stein, dictated by academe and the expectations of English 22. Stein’s writing and Moody’s response are determined first by the educational context. As the student, she is responding to the expectations and requirements of English 22. As her instructor, he is responding to the writing she presents to him, evaluating it as he has been trained to read, and as the product of this college course. In reading and commenting on this daily theme, Moody is just doing his job. Like any college instructor worth his salt, Moody splits his comment between praise and criticism, dividing his observations along the fault-line between Stein’s identifiable errors on the surface, and the promise he sees in the writing because of the questions it raises for him. This piece is extraordinary because it produces interest and puzzlement, even though it is riddled with errors. Moody’s initial response to Stein’s theme shows us a reading coming out of an authentic context which treats the theme Stein wrote as what it was: student writing. While Moody is, as I have discussed in the previous chapter, a limited reader because of the context that he is reading out of – the late 19th century classroom – that the very limitation allows him, helps him, to read what Stein has written on the page, and to respond to that, and her, in her role as a writer learning to write. This theme, in particular, Moody treats as an opening foray, and so
comments where Stein needs to go next. Moody and Stein occupy the same context; in fact, they are mutually invested in a writer-reader relationship and context which influences what they both write and what they both read. This is not true for any of Stein’s subsequent readers of these themes. As we will see, subsequent readers have shown much more self-interest in reading these themes out of context in order to say something about the later Stein. We will now turn to the first of these readings.

**Under the Influence of Gertrude Stein: Rosalind Miller’s “Radcliffe Manuscripts”**

Rosalind S. Miller published these manuscripts of Stein’s daily themes from English 22 in 1949 within a monograph entitled, *Gertrude Stein: Form and Intelligibility*. This collection comprised one of the first expositions on Stein’s writing following the author’s death in 1946.\(^\text{15}\) Coming so quickly on the heels of the author’s death, one must wonder why Miller chose to focus on her student themes. Miller asserts that her book “is not a scholarly critique for the specialized student;” rather, it is “for the reader who has found Miss Stein’s books difficult and often unintelligible.”\(^\text{16}\) Given Miller’s interest in serving the general reading audience, in opening up some understanding of what the average reader finds difficult and unintelligible, one might have expected her to turn to Stein’s mature works – either those that provoked difficulty, or the one, *Autobiography*, that had been already universally admired as innovative, entertaining and historically

---

\(^{15}\) It also remained, until the publication of this dissertation, the only print source of these themes despite being riddled with editing and publication errors. See Brazier edition of themes in Appendix A. Miller conceived of this project as a graduate student in English at Columbia University, where she received her MA. She would go on to pursue an MSW and become a professor of social work at Columbia, but her early education was all English literature, and appears to have reached its zenith with this publication in 1949. Prior to her graduate work in English and Social Work, Miller received her BA in English at Penn State. She died in August of 2002. There is no notice of *Form and Intelligibility* in her obituary. ([http://query.nytimes.com](http://query.nytimes.com), NY Times paid notice, obituary)

\(^{16}\) Miller, *Form and Intelligibility*, n.p.
relevant. Instead, Miller began with Stein’s student writing, not the usual place when attempting to educate a confused public about a significant author, or to establish a writer’s place in history, or even to show her own chops in a graduate program, to complete a degree.

Miller is one in a long tradition of Stein apologists. Perhaps it was simply that Miller, like me, took an interest in student writing. But the risk – not to the apologist, but to Stein – of focusing on the juvenilia, with such an established critical biography, is not nearly so great now as in 1949, when the literary world was less convinced that Stein was an influential and important writer in her own right. Her place as a writer is secure now. Then, not so. So what do these student themes “do” for Miller – in educating the public and establishing Stein as a writer – that Stein’s mature work couldn’t do in 1949? For one, they could establish Stein’s potential as a writer without the demands of demonstrating the success. William Vaughn Moody was Stein’s first documented reader of these themes; Rosalind Miller was her second. But what they each saw in these themes reflects more than what was visible on the page. What they comment on, what they note, reflects what they valued in their own reading practices. By addressing Stein’s student writing, Miller could appeal to her reading audience to see more than what was there, in effect, to see more than William Vaughn Moody could possibly have seen as Stein’s undergraduate composition instructor; that is, the promise of a modernist giant. In taking this position, however, Miller must still contend with the student writing itself, and with Moody’s commenting, especially the criticism, including his many observations of Stein’s failings. In order to demonstrate the potential for success, Miller must explain the
prevalence of error, the evidence of fundamental mediocrity alongside the lone compliments of vividness and force.

Miller begins with the error, appealing to the “studentness” of the student to argue that Stein, like many a college student, just hadn’t yet learned how to place a comma. She then shifts her reading of Stein’s error onto a critique of the teacher’s reading, blaming the narrow conventions of academe, the overworked conditions of the composition instructor, and suggesting that from her vantage point, there is more here than what the average instructor, with his hundreds of similar themes, could have seen:

At first glance it may be said that these are the themes thousands of college freshmen wrote and are still writing. Much of the subject matter is conventional theme material, and the misspellings, wrong punctuation, improper sentences structure are the usual mistakes corrected by college English instructors in marginal notes. But on closer analysis the material is more significant than the hackneyed, conventional themes which ruin the eyes and enfeeble the mind of the college English teacher.17

Because of the college English teacher’s institutional role, because of the sheer monotony of grading, because of the conventionality of Stein’s themes, and her “mistakes,” Moody could not see what was really there, unable to see the real significance of Stein’s work, which Miller, through analysis and hindsight could see. Moody, Miller argues, was invested in these themes as a teacher, a keeper of good syntax and grammar – a profession that Miller, herself a teacher of college composition, could certainly appreciate – but his role and responsibilities for teaching traditional standard written English hampered his ability to read perceptively. This is quite a different assessment of Moody than that provided by his colleagues, as I conveyed in chapter 3, which suggests that Moody was a cut above his teaching cohort, not the ordinary instructor Miller presents.

17 Miller, Form, 96-97.
Miller indicts the composition classroom for its inherent prejudice, a bias that prevents the instructor from seeing as she can.

Miller’s next critical move is to shift focus away from Stein’s error, away from the surface of her sentences, and onto the substance of them. An unprejudiced reader, argues Miller, one not charged with assessing these themes as Moody did with the bias of English 22 guiding his evaluation, would see something entirely different from the Harvard instructor:

Certainly any unprejudiced reader will recognize (I add my vigorous testimony as a frustrated reader of college themes) that these youthful efforts reveal talent not common among average first-year college students.\(^{18}\) The skill in expression . . . is remarkable. Notice also the perception in her remarks on those who always scream ‘transition’ whenever there is a change in the world or in literary style, her humanitarian sympathies, her literary judgment, her common sense. This is surely not an ordinary freshman!\(^{19}\)

Miller appears to agree with Moody’s assessment of Stein, seeing something of the extraordinary in this student and her writing. And yet, where Moody moves quickly from the “extraordinary” to “puzzlement” and “wretched sentence-structure,” Miller provides a list of examples from these themes meant to demonstrate Stein’s remarkable “skill in expression.” What these divergent approaches begin to show is that the reading of Stein has a lot more to do with the context surrounding the readers than it does with the texts themselves. In short, Miller manipulates the context to raise the potential of Stein beyond the ordinary response of her teacher.

Let’s acknowledge, first, that Miller is not the unprejudiced reader she claims to be. She is invested in establishing Stein’s place in 20\(^{th}\) century literary history. While acknowledging that these themes are much like those written by thousands of freshmen,

\(^{18}\) NB: Gertrude Stein was a sophomore when she wrote these themes.

\(^{19}\) Miller, *Form*, 106; NB: Miller also sees “humanitarian sympathies” as a common theme in this archive.
Miller suggests that the material “is more significant than the hackneyed, conventional themes which ruin the eyes and enfeeble the mind of the college English teacher.”\textsuperscript{20} And yet she acknowledges the ubiquity of professorial corrections on Stein’s papers that exhibit what Richard Bridgman later calls “cultural debris” and “mechanical errors of the grossest sort.”\textsuperscript{21} Having chosen as her subject matter for this project student themes, Miller’s first challenge was to acknowledge, refute, or re-direct the more negative comments of Stein’s first-year teacher of composition, and her second challenge was to clarify the differences between what Moody chose to praise and critique in these themes, and what she would. That is, she acknowledged what Moody marked as error, but qualified her reading based upon her knowledge of the later Stein, a move that solved one problem, but created another, far more complex:

But yet when the instructor writes in the margin that Gertrude Stein does not know how to punctuate or is not making herself clear, it should be remembered that these are \textit{typical} remarks to be found on any corrected freshman theme. These errors are not to be confused with Miss Stein’s later stylistic ventures. And if we, with the advantage of hindsight, are able to see more virtue in the themes than the teachers who corrected them we should remember that we know the later Gertrude Stein.\textsuperscript{22}

For Miller, there is anxiety about the error in these themes, and about Moody’s reading of them. She says she does not want us to be confused by what we read, knowing the later Gertrude Stein. But why should we be confused about the error in these student texts? It seems a straight-forward enough reading endeavor, but Miller cautions us that “these errors are not to be confused with Miss Stein’s later stylistic ventures.” This warning

\textsuperscript{20} Miller, \textit{Form}, 97.
\textsuperscript{21} Bridgman, \textit{Gertrude Stein in Pieces}, 5. As evidenced in my annotated themes in the appendices, I find this “cultural debris” far more interesting than Bridgman did. I believe it says much about Stein’s absorption and assessment of contemporary culture, quite central, in fact, to understanding Stein the student within her educational and social context.
\textsuperscript{22} Miller, \textit{Form}, 106; italics hers
against confusion raises the distinct possibility of just such a mistake. The risk is that the
“stylistic ventures” of the later Gertrude Stein might look a great deal like the “error” of
the student writing, promising though it may be.

Here we find ourselves thick in the dilemma from which my own self-interest in
Stein’s readers springs: how are we to distinguish between – or define the difference
between – “error” and “style” in Stein’s writing when they resemble one another so
closely, whether reading the student themes or the mature work? This puts extreme
pressure on the reader, the critic, the Stein apologist, to define the mature writing against
these student themes, rather than as a continuation of them. At the same time, that critical
antagonism between student error and adult style requires that the themes be
contextualized by critics not by the course in which they were written but by the work of
the later Stein. As I will demonstrate through this chapter, this kind of hindsight is not
only unhelpful in understanding the student writing, but can be downright damaging to
any assessment of her student work. In the case of Miller, her knowledge of the later
Stein is as hampering to her reading of these themes as Moody’s contemporaneity and the
composition classroom would be. If Moody’s prejudice was determined by the demands
of Harvard’s compositional methods, Miller’s was determined by her own investment in
separating the student Stein from the adult Stein, and by the presumed ignorance of her
audience, who need her help to do so.

Remember that Miller has written this book “for the reader who has found Miss
Stein’s books difficult and often unintelligible.” She doesn’t detail what makes them
unintelligible directly, but we can presume that the risk of mistaking the “error” of the
student writing for the “unintelligible” of the adult writing is because of the
similarities between the two, and thus the possibility of conflating, or confusing them. In addition to presuming confusion between Stein’s student error and her later stylistic choices, this logic sets up a contradiction in Miller’s basic premise: we see more virtue in these themes in 1949, not because they are intrinsically more virtuous than they had been in 1894, but because we know the later Stein, ironically, the one she identifies as “unintelligible” to many in the reading public. Miller is arguing that Stein’s unintelligibility is her greatest virtue, though her error is not; and yet people are likely to mistake one for the other. What a reading quandary! If Moody had known the later Stein, she suggests, he might have seen more than the typical errors on a theme. The problem is that her argument includes the possibility, indeed, anticipates the probability, of readers conflating that very error with Stein’s signature writing as an adult, the writing that has prompted Miller to pick up these themes in the first place, and that allows her to read virtue in them.

Hindsight was supposed to have clarified Stein’s student writing, but it has apparently made it far more complex. When Moody praises Stein for the “imaginative force” in her first theme, he is identifying the virtue of her ideas, even though, or perhaps because, this virtue produces puzzlement; and when Moody critiques her “wretched sentence-structure,” he is identifying grammatical errors. Moody is not puzzled here about Stein’s error. Moody’s assessment of Stein’s student writing suggests a sloppy, but imaginative writer, one whose student writing is adequate, certainly not promising a future career of literary greatness, but average in the context of English 22. But for Miller, the foundation of Stein’s greatness as a writer, and the inevitability of her success,
are potentially confused with Stein’s earliest errors. Shift the context, and the readings may as well be of different texts.

Taken together, Moody’s first end-comment and Miller’s re-interpretation could be read as the beginning of Stein’s lifetime relationship with her readers, a relationship in which bewilderment and concern about unintelligibility temper both the praise and criticism, until and unless the reader makes two choices: first, where to see “stylistic ventures” and where to see “error;” and second, to accept or reject as virtuous Stein’s tendency to produce puzzlement in reading. These choices are related and turn on whether a reader, upon reading, believes there is any “there there.”\(^{23}\) Stein’s student writing, itself, and the critical history inaugurated by William Vaughn Moody and Rosalind Miller, create for me an investment in articulating what Stein has to teach us about how we approach reading her work, especially her juvenilia which complicates, rather than confirms or anticipates, the legacy of her later mature work. I’ve introduced Stein’s student texts initially through my own reading of Stein’s reading practices, and then through Moody and Miller’s responses, because they demonstrate that with these themes of Stein’s, we cannot impute meaning only to her texts. If I am to tell the story of Stein’s development from student writer to mature writer, I must also tell the story of the critical reception of her work because that reception has determined, and is still determining, her place in history as much as does her writing.

We have elided this significant transformation from error to style that Stein asserted through her writing life, such that the process of transformation has all but been erased. Stein, it may be said bluntly, was a mediocre writer in college by the standards of

\(^{23}\) An expression coined later in life by Stein, and delivered in the negative in reference to her hometown of Oakland, CA: “there is no there there” (*Everybody’s Autobiography*, 298).
the day. How did she “become” the great modernist we now know? Though documented in still-life by Steinian believers and detractors alike, this transformation deserves adequate explanation, and deserves the incorporation of her student themes within that transformation. Without acknowledging the process by which Stein became a writer, we risk both inflating our claims of Stein’s stylistic development, and also understating the role of intention in Stein’s transformation as a writer. My final chapter examines a year of that transformation by looking closely at the writing choices Stein made in the context of English 22, marking the points of progress, and proposing a complex, but narrow, view of the trajectory from error to style during this one year of Stein’s writing life before she claimed to be a writer.

In the next section, I will take a close look at Richard Bridgman’s extensive treatment of Stein’s themes because they show clearly how a reader’s agenda can interfere with the reading of juvenilia as writing to be taken on its own merits. In his search for meaning in these themes, Bridgman does not see them as works where Stein was learning to negotiate in writing her own ideas and those of other authors, or in dialogue with the conventions of a particular kind of writing (the writing of late 19th century Harvard professors). He looks outside these texts – both Stein’s and those that influenced her – for meaning. In doing so, as I will show, he misrepresents not only Stein’s collegiate experience, but the very themes themselves. By pressing these themes into a mold of his own creation, he does violence both to Stein’s history and her student writing. In seeking only biographical value in these works, he ends up with a caricature of the young Stein not as a student in a writing course, but as an overwrought diarist.
Reading Bridgman Reading Stein

Outside of Rosalind Miller’s published master’s thesis, there have been only a few extended treatments of Stein’s undergraduate themes in the past sixty years. I will focus the last section of this chapter on the most influential of these readings, that of Richard Bridgman in *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*. The themes assume a position of prominence in the first forty pages of his 350-page book, which is presented in its entirety as “a preliminary inventory of Gertrude Stein’s literary estate,” a collection which he also calls an “unruly mélange.” While his catalogue is still one of the best single resources for taking in Stein’s complete works and seeing the breadth of her career, Bridgman does not engage in deep readings of the texts. Rather, he picks and chooses his sources for what they reveal about Stein at a particular moment in her life; hewing closely to the approach articulated in his title, he presents pieces of Stein’s text, sometimes drawn from very disparate sources over time, to present a narrative of her life through her writing. One can immediately see the risk in such an approach: when lifted from its context, a phrase – especially one of Steins’ – can be made to mean almost

---

24 One of these is Priscilla Perkins’ essay “‘A Little Body with a Very Large Head’”*: Composition, Psychopathology, and the Making of Stein’s Normal Self* (*Modern Fiction Studies* 42.3, 1996 529-546). In this essay, Perkins applies a composition-informed Foucauldian reading to several of Stein’s themes written in 1894-1895. She focuses specifically on “In the Red Deeps,” “An Annex Girl,” and “In the Library” to shape her reading of Stein’s self-development through her manipulation of characters and texts. In that sense, Perkins’ project is very much a precursor to mine, a model from which to work on these student themes. But while she provides some 19th-century compositional context for her Stein’s themes, she misidentifies the course as English A, rather than English 22, she relies on the standard information referencing Harvard’s composition courses, rather than those provided to the women at Radcliffe, and she takes as given the flawed sources of Miller and Bridgman in her critical analysis; her article is more invested in the theoretical application of late-20th century ideas about composition and identity-formation to the themes than about the accuracy of the historical 19th century context in which Stein wrote.


26 Bridgman, *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, xiii

27 Ibid., xvi.

28 Other valuable, and more contemporary, overviews of Stein’s work include the Library of America volumes (1998), and the considerable work of Ulla Dydo in explicating all stages of Stein’s writing life with the exception of her student themes. See Dydo’s *A Stein Reader* (1993).
anything. This is especially problematic with Stein’s work in English 22 because it is a body of work with two kinds of coherence: first, given by its very context and function as coursework; and second, by its preservation as an archive, with some pieces selected and saved from the year 1894-95, and others discarded.

Richard Bridgman opens his narrative of Stein’s life and work specifically in English 22, and more broadly in the midst of her Radcliffe education, catching her as she emerges from her family constellation into college student life. He offers the most stunning first sentences of any biography of Stein, with both a tribute to and ribbing of her efforts to write at her Ivy League college: “During 1894, her second year at Radcliffe College, Gertrude Stein floundered into an approximation of verbal adequacy.” Unlike Moody, who was willing to be puzzled by Stein’s writing, Bridgman does not mince words. For someone clearly invested in the literary estate of Gertrude Stein, this salvo is even stranger than Miller’s decision to focus on these themes as an inroad to understanding Stein’s unintelligible work. What benefit could highlighting Stein’s inadequate college prose possibly afford Bridgman in his otherwise sympathetic approach to Stein’s writing?

As with Miller, beginning with the themes allows him to focus on a tension at the beginning of Stein’s education, before she had become an established writer; unlike Miller who pointed to the promise without having to prove the success, Bridgman does not even attempt to see the silver lining in Stein’s student prose. Rather, he points dramatically at the mediocrity of her college writing, assembling the harshest of criticisms from the course and flinging them out one after another on the first seven pages of his book. After a brief interlude to examine her childhood, he returns again to the

29 Bridgman, *Gertrude Stein in Pieces*, 5.
themes folding them into a narrative of her college career. To briefly review our readers in this chapter: Moody saw force and imagination tempered by grammatical error; Miller saw an extraordinary talent overlooked by an exhausted professor; Bridgman sees a student “[floundering] into an approximation of verbal adequacy.” If Moody was a teacher and grader, and Miller was a graduate student and apologist, Bridgman was a literary critic with an agenda, and Stein’s themes figured into that agenda in just one capacity.

Despite the attention to the themes he pays in the opening of his book, Bridgman quickly dismisses them as unworthy of critical attention; not because they are juvenilia, or somehow not representative of her work, but because Stein had not yet intended to be a writer when she wrote them.30 In explaining the focus of his critical attention, Bridgman informs us that the juvenilia is to be part of the “biography,” while the rest of Stein’s writing is to be handled critically: “Except in its account of Gertrude Stein’s early years before she had fully committed herself to verbal expression, this study is not a biography, but rather a descriptive reading of her work.”31 What constitutes a writer’s “commitment to verbal expression”? At its most liberal, we could say that the moment a person puts pen to paper is a “commitment to verbal expression”; in that scenario, these themes – juvenilia though they are – are worthy of incorporating into the story of Stein’s writing life. At its most conservative, however, determining when a writer’s work has become

30 For some poets, Sylvia Plath and Anne Sexton come to mind. juvenilia is not considered exemplary of the poet’s skills as evidenced in maturity, but the poems are still considered poetry, and the writers of them considered poets. Dismissing the juvenilia as worthy or unworthy of critical inquiry in these cases would have nothing to do with intentionality, but with quality. Bridgman reads Stein and her student writing quite differently: Stein may have written in college, but only became a writer when she decided to with intention. If we take this to be a valid approach, the question is then: if not for the evidence of the writing itself, its existence as writing, when did that intentionality take place, and on what do we base it? I take up these questions in earnest in my Conclusion.

31 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, xiv.
“intentional” is an arbitrary value judgment rife with consequences, the primary one of which divides an author’s work not only into “juvenilia” and “mature work” but into writing worthy of critical inquiry and writing not worthy of critical inquiry. For Bridgman, Stein “the writer” does not exist until she chooses to “become” a writer; and for him this was not the case when she was a student in English 22.

Bridgman makes this value judgment despite Stein’s own reclamation of this work as part of her archive – not only as evidenced by its existence – but also by claims she made later in life:

When I wrote my first story when I was at Radcliffe I called it Red Deeps out of George Eliot, one does do that, and since well since not, it is a bad habit, American writers have it, unless they make it the taken title to be a sounding board to send back the sound that they are to make inside, that would not be too bad, not that anyway it makes any difference anything is anything and anything that is anything is that satisfaction. Let us be pleasant.32

Bearing the digressive signature of her adult writing, as well as the stream-of-conviction grammar and punctuation, this passage nevertheless places the student writing within a trajectory that Bridgman does not. The adult Stein may be critical of her past work in taking on Eliot’s title as a “bad habit” that she shared at one time with other American writers, but it is equally significant that she called “Red Deeps” her “first story.” Bridgman himself acknowledges this quotation, but does not choose to recognize the story as Stein obviously had later in life.

Bridgman chooses instead to read these themes purely as biographical background because of the disparity between the innovation that he will argue can be found in the adult work (as evidenced, for example, in the quotation above), and what he cannot argue away in the juvenilia: that is, the mediocrity, the error, the “studentness” which he

32 Stein, Everybody’s Autobiography, 290.
focuses on with such a harsh light, not as a prelude to her break-out as an adult, but as
evidence that what she accomplishes is far greater still given her dismal origins. What he
did not see in these student themes was Stein wielding her “error” as she did when she
was an adult writer. This in itself is not surprising. As Bridgman notes, nobody
considered Stein a successful writer when she was a student, or, as he puts it, her claim
above notwithstanding, “before Gertrude Stein entertained serious literary pretensions.”

Leo Stein, Gertrude’s brother, confirmed that her expository problems were
longstanding, “Gertrude was in her pre-‘cubist’ days a barbarian in her use of
language.” She “couldn’t write plain English effectively,” and “never could use
words with precision and force.” Leo believed the key to his sister’s problems
was that she was “basically stupid.”

Leo’s criticism of his sister’s intelligence, though perhaps overstated for familial reasons,
was reasonable in its context, and echoed less insultingly by her colleagues. Gertrude
was an average writer in college by all conventional standards. What set her apart from
other average writers was the confidence and intractability with which she wrote, despite
the criticism she received. It is not that she was immune to criticism, but that criticism did
not appear to affect the quality of subsequent writing, not as good or bad, but as a kind of
writing she perpetuated. The kinds of linguistic patterns that were clearly errors in her
daily themes may, indeed, have appeared brilliant when produced intentionally as

---

34 Ibid. Bridgman’s quotes are drawn from Leo Stein’s letters to Mabel Weeks published in *Journey into
the Self*, 141, 136, 134, 149). NB: Leo Stein’s vocabulary for good writing is “precision and force” and bad
writing as that of a barbarian.” These are terms directly out of Barrett Wendell’s *English Composition*
(1891), which would have been both his and Gertrude’s textbook in at least one of their composition
courses. Wendell uses “clearness” for “precision,” but “force” and “barbarism” are both terms applied by
Wendell in his textbook. Leo clearly internalized the standards of his Harvard composition courses, such
that in 1933-34 he could still ventriloquize his professors’ rubrics in his criticism of Stein’s writing.
35 Most notably her graduate student friend, Leon Solomons, co-author with Stein of her first published
work, “Normal Motor Automatism,” *Psychological Review*, III (1896), No. 5, 511. He wrote, “My general
comment is that you ought to be ashamed of yourself for the careless manner in which you have written it
up … The trouble with the article as it stands is that one has to hunt around too much to find the important
points, – it is as bewildering as a detailed map of a large country on a small scale” (Gallup, 15). See Gallup
*Flowers of Friendship*, for the full letter of Leon Solomons expressing his dismay in Stein’s editing.
replicas in writing of what the cubist painters were doing in paint (as has been argued quite sufficiently). But Stein was not yet doing this intentionally in college, and that has made a huge difference in how critics have received her writing. It seems to me, however, that the only difference between brilliance and stupidity in Gertrude Stein’s case is whether or not she intended to do what she did. Perhaps this is why biographers and literary critics are still apologizing for her work: it is near impossible for any of us to pin down how and when Stein transformed herself from an average writer into a genius. Because of that steep trajectory, articulating something clear about that transition seems a necessary part of understanding the Steinian aesthetic.

Though Bridgman sets before us the themes in question, he does not take on this difficult task. He claims he will read the themes for their use as historical background, making a connection between that background and the beginnings of Stein’s “stylistic course.” But his actual treatment of the thematic material is purely as autobiographical source for the picture of the collegiate Stein he wants to paint. Bolstered by Stein’s oft-used first person narratives in the themes, and at liberty to conclude that any attempt at third person fiction was but a veiled reference to her actual life, Bridgman takes what Stein has written as the processing of real life experience: “The themes she prepared for her sophomore composition course, English 22,” writes Bridgman, “provided the occasion for extensive self-exploration.”36 The Radcliffe themes are useful for him and worthy of examination for their “emotional content.” In response to Stein’s first theme, “In the Red Deeps,” Bridgman concludes:

At one level it is impossible to take this hysterical self-dramatization seriously. Yet it is precisely the dilemma of the young that they feel such threats to their precarious psychological stability with supreme intensity, yet are forced by

inexperience to express their feelings in trite and clumsy ways. The emotional content of Gertrude Stein’s apprentice writing deserves sympathetic attention, for it is in the process of taming and exorcising her demons that Gertrude Stein’s stylistic course was irrevocably set.37

Bridgman’s observation, patient and condescending, is more than most Steinian critics have offered for these early efforts. When he credits “inexperience” for Stein’s clumsiness with writing, and points to the “dilemma of the young” as the cause, he conflates inexperience with writing and inexperience with life. His passive connection between Stein’s “process of taming and exorcising her demons” and the development of her stylistic course has to it the quality of a religious transformation, as if learning to write were primarily an emotional, spiritual, or psychological exercise. The idea that “stylistic course” emerges from “exorcising demons” fails to account for the writing process that engages Stein in the course. Focusing so intently on the emotional content leads Bridgman down a hermeneutic path that obscures not only the complex student behind these themes, but distorts the writing itself in the service of propping up his portrayal of a young Stein in psychological crisis. Remember that this portrayal is not without its larger purpose: to segregate these themes from his consideration of Stein’s intentional work.

Rosalind Miller’s agenda demanded that she manipulate the context around Stein’s themes. Bridgman’s agenda resulted in manipulation of the texts themselves. Perhaps the most egregious of Bridgman’s specific claims involves his reading of Stein’s theme entitled “Woman” which he claims represents “a conference between Moody and  

37 Ibid., 27.
In this theme composed in November, Stein, assuming no less than three points of view, complains bitterly about the hysteria of “woman.”

Woman.

Never will I ever try to reason with a woman.

She immediately gets hysterical and thinks she is calm. She acknowledges that you are right half-a dozen times and then deliberately repeats the statement thinking she has gotten hold of a new point of view. At last in despair you either smile or frown according to your temperament and she goes home convinced of remarkable argumentative powers. The eternal feminine is nice to be sure but its painfully illogical.

Point of view nobly remote.

Moody seems to have understood both Stein’s point and her ironic point(s) of view, wryly commenting: “Point of view nobly remote.” Bridgman misses the point entirely. I

---

38 Ibid., 6.
39 Miller addresses this theme within a section on Stein's sense of humor, at the same time identifying the cruelty in the remarks as opinions which Stein never altered: “Stein's humorous and often cruel attacks on the mentality of some women – or lack of it – constitute an antipathy she harbored all her life. Her mental vitality would naturally rebel against the hysterical, illogical 'femme' sketched in the theme, 'Woman' (November 20)” (Miller, Form, 103). While overstated, Miller’s reading is supported by letters exchanged between Stein and Margaret Sterling Snyder in the late 1890s, with Snyder describing Stein’s intellect in gendered terms: “As a rule so much sensuous intellectuality as you have is found in men” (Gallup, The Flowers of Friendship, 16). Stein actually pursued scientific studies in the hysteria and neuroses of women while at Johns Hopkins (see Wineapple), perhaps the most direct way to objectify the behavior. She did not pursue this for long.
will address the importance of these multiple points-of-view in this theme and others in
the next chapter; but for here, that particular shifting point of view is not responsible for
Bridgman’s mis-appropriation of this theme in which he claims Stein has “[utilized] the
perspective of a man.”40 He then reads this theme as a ventriloquism between Moody and
Stein, as if Stein were representing Moody’s point of view of her. It is quite an
extraordinary interpretation. With no evidence that this theme points to an actual
exchange between Moody and Stein, Bridgman concludes that “the excitability that
marked her conference with Moody was in part responsible for the literary problems
which Gertrude Stein suffered.”41

Bridgman then points to Moody’s assessment of Stein’s “considerable emotional
intensity” as recorded after her final submission in May, and turns to another theme,
written in December to provide his evidence of the hysteria which supposedly contributed
to Stein’s literary problems. In his reading of “In the Psychological Laboratory,”
Bridgman again overlooks the complexity of Stein’s multiple points of view in the theme
in order to attribute the following description unequivocally to Stein herself: “She
classified herself that year as ‘this vehement individual’ and described her behavior in
the Psychological Laboratory as ‘emitting fiendish yells, and explosive laughter,
[standing] in belligerent attitudes … and anon applauding violently’.”42 Let’s consider
this theme in full to see what Bridgman excludes in order to cultivate this image of Stein.
Note again, how Stein employs both the third person and the second person in this theme,

40 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Piece, 6.
41 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, 7. NB: “Woman” was written on November 20th; on November 27th,
Stein wrote a piece called “A Conference” which is completely unrelated to “Woman.” It is quite possible
that Bridgman was conflating these two themes in order to make his point about Stein’s hysterical writing.
In either case, Bridgman’s reading here is flawed by his research and/or interpretation.
42 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, 7. Ellipses are Bridgman’s.
setting up a lack of clarity in point of view, but nothing like Bridgman’s characterization."^{43}

In A Psychological Laboratory.

One is indeed all things to all men in a laboratory. At one moment you find yourself a howling mob, emitting fiendish yells, and explosive laughter, starting in belligerent attitude hammer in hand and anon applauding violently.

Before long this vehement individual is requested to make herself a perfect blank while some-one practices on her as an automaton.

Next she finds herself with a complicated apparatus strapped across her breast to register her breathing, her finger imprisoned in a steel machine and her arm thrust immovably into a big glass tube. She is surrounded by a group of earnest youths who carefully watch the silent record of the automatic pen on the slowly revolving drum.

---

^{43} Note carefully the shift in point of view in this theme: from “one” in the first sentence, to “you” in the second sentence, to “she/her” in the third sentence and following, as the theme takes off in its narrative. I address these point of view shifts thoroughly in chapter 5 as evidence of Stein’s attempts at positioning herself in relation to her audience. Her move from first to third person through the course shows not only a progress in learning to choose, and use, the conventions of story-telling, but gives us a window into this difficult process for the student writer. When, and how, Stein uses point of view determines, through these themes, when she is most in control of her sentence; and that, I argue in chapter 5 is the main reason for the relative strength of some themes, and the weakness of others. She is in the process in this course of figuring out how to position herself in relation to an audience by way of point of view.
Strange fancies begin to crowd upon her, she feels that
the silent pen is writing on and one forever. Her record is
there she cannot escape it and the group about her begin to
assume the shape of mocking fiends gloating over her impris-
oned misery. Suddenly she starts, they have suddenly loos-
ened a metronome directly behind her, to observe the effect,
so now the morning’s work is over.

When considered in its full context, Bridgman’s selective description of “Stein” rings
false, in the first, because she is one of many people apparently participating in a very
specific experiment which involves making loud and surprising noises. In the next
moment, however, one of the student-experimenters is required to be quiet and still in
order to be tested whether automatic writing exists. Considering the opening line of this
theme, that “one is indeed all things to all men in a laboratory,” those “fiendish yells” and
“belligerent attitudes” seem far less hysterical than Bridgman portrays. They do not refer
only to Stein; they do not even accurately reflect what she was describing in the
laboratory in this theme.

What Bridgman creates around these themes is a fiction of Stein as a student and
a young woman. He then holds that fiction responsible for her disastrous prose in college
as he assesses it. We can see Bridgman attempting to make a causal link between Stein’s
“hysteria” – as expressed in the themes – and the stylistic markers within the themes
themselves – which express the hysteria he sees in the person writing them:
This aggressive exuberance, which teetered on the edge of hysteria, agitated her college themes. The only stylistic means she could find to express her emotion were either an archaic and sentimental diction or the surface objectivity of the scientist. When she tried to compose in her own idiom, or when her imagination became thoroughly engaged in her subject matter, her prose began to buck and sputter. It was not stupidity that caused her miserable prose, but a lack of experience in using the conventions by which people channeled the tumult of their inner life.44

Bridgman does pinpoint one documented inadequacy of Stein’s in this passage, that she has a “lack of experience in using … conventions.” The broader problem with his causation is a tautology based upon a simple, but broken, premise: that “style” is produced by “channeling” emotion through these “conventions.” What Stein has written in these themes may be inelegant, it may lack precision and clarity, it may be emotional, but we must also assume that it is intentional and based upon the conventions that she knew; her “own idiom” was at this time comprised of “archaic and sentimental diction” borrowed from a poor imitation of George Eliot, for example; or the “surface objectivity of the scientist” she was training to become in that very Psychological Lab. These were her idioms. Bridgman writes, “In the absence of an adequate controlling form, she permitted her feelings to spill messily onto the pages of her college themes.”45 What Bridgman fails to account for in this final assessment is that it was these “controlling forms” – the conventions of English 22, the models of writing she was reading – whether 19th century fiction or lab reports – that caused her writing to appear hysteric. Where did she get that “archaic and sentimental diction”? Why did she assume the “surface objectivity of the scientist”? Indeed, what should we call “her own idiom” in a course balanced between descriptive writing and modeling of texts? Her prose did “buck and sputter” when her “imagination became thoroughly engaged in the her subject matter” –

44 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, 7.
subject matter determined by those whose influence she was under – but it is hardly responsible to attribute these only to the expression of Stein’s emotional state as if writing were done in a vacuum. She was perfectly responding to the expectations of this writing; she was just not very good at it. Why must Bridgman explain that with hysteria?

These are not simply windows into a troubled young woman, but windows into the educational process of becoming a writer. Bridgman sees no educational process in these themes, in the archive that Stein left of her student writing. He reads emotional trauma at the beginning, middle and end of this course, with no sense of what Stein learned from the writing process. He has a dim view of Moody’s assistance without knowing that a third of these themes were not even saved; but even besides obliquely blaming Moody’s lack of assistance, Bridgman does not look at the form of these themes, their progression in order, to determine what Stein has taken from these comments. They are useful to him only as explanations for Stein’s static state of being, not her state of educational progress in the writing course. It’s as if the year-long course were one long diary entry emphasizing Stein’s hysterical self-dramatization.

For all of the influence he has had on situating these themes within Stein’s canon, Bridgman has whitewashed all complexity in the early biography of Stein’s life, and devalued the writing by his manipulations. Bridgman uses the themes to create a fiction of Stein, but Stein is the one using the themes to create a fictionalized version of her herself, mixing experiential episodes with the fiction she reads. By focusing on Stein’s attempt to control the interplay between experience and fiction we can focus on more crucial questions to the project of Stein’s becoming a writer which was, of course,

46 Who else has addressed them so thoroughly? Nobody. Bridgman’s approach seems to have satisfied the scholarly community such that there has been no need to revisit his reading of the themes until now. His interpretation of Stein’s themes have been cited universally without critique.
one goal in English 22: our question should be not, How does an emotional undergraduate obtain equilibrium in her life? but rather, How does this undergraduate progress as a writer in her course? For all of the time Bridgman invests in these themes to build his picture of Stein the emotional undergraduate, that is not a question he even entertains.

Bridgman is completely invested in Stein’s recognition as one of the most important writers of the 20th century. But he was unable to find a place for these student themes in his trajectory of her writing life. As writing, they had to be relegated to “prior” to her identity as a writer, despite her own inclusion of them in her memoirs as part of her writing corpus, and despite the fact that she chose to keep them in her archive. She may have dismissed them as her juvenilia, but Bridgman dismisses them as writing worthy of consideration as writing.

**Composition as Explanation: Explanation as Composition**

These are the problems with Bridgman’s address of these themes. First, he does not adequately acknowledge the context: this is a course, not a private diary. Secondly, as themes written in a course, they were written to be evaluated, and they were saved by Stein as the first of her “stories.” They may reveal aspects of Stein’s lived experience, but they cannot be taken, in good faith, as stand-ins for the truth of her existence. Bridgman exploits these themes as revelations of Stein’s emotional instability, hysterical processing of prior experiences, and then uses those assessments of her emotional state as evidence that reinforces his argument as to why her prose was tortured. The prose was not under control, ergo, the writer was not under control, ergo the prose was not under control. He
equates the ability to write a clean sentence with mental health. This approach provided him with a reinforced assessment of Stein’s student prose. Unfortunately this approach is false, based not only on the context of the course, but on the principles of composition. Emotional stability does not produce clean writing if a person has not learned the conventions, neither does emotional instability, perforce, produce poor writing. This is the logic of Bridgman’s use of these themes as not only evidence of Stein’s unstable college life, but – even more damaging to our understanding of her development as a writer – as a reason for the mediocrity of her expression, for her fractured prose, for her early inability to place a comma. It’s as if, once healed of her mental instability, she would be able to write controlled prose. The question of whether she did or did not as an adult cannot be established based on the same rules of conventional prose by which he judges her themes. As an adult, she threw those rules out. As a student, she did not have that choice.

Remember what Bridgman wrote about “In the Red Deeps”: “At one level it is impossible to take this hysterical self-dramatization seriously.” The fundamental problem with Bridgman’s assessment is not that he doesn’t take Stein’s writing seriously enough – devoting the opening forty pages of his book demonstrates a seriousness in dealing with the themes – but that he takes one aspect of it – the biographical – too seriously, and that his emphasis on its emotional content to the exclusion of its compositional nature compromises his readings. This seriousness is based primarily on the first-person point of view that Stein takes in many of her themes. The first-person

47 It reminds one of the joke about the man who went to the doctor with a broken hand, and asked whether he would be able to play the piano when it healed. The doctor said, “Yes, of course.” And the patient replied, “That’s wonderful, because I could not play the piano before my injury.”
48 Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, 27.
narrative invites, for Bridgman and almost all critics who address these themes, the autobiographical reading. And even as most critics acknowledge that the Stein who writes may not be the same Stein who lives, the conflation of the two appears to be irresistible, as even my own introduction to this chapter can testify.

Bridgman, in not reading this theme as a deliberate piece of writing, instantiates a persona difference between the young and adult Stein which separates out the writing of one from the writing of the other, and provides only an emotional connection between the two, thus creating a chasm between the student and the master at the level of the sentence. He may even be right about his claims of emotional youth and maturity, but in focusing on the emotional content of these themes Bridgman misses a more vital point. Once the “demons are exorcized” what is left? Why should the remainder be such idiosyncratic prose? More importantly, why should that remainder sustain the “disdain for punctuation” as Moody describes it later in the course, but eliminate the melodrama, the “hysterical self-dramatization” as Bridgman calls it? Surely the answer is not because Stein received more pedagogical support to pursue “wretched sentence structure” than “vivid force.” In fact, the evidence in both the student writing and the adult prose would suggest that Stein is doing far more than exorcising her own demons in this course. She is learning what the educational context means for a young woman, what the constraints of English 22 pose for her expression in print, what is validated by academe and publishing and what is rejected (or what must be paid for out of pocket). These daily themes are not the emotional outpourings of a young woman in isolation, but laden with her admiration for 19th century prose as a student, and burdened by the expectation of producing like work. If she was exorcising any demons, they were the demons of literary influence,
pedagogical rigidity, and lack of basic preparation for college level writing of the sort expected in Daily Themes.

To take Bridgeman’s terms forward, if Stein is exorcizing any demons early in her English 22 course, the evidence in these themes points to the demons of literary influence: with George Eliot at the fore. We may choose to read in these themes an unstable young woman in college, or we may choose to read a reader whose own writing depended wholeheartedly on the models of writing she was absorbing: either to reject them as insufficient, or to transform them into the stories of her own life, however inept she was at doing so either directly or covertly. Stein herself gave the evidence that the driving force behind her first theme was not the outer world, but the inner world, and her inner world was populated by books. As I have shown earlier in this chapter, there is value in reading this theme through its literary references, to observe the relationship between Stein’s consumption of text through reading, and her production of text through writing, with the difficult mediation of self and other at the center of the process. This is not just an exercise in biographical archaeology – solving the mysteries of Stein’s Radcliffe days through the literary references to George Eliot – but a way to evaluate what Stein valued in writing, how she filtered her literary interests through her own skills, how she navigated between the outer and inner worlds, as she defined them.

Bridgman does plumb these literary allusions providing a very thorough reading of the inter-textuality between Stein’s first theme and Eliot’s Mill on the Floss, but again, he takes them too far, projecting forward in Stein’s life to describe the parallels between Maggie Tulliver’s relationship with her brother, and Stein’s relationship with Leo. It is truly a piece of comparative analysis, focused on the biographical similarities he sees not
only between the texts, but the lives of Stein, Maggie Tulliver and George Eliot herself, well beyond 1894-95 when the themes were written. But what is sacrificed when this kind of intertextuality is used only to mine the biographical similarities between a writer and her source? If we take away only an insight into Stein’s character because of what she chooses to reference, we have used that parallel not to explore what the writing does, but what the critic wants to see in the writer. What is lost is a focus on the theme, diverted as it is from its text to the author who wrote it. Consider what a departure this is in reading practices when these themes were for a course: it’s as if the composition instructor were to analyze the writer rather than the writing; to see in the writing a window into her soul. This was not what Stein was doing, and in using these themes to do so, and using Eliot to provide yet another window into that soul through his comparative analysis, Bridgman pulls us even further away from the themes that Stein actually wrote.

* * * * * *

The palimpsest of history builds a story, and when there is no critical assessment of that palimpsest as it is laid, or evaluation of its accuracy as the story accumulates, that story becomes understood as true. The problem begins when the original documents upon which that story was based are faulty – as with Miller’s transcriptions – or when there is an investment in telling only one aspect of the story – as with Bridgman’s biography of Stein’s student work. Since all readings of these themes in print since 1949 have used Miller as their source, there was no hope on one level that the reading of them could be accurate except through archival sourcing. Bridgman’s work is unfortunately flawed both by his use of Miller and his use of these themes as transparent insights into Stein’s inner life. To Bridgman’s work, we have two concluding responses: we are glad that he
addressed the themes when so many people did not see them as worthy of citation, but we are distressed because of the manner in which he uses them, as if they held the secrets of Stein’s college life rather than as exercises in conforming – or not conforming – to the expectations of a composition course.

What do I offer as an alternative to Bridgman’s piecemeal critical exploitation of these themes for biographical background? I offer the context of a college course in a specific moment in time, a proposal that we once again consider these themes as Moody did: themes for English 22. And what would we look for in these themes as evaluators of that work? Over the course of the semester, we look, as composition instructors, for progress, for change, for evidence of learning. That is why my chapter 3 was necessary, to show at the very least what the objections, goals, and standards were within and against which she was writing: until now, these themes have been read stripped of their context, so no wonder they have served as a convenience, presented as Stein did, a persona hewn close enough to her own to invite exploitation of just the kind Bridgman took. But beyond this, I offer an address of these themes on the terms in which they were produced, the conventions of the course, the expectations of the professors, the demands of being graded, and finally, with attention to the texts which informed the writing itself. These are the terms on which these themes deserve address. And from that vantage point, we may then speculate with more authority, how does this C student transform herself – in writing – into a modernist genius?
Gertrude Stein, Student of Writing

Many references have been made in this book to ‘the reader’ – he has been much in the news. It is now necessary to warn the writer that his concern for the reader must be pure: he must sympathize with the reader’s plight (most readers are in trouble about half the time) but never seek to know his wants. The whole duty of a writer is to please and satisfy himself, and the true writer always plays to an audience of one.

- The Elements of Style, Strunk & White

The Daily Themes of English 22, the “Radcliffe Manuscripts,” are not windows into the true young Stein, but into Stein’s education in composition, evidence of her belief in what Harvard professors wanted of a young writer, and the results of her efforts. We cannot even assume that she was attempting to please them. Certainly, when she wrote of her “disdain to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details,” she was not looking to curry favor in a professor dedicated to fine description. Perhaps a “gentleman’s C” is all she expected. Perhaps she was not such a good student. Perhaps she just did not care what grade she received. Perhaps she could not deliver on their expectations. Perhaps she was being rebellious. All of these may have been true at various times in the course. If these themes can inform us at all about her stylistic course they do so by what she learned from her professor, what she took from his commenting, and what she rejected. Some of this we can glean from themes if we look carefully at how she responded over the course of the semester. Much of this is speculation, and we can speculate as well. But even that speculation has more credibility than lifting the content

49 Strunk and White, The Elements of Style, 84-85.
50 See Sue Carter Simmons, “Radcliffe Responses to Harvard Rhetoric,” for a rich history of the “gentleman’s C” at Harvard. In particular, she notes that Harvard was the hardest school to get into and the easiest from which to graduate. In this sense, Stein – at least in English 22 – was very much a Harvard gentleman rather than a Radcliffe lady.
of these themes to explain a young life. At the very least, these themes deserve to be read as writing for a professor and submitted for a grade.

For her efforts in this course, she earned a C. What does that mean for us? It means that she produced average work by the standards of the course. It suggests that she came into the course lacking in skills and preparation of the sort expected, that she may have improved, but did not respond positively to the conventions asked of her. Several of her peers also received Cs, and one person received a D, which means Stein was not at the bottom of her class. However she performed in this class, it did not conform to the expectations of a strong collegiate writer of daily themes in 1895. As evaluators of student writing, we encourage, we look for a trajectory of improvement. That C tells us there was little improvement that year, according to William Vaughn Moody. Does that C imply anything emotional or revealing about Stein’s personal life? Not really. It offers only a measure within a context, a way to place Stein’s work within academe, and to project forward to a connection between this student work and the next writing she produced. Given how much attention Bridgman paid to this work, it is almost shocking how little he tried to connect it with her next writing efforts. But of course, that is the great challenge. How does one explain the transition from C student to controlled writer? Bridgman does so by linking Stein’s ability – with maturity – to translate emotional trauma into clearer prose. He calls *QED* and *Fernhurst* “apprentice writing” thus placing it in a post-student, pre-adult category. But even this he reads with a bias for that inevitable trajectory towards modernist greatness, and an equal blindness towards the nuts and bolts that comprise learning to write: he admits that Stein “gave up” melodrama, but he does not explain why she did not at the same time begin using commas.

---

51 See appendices: English 22, 1894-1895, Radcliffe, final grades.
This is because the root of this issue is not in emotional stability or working through demons, but in context: in one context Stein was writing within the confines of expectation, set by the late-19th century arbiters of error and style: A. S. Hill, Barrett Wendell, Lewis E. Gates, William Vaughn Moody, Harvard. From within this context, she had very little to no control over the prose she could produce, over what was considered acceptable; the evaluation was narrow, the choices limited. Within this context, Stein was a C writer. But removed from this context, removed from academe there are no grades, there are no standards, there are no rules. Nothing frees a writer more than being one’s own evaluator, than knowing that the authority of the writing is internal rather than external. This is not to suggest that Stein’s writing changed exclusively because she was no longer a student, but to suggest that the “freedom” to write in English for a female student was no freedom at all. For Stein, the strictures of late 19th century composition classroom helped her to produce C writing. It was not until she left the composition classroom, indeed, left academe entirely that the possibility of being a writer could make sense. What form this writing would take obviously came from her experience, what she learned, but also what she chose to reject from that time. Bridgman says she gave up melodrama. She also largely gave up commas, despite Moody imploring her to “overcome her disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation.” Most importantly, however, she gave up her audience, the audience that was bound to give her a C. Even though throughout her life she received those Cs and worse from critics, she had learned to reject them back in school, to reject the audience that said she was average.
It is no wonder she later in life wrote: “I write for myself and strangers” as an explanation for her aesthetic. This may have been the most valuable lesson she learned in composition class. For whom was she writing “In the Red Deeps”? For herself and for Moody, and I believe the elements I highlighted in the structure of her theme can be distributed fairly sensibly between these two readers: its self-exploratory claims, personal confessions, first-person point of view, and expressive tone are all for the benefit of Stein. The references peppered throughout, the half-attempt to make connections between her own experience and the intellectual world in which she found herself, the gauntlet through down against descriptive writing, these are for the benefit of her teacher. With these two audiences, we have a terrible clash of genre: expressive writing vs critical writing. Moody’s response, as I noted earlier, is actually quite astute, offering flexibility for this unwieldy theme, allowing for multiple understandings, giving Stein potential structures for her future writing. It’s the options, the possibilities that show a pedagogical insight.

Moody does not read Stein’s themes as emotionally or autobiographically transparent. Far from taking this first theme to be a personal confession of instability, Moody’s comments on the first theme are utterly conventional, as if responding to an utterly conventional theme. His evaluation is detached; unlike 20th century readers, Moody has assumed that the student is constructing some kind of performance, though he expresses bewilderment of what kind exactly. Moody seems very interested in the manner, or method, in which Stein conveys her thoughts. This is not attentiveness only to sentences, but to the psychological state she is trying to convey;\(^{52}\) this is the area of

\(^{52}\) To be clear: there is a place for assessing psychology in this case since it is presumed to be intentional, that Stein is creating a psychological state rather than manifesting one.
writing which he can compliment as possessing “no inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force.” In this middle area between commenting on the content – the narrative she tells – and the surface – the grammar he corrects – this area is where Stein will pursue her most successful ideas in the course – this inquiry into the “psychologic state” as Moody calls it, will be the first compliment she has received in English 22.

I believe this compliment stuck. It is not unusual for a student to respond to compliments, and to shy away from, or entirely ignore, criticism. And there is no shortage of criticism in this first comment: half of it focuses on Stein’s sentence-level control, the harshest comment drawing attention to her “wretched sentence structure.” Despite the terseness of W.V. Moody’s comments to Stein, and compared to the critics who have taken notice of Stein’s daily themes, Moody appears to have been the most honest and incisive as a reader, because, as I have mentioned before, he shares a context with Stein, and therefore is not looking for any other version of her work than the one presented to him in writing. With only the agenda of reading and evaluating what is on the page, we might return to his opening comment delineating two modes of reading Stein’s student work: as “a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms, or [as] a study from an objective stand point of a morbid psychological state.” So even Moody’s early response and Miller’s context may indicate why critics to follow were inclined to read these themes from the psychological point of view. But without also assuming the pedagogical relationship inherent in Moody’s reading, they wander too closely into purely autobiographical reading – as if Stein the student was not deliberately making any choices about what she has written, or that this was an imitation or a performance.
Whereas Moody reads Stein’s writing as “student” writing – texts from which to teach – Bridgman reads Stein’s student writing as texts from which to learn, and not about the writing itself, but about the student behind it. By viewing these themes primarily as writing rather than background, we demand a more critical stance towards the work: for example, being appropriately suspicious of the first-person point-of-view, considering the genre, the context, the intended readership, and most importantly, the intention of the writer. What does it mean to call it “student writing” or to compare “student writing” to a girl’s diary? It means that the critic assumes that the writer is not in control of what she is doing adequately, based upon the skill in evidence in the theme, even to assume that her lack of emotional control affected her ability to write. The problem with this assumption is that it equates an end result, for example, an overblown theme, with the inability to keep the theme in check, rather than with the possibility that this was a conscious decision to make it overblown. The assumption is that if Stein could write “better” in the opinion of the reader, she would. If she were able to write less melodramatic prose, she would. But I think this is a fundamentally false assumption because it privileges the reader over the writer from the very start. And yet, when approaching student writing, this is the typical stance any reader takes. This is what I have meant by student writing being laden with expectation.

So, if one of my final claims in this chapter is that Stein is asserting a kind of control in this first theme, then what is this writing “supposed” to do? Shock and awe? On some level, yes, and this strategy has been documented in many student themes by composition scholars of the 19th century. But the massive referencing of text in the first essay reveals a student very conscious of providing credentials for her own participation.
– she pulls those credentials from her reading knowledge, which is obviously vast given the territory covered. But she is overwhelmed by the reading as a reader, and then again when choosing to address it as text, by the function it has in her own writing. I suggest that what the themes show us is that the experiences she is dramatizing actually prevent her from writing clearly, not because of her own emotional instability, but because of her relationship with text. In truth, emotional stability has nothing inherently to do with writing skill or expression. It is not emotional instability that leads to bad grammar or “trite and clumsy expression.” For Stein, at the beginning of this course, it is her handling of texts as expressions of personal experience – her processing of them both in reading and in writing – that causes the breakdown of grammar, the breakdown of her themes, the dramatization of the writing struggle.

I’m not suggesting that the alternate reading is that Stein was manipulating these responses, that she was here fully in control of her writing choices. But I am suggesting that by reading this opening theme as a transparent expression of some internal struggle reflected through bad prose and grammar, we miss out on what Stein is doing consciously: and that is using her reading knowledge to interpret her own “inner world” experience, and on the flipside, using that reading to avoid writing substantively about “outer world” experience in lieu of her imaginary morbid fears – which are closer to those of her reading life than of her living life. In these themes Stein did present us with a “reading” of her self, including a self-selected reading based upon those she chose to keep, which comprise only part of the themes she actually wrote. We see but a picture here of what Stein wanted us to see. But let us see that picture. Not ours.

*       *       *       *       *

*       *       *       *       *
Before turning in the next chapter to more exploration of how Stein progressed in this course theme by theme, let me gesture – confess even – to one final challenge to reading student themes that haunts my own project: these were “daily” themes, written quickly, and largely unrevised. Even though Stein saved them for posterity – an interesting story in its own right – they were written to satisfy a daily writing requirement, and only a few of them were revised. They are understood to be parts of a whole which did not involve integration for the students, but rather, accumulation of discrete observations. So each theme represents, truly, only a “daily” piece of work. None of these are the efforts of intense concentrated thought or revision. Given these conditions, we should ask how much consideration these themes can bear – not in the sense of whether they “deserve” to be read, but in the sense of how they can be read, whether they can support the kind of intense scrutiny that we allow ourselves for intentionally produced work. How much weight can be placed on the individual themes, paragraphs, sentences, words?

This burden, this question of value and assessment with regard to student writing in general, initially drew me to this project. The fact that a modernist giant had produced them only made that question more compelling. As teachers of writing, we invest in student texts with a profound ambivalence: these are our primary texts, and receive, as Miller noted and Moody bemoaned, an enormous amount of time and effort, and we care deeply about how our students read our comments, whether they respond, how they respond, and what affect we can have on them. On the other hand, how much can we attribute to our own influence on them? How much of my own investment in Stein’s student themes is a desire for the institution to have made some impact, even if that
impact was negative or inverse? Based on the lack of interest with most of Stein’s biographers, the answer would be, not much, for they are not worthy of consideration. But for those who have invested in an inquiry, these texts may serve as the precursors to her stylistic genius – whether as reaction formation or foundational learning – or they may serve as evidence of the failure of Radcliffe’s composition classroom to teach her proper 19th century standard written English. How they read depends upon what Stein intended to do.

To what extent is intention the very basis upon which all critics read, if not because they intend to, but because they cannot help it? And to what extent does that assumption truly hamper our ability to read without bias, to read what an author has actually written, and not what we want or expect to find? I should be referencing Barthes here, or Foucault, I’m sure. In the very heart of my argument in this dissertation is a prejudice of reading that I must acknowledge: my own project to create a reading of Stein’s reading is tainted, and as I put forward my reading of Stein’s earliest known writing – in part to make it visible in its own right, in part to throw new light on how critics have used these texts, but mostly to examine the pedagogical moment that produced this writer as she first produced writing – I do so at the risk of undermining my local project in this chapter: which is to expose the inherent violence of such reading, especially when applied to student work or juvenilia, where we automatically assume less writerly control than we do for intentionally published and public work.

And yet: if we read these themes as part of an archive Stein chose to preserve, and to read them within the context in which they were created, that of the Radcliffe English 22 classroom, with Stein as Special Student within a history of Special Students at
Harvard and Radcliffe, we have a much fuller picture of the production of the archive. My position as reader of these themes need not be a compromise, or an appropriation of these themes for autobiographical background, or even simply evidence of a period of women’s educational history through one more educational biography. Reading of any kind, when student themes are involved, may do a certain violence to the text; what I have done to mitigate that violence is to provide the beginnings of archival background and educational context that these themes require; and to explore the irresistible manipulation that student themes induce in critics whose devotion to the adult work feels compromised by exposing the student learning process to the light of critical inquiry.
Chapter 5 – Daily Living, Daily Writing, Daily Themes

Introduction: Rewrite, Revise, Rebel, Relent

This final chapter has been nearly impossible for me to write. The fundamental problem – dogging me for more than three years – has been how to approach these themes, discrete dots of thought strung together only by their association chronologically through time and the fact that they were written within a college course by a single student. The very nature of a Daily Themes course insures definitively no natural progression from day-to-day. The themes are as varied of topic, plot, focus, point of view, and genre as if Stein walked outside each morning, thought, “What shall it be today for Daily Themes?” and wrote around that moment’s inspiration. In doing so, she was following a basic prescription of English 22. As a result of the format of this course, we have – by design – a set of unrelated themes, observations, aphorisms, descriptions, stories, complaints, formal arguments, critical analyses of texts, and meditations. I have considered – and rejected – in my struggle to represent these themes critically the following methods: 1) chronological address to represent Stein’s trajectory of growth or progress as a writer; 2) thematic address by content to represent Stein’s concerns of the day as they developed over the year; 3) formal address by technique and usage to represent Stein’s choices and struggles as a writer to conform to, adapt to, or reject the expectations of the course as she understood them. The problem I faced with the latter two of these structures was that by focusing on one – for the benefit of narrative and critical coherence – I was misrepresenting the other, for content development and formal sentence-level control created a jagged trajectory when considered side-by-side over time. In choosing the first approach, to trace them chronologically with close readings of
each theme, I was failing to impose my own critical narrative on the themes as a whole, and struggling with the fact that this was a false chronology at heart, for there are pockets and voids where Stein has removed from posterity’s reach themes she did not deem worth saving. Each theme, I found with great frustration, could be the point of departure for a number of disparate readings intersecting all three approaches and pointing to none. Each time I committed to an outline with conviction, I undermined my own project with doubt: wouldn’t the other approach be more suitable?

My solution to this dilemma – born in part because the struggles of a writer can always be cured by a deadline – is to attempt a bit of all three approaches above. I will take as a partial structure the narrative of themes Stein has left us in chronological order, to show development – again, as she left it to us – from theme to theme. Though I may jump back and forth a bit, I will present a general march from the beginning of the course in October to its conclusion in May. In order to represent adequately the breadth of her work over the year, I will cover a great number of Stein’s themes, for she has already culled them, from the 100 or so that the course called for, to the 47 we have. As for the second and third approaches, I have organized that forward march around hinge-moments, individual themes or clusters of themes that mark for me either critical learning moments for Stein in her student work, or critical teaching moments for our understanding of her student writing. I would not call these hinge-moments necessarily markers of “progress,” though they all serve as evidence of what Stein was learning at different points during that year of her undergraduate education. Stein’s was not a trajectory of consistent improvement. We might rather call it inconsistent improvement, opening up the question, relevant to composition studies, of how we evaluate progress in
a writing course. Her inconsistency indicates to me a vexed relationship between writing process and product as imagined in English 22; or perhaps, if we are honest, it indicates a harsher and broader reality of how much can be learned and taught in one year of writing themes. But that question I leave to my conclusion.

Finally, my structure – such as it is in this chapter – is indebted to a rigidity of my own reading of Stein which she, surely, would appreciate. I have been working on this chapter, as I mentioned, for three years, and been meditating on it for more than ten. I began considering Stein’s student themes when I was a Writing Program Administrator working with developmental writers at Rutgers, and the similarities between my basic writers’ papers and Stein’s sophomore themes was striking to me. On the cusp between my modernist training as a graduate student and my professional role as a compositionist, I had originally intended to show through Stein’s themes a trajectory from “error” to “style” such that we could point to English 22 as the origin for Stein’s unique contribution to modernism. I have made that case through other means, finding that my critical imposition of error and style was the wrong focal point for establishing the importance of English 22 in Stein’s writing life. Though I dropped my original frame, still, for all of those years, the same themes have surfaced again and again in my reading, pointing to the following thematic and formal issues which I will address in this chapter: point of view as developed through pronoun use, the role of point of view in expressive versus textually engaged writing, the relationship for Stein between sympathy and struggle in cultivating an audience and establishing writing authority, descriptive writing versus argumentative writing, and the struggle for Stein between living, writing, and writing about living. It has been a motley, long, and unbearably persistent list.
My experience of trying to impose critical sense on these overlapping aspects of a
writer’s development – an insurmountable task in any conventional sense – puts in mind
an anecdote that Stein wrote to Sherwood Anderson regarding her magnum opus, The
Making of Americans, which took her from 1903 to 1925 to write and finally publish. Her
thoughts are instructive, affirmation of my inability to lop off one or another of these
issues in the service of a laser-like argument, but perhaps more importantly a look
backwards on the relationship Stein had to her own writing over time, how she
considered those words, once written and organized, materialized from her own inner
world, and on the page at last:

It came to 925 pages and has been a pleasure to do and rather strange to do, you
see I have not read it all these years. I did it just after Three Lives and I went on
and on with it and I finished it . . . It has been printed in France and lots of people
will think many strange things in it as to tenses and persons and adjectives and
adverbs and divisions are due to the French compositors’ errors but they are not it
is quite as I worked at it and even when I tried to change it well I didn’t really try
but I went over it to see if it could go different and I always found myself forced
back into its incorrectnesses so there they stand.1

And so here I stand: having tried to change and shape this chapter (unlike Stein, I did
really try), I have always “found myself forced back into its incorrectnesses” unlike what
I had hoped a critical assessment of these themes should be. And yet, I have acquired in
this struggle to address critically Stein’s Daily Themes a conviction that the only way for
these themes to be contextualized in full alongside my transcription of them is as a
reflection of the motley group of themes they are, the sometimes random insights they
provide into Stein’s process as a student writer, and the broader insights they provide on
this one year in Stein’s writerly development.

1 Letter from Gertrude Stein to Sherwood Anderson, August 1925, quoted in “The Making of The Making
of Americans” by Donald Gallup in the Appendix to Fernhurst, QED, and other early writings (New York:
Point of View and Pronouns: From “I” to “You” to “They”

I begin my analysis of point of view with themes from November 20 and December 1, for one quality share: Stein begins both essays in the first person, but quickly adopts the second person, shifting the point of view from “I” to “you” in mid-theme. The first example, entitled “Woman,” recounts a fraught personal encounter with the “eternal feminine;” the second is a critical analysis of Mary Wilkins Freeman’s novel Pembroke. I juxtapose them to demonstrate how the pronoun “you” functions differently for Stein in the two contexts, where in the first, the “you” refers to herself, and in the second, the “you” refers either to her reader or serves as a critique of the characters in the novel itself. The fact that one pronoun serves both purposes sets up one of Stein’s problems with point of view that I will examine through several other themes as the course continues. My project in examining this “you” as its reference changes from theme to theme is to consider what purpose this transitional pronoun serves for Stein in establishing her position in relation to her subject matter – textual or topical – and to her audience.

Who is “You”?: “Woman” – November 20

Let’s consider first her theme of November 20, mentioned in my previous chapter through Bridgman’s use of it as evidence of Stein’s undergraduate hysteria. Note the rapid pronoun shifts from first person in the first sentence, to third person in the second
sentence sliding directly into second person. Stein finishes with a generalized third
person description of a first person emotion:\footnote{2}

\textit{Never \textbf{ever} will I try to reason with a woman.}

She immediately gets hysterical and thinks she is calm. She
acknowledges that you are right half-a dozen times and then
deliberately repeats the statement thinking she has gotten hold
of a new point of view. At last in despair you either smile or
frown according to your temperament and she goes home con-
vinced of remarkable argumentative powers. The eternal
feminine is nice to be sure but its painfully illogical.

\textit{Point of view nobly remote.}

Stein is neither the first nor the last student writer to use “you” when not really referring
to the reader, but referring rather to herself or a generalized person. Using “you” in this
way is a rudimentary, but common, transitional phase for student writers trying to assert

\footnote{2 All references to Stein’s daily themes or comments by English 22 instructors are snapshots from Brazier
edition of the themes in Appendix A. See Appendix for full explanation of editorial markings and for
annotations corresponding to internal footnotes. Brief explanation of colored inks: the red ink represents the
instructors’ edits, marginal and end comments; the green ink represents Stein’s edits, either before or after
the themes were submitted for evaluation; blue ink represents Stein’s edits at a later time, after the
conclusion of the course.}
control over their subject matter. The result becomes, by nature of the second person, a directive – or mis-directive – to the reader. Ineffective and inaccurate though it may be, this can be an important step for apprentice writers who are learning to appropriate and assert a position of authority by framing their own authority as an imperative: “You, reader, believe or feel such and such … and by you, I mean me.” The difference between a true imperative, however, and this transitional phase of student writing is that students do not realize – or have not intended to – write an imperative to their reader. Their intention is not to address the person reading their work, the “you” that interacts with the text; their intention is to assert their own understanding of the issue at hand, by projecting onto the reading, their own position as if everyone would believe or accept the same assumptions that they do. They use the “you” in this sense unconsciously, rather than deliberately. This effect, designed to create proximity between writer and reader, actually creates distance, for the “you” is definitely not the reader, but an extension of the writer herself. Using “you” suggests a writing point of view prior to understanding its function, prior to a writer intentionally positioning herself in relation to an audience. It is, in this context, a transitional stage in moving towards the control of authoritative writing in the third person, a point of view common with descriptive writing. In addition, “they” “he” or “she” signal the beginning of intentional work in relation to both text and audience.

As I mentioned, Richard Bridgman reads this theme as if Stein has assumed the position of the teacher in a critique of herself, placing Stein in lieu of “Woman” and thus arguing that this theme is a self-analysis. My argument against self-analysis is based primarily on Stein’s use of the word “you” following her self-identification as “I” in the opening sentence, critiquing “Woman” at first in the first person. First person is, by its
subjectivity, both the most, and least, authoritative position from which to write. In this case, Stein chooses to leave the “I” behind almost immediately picking up the uncompromised directive “you” as a source of more authority, and as a buffer against any implication by her own gender. The “you” is actually “Stein” standing here for the person who experiences the illogical female and the repercussions of her capriciousness. She is trying to create distance between the first person narrator – Stein – and the third person subject-matter – “woman.” The “you” greases this desire to create distance from her subject matter. Clearly Stein does not identify herself in this critique of “woman,” but her sex implicates her with her reader anyway. The “you” cannot mediate between the “I” and the “she” in this case, though her professor Moody gives her credit for trying: “Point of view nobly remote.” He reads this as contempt bred by familiarity when it is clear that Stein is trying to disassociate. The writing emerges from a struggle to communicate with “Woman,” her inability to relate to someone female, and yet so different from her. Stein gives no indication that she sees herself in this sketch of women. There is nothing to indicate that she is taking an outside point of view in order to critique her own situation: in other words, this is not an essay concerned with self-analysis, at least in the main subject characterization. This is Stein interacting with an outside force, and her reader identifying and collapsing the author in this characterization.

Suffering and Sympathy: Mary Wilkins Freeman’s *Pembroke* – December 1

Mary Wilkins Freeman’s novel *Pembroke*, published in 1894, served as Stein’s first text of direct literary inquiry in English 22.³ Instead of overlaying and overwhelming

³ Introductory Sketch (from Project Gutenberg online):”Pembroke was originally intended as a study of the human will in several New England characters, in different phases of disease and abnormal development,
this text with her own experiences as she had with *The Mill on the Floss* in her October 10 theme, “In the Red Deeps,” she begins this theme by addressing Freeman’s characters themselves. It is a harsh critique, not of the book, but of the New Englanders Freeman describes, as if Stein were critiquing real people, and reveals a strong personal antipathy born of her experience of them in reading. Her reaction against the New Englanders is not unlike her reaction against “Woman” in the theme I just addressed. And yet these are textual characters, with textual mediation. Stein is not responding to a “Woman” or even a generalized category of woman, but to characters within a book. The main difference between this textual engagement and her use of literary allusion on October 10 is that here, instead of subsuming the texts within her own experience and writing in the first person “I,” she begins in the first person, but shifts the point of view to “you” in the middle of the theme. The aim, as with “Woman” and unlike “In The Red Deeps” is to create a critical distance rather than a merging with the subject matter. I will critique this shift in a moment, but it is important to emphasize up front that this use of the personal pronoun “you,” however much it demonstrates a lack of consistency and control, still works to prevent her from collapsing the text into her own experience. In that sense, this theme shows a maturing relationship with text when compared with Stein’s first theme.

The theme is an indictment of the character of New Englanders through Freeman’s novel. Despite maintaining a critical distance, it is a passionate theme and betrays in Stein a personal resonance with the text through the intensity of her critique. Here we see another shift from first person singular to third person, and then to second person in a single theme. As compared with her treatment of pronouns in “Woman,”

---

and to prove, especially in the most marked case, the truth of a theory that its cure depended entirely upon the capacity of the individual for a love which could rise above all considerations of self, as Barnabas Thayer's love for Charlotte Barnard finally did. Contemporary fiction: published in 1894."
however, she “sits” on the third person pronoun much longer in this theme before moving to the “you.” I see this dwelling on the third person as Stein exercising more control here in relation to the text than she did in the non-textually-based theme of “Woman.” This is in part because Stein’s use of “you” is literal in this theme: she directs her criticism at “New Englanders,” the most obvious of whom would be William Vaughn Moody, the “you” who is reading her theme. It is the vocative you in “you New Englanders” halfway through the theme that links the second person pronoun with the reader William Vaughn Moody:

Gertrude Stein Special
Dec. 1 1894
English 22

I have just been reading Pembroke by Mary Wilkins and it has left me with a feeling of soul sickness and utter hopelessness. The intolerance of these New Englanders is overwhelming. There is never a curve all the lines are hard and straight. The word sympathy is not in their vocabulary. To me it seems such a pitiful waste of human life to see that each struggles on alone no help no sympathy. Poor humanity even when sympathy is offered and though the man yearns with all his heart for it he turns his face to the wall and will have

---

4 William Vaughn Moody was a native of Indiana. But whether or not Stein was aware of his home-state is irrelevant, for in this theme, her slide from “I” to “you” indicates that she has collapsed her reader’s identity into the identity of the figures in the book. For Stein, in addressing her reader, Moody, as “you” she equates him with being a “New Englander,” and therefore he is representative of all the faults she names in this theme.
none of it. You New Englanders say that you have more feeling of sympathy because you conceal it. Its palpable falsehood.

All things die with misuse and you have been so hard all your lives what that can* 2 you know* 3 of sympathy.

You have feelings to be sure but always feelings of supreme egoism. Egoism so all-embracing that you fail to recognize it. You never struggle with yourselves. You think you do but you never really do so.

“Vox clamantis in deserto”.

When placed in conversation with Stein’s theme “Woman” there is some irony in Stein’s indictment of their lack of sympathy, their failure to “struggle with [themselves].” While the occasion of this theme is Stein’s reading of and reaction to *Pembroke*, the “theme” of this theme is “sympathy and struggle,” with its continued resonance with Stein’s reading of Eliot, and we could argue, a more general approach to her relations with people, whether fictional or real. In this theme, the text itself is an anchor for her, something against which she can define herself, an approach she does not take either in her first theme of October 10, or head-on in her theme about “Woman.” Here she navigates more solidly through her analysis because her criticism of the characters is couched in criticism of the text. She identifies in the very first lines as a *reader* of text, beginning boldly in the
first person, identifying the source and author of her critique: “I have just been reading *Pembroke* by Mary Wilkins…” This in itself is an advancement in writing control from October 10 where she does not directly site the text she is responding to. But the strength of the first person point of view, and the identification of the text bleeds into a fused sentence, leading to the phrase “the intolerance of these New Englanders is overwhelming.” As her professor comments on another of her themes, in this theme, too, Stein’s “vehemence runs away with [her] syntax.” The consequence at the outset is a failure to recognize sentence boundaries, even as she endows her sentences with a more powerful position in relation to the text she sites.

She values this idea of “struggle with yourselves.” For Stein, to struggle is to contemplate her own place in relation to others. Sympathy is about creating a connection of understanding and affirmation. Sympathy to Stein thus means understanding – by self and others – of her point of view, her position. Sympathy requires self-struggle, which I would also equate with a willingness not to assume authority, not to assume her point of view is the only one. A non-sympathetic reader, then, is someone who does not question his own point of view. This egoism frustrates Stein because she does not have it, nor does she have the writing skill to assume it. Her only power at this point in her writing life is to critique that power as “unsympathetic” to her own plight, to critique the lack of struggle that she observes in other people.5

From self-analysis to analysis of others, to extreme didacticism: that is the move from first to second person, showing that Stein is becoming more comfortable with

---

5 This entire discussion of Stein’s frustration is ironic when considering her peer impressions of her. Mabel Weeks described her thus, in comparison with her brother, Leo, suggesting that Stein’s self-perception was at least at odds with the perceptions others had of her: “[Gertrude] insisted that everyone meet her on her own terms. Leo, in a way, couldn’t meet anyone except on his own terms. But he wasn’t a bully. Gertrude bullied everyone” (Weeks in Leo Stein, *Journey Into the Self*, viii).
subject matter other than herself. It also reveals that she is acknowledging her audience, and shows a confidence, even an aggressiveness, in addressing that audience. And yet, the pedantic approach of the second person is not a conventionally desirable point of view for narrative or description. The first person is understood or read as autobiographical or assuming a narrator’s point of view. The third person allows for an outsider or objective viewpoint. The second person, though, serves a purpose – however unsuccessful by standard measures – with a writer like Stein – for she is in this theme forging a real and lively connection between her own reading and the reader who will confront her reading of that reading: her own personal audience. She has circumscribed an audience for criticism, having derived her object of criticism from the work of fiction.

Bringing this pedantic approach full circle, her instructor, whom she indicts in this theme with her directive “you” comes through with a flip, egoistic, unsympathetic response: “Vox clamantis in deserto.” Stein is a voice crying out in the New England wilderness. He is mocking her in his response by confirming her frustration not so ironically: she can cry out all she wants, but it will make no difference. The instructor understands, and responds in exactly the manner Stein would expect, with no sympathy, and pure egoism: yes, you are alone, and in fact, nobody hears what you say, and if they did, they would not care. You see, I don’t care. I will even write to you in Latin so as to accentuate your alienation.6

I will note here finally that the handwriting in this theme suggests it was written in a flurry. That said, this is also one of the few themes that appears to have been read

---

6 Interesting note: Stein, in truth, did not know Latin. She delayed taking her Latin entrance exam until after completing all of her other coursework and exams. She had already been accepted to Johns Hopkins, and still had not passed her Latin exam which was the final hurdle to obtaining her Radcliffe degree. She took the exam in the fall following the completion of her courses, and received her AB from Radcliffe in 1898.
over and edited by Stein in pencil before or after submission. This was a theme to which she returned to revise, an unusual move for her at any point in her writing career, even in this course in which revision and rewriting were part of the pedagogy. Tellingly, Stein did not correct the grammatical issues in her revision; she raised the descriptive stakes by adding an adjective “utter” to the hopelessness she was feeling, replaced “head” with “face” and replaced “feeling” with “sympathy.” Most importantly, these edits reveal that Stein re-read this theme herself which indicates a relationship with her own text that goes beyond production, or rather, returns from production to consumption of her own writing, and demonstrates a consciousness of revision. We have very few examples of this in Stein’s corpus. The fact that we see it here shows that she approached this theme as a document 1) worth revising; and 2) in need of some kind of improvement.

“You reader”: “The Great Enigma” – December 29

It is to a symphony concert that I would conduct you reader, but do not expect to have your ears greeted by the perfect harmonies of a Boston orchestra for you are only in a Western city and musical culture is only in its first stages. I hope to compensate you, however, for your outraged ears by pleasant company. Look carefully among the audience and you will see a girl rather stout, fair and with a singularly attractive face, attractive largely because puzzling …

- Gertrude Stein, opening of “The Great Enigma”

The analysis of character is, as far as the limits of your space have allowed, convincing and suggestive. The point of view wavers strongly. We have an instinctive feeling, from the tone in which the young lady is treated, that the point of view is really hers, and that the analysis which deals with her character is her self-analysis, but ostensibly the point of view is that of the author or omniscient spectator. The result is a trifle confusing – the opening is very oddly awkward and formal. I wish that you might overcome your disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation. Rewrite the first page and revise the rest.

- W.V.M, end comment of “The Great Enigma”
Stein’s first draft of her theme from December 29 takes an archaic approach, addressing the “reader” directly as “you” in the telling of a protracted courtship story, in which a mismatched couple – one passive, in this case the male lover, and one active, in this case the female protagonist – struggles in a static relationship for some sympathy. Steinians familiar with the relationship impasses in “Melanctha” or *QED* will surely see a precursor of such thematic material in this daily theme. What interests me, however, is not so much the content that Stein introduces for the first time here, but acknowledgement by Moody of her problems with point of view, which he says “wavers strongly.” By his account it wavers between the tone of a first-person self-analysis and a third person narrative. He notes that Stein’s character seems to be presenting her own point of view, but Stein’s actual strategy is that of “author” as “omniscient spectator.” His assumption seems to be that Stein is trying to fictionalize a first-person account, but cannot take herself out of the telling, so she’s created a character acting on her behalf, and yet she wants also to be able to tell the story from outside. We can read Moody’s comment as the sign that Stein is presenting a more complicated merging with her own characters, as represented in point of view.

In addressing Moody’s comment, Michaela Giesenkirchen sees it as a point of departure for Stein’s later interest in “how the subjective and the objective element of introspective narrative or description related to one another.” She smartly observes, though perhaps overstates, that “Stein’s Radcliffe writings reveal that her endeavor at the beginning was to integrate scientific typology and literary characterization in ways that

---

would help capture the complications in her experience of herself.” This led Stein eventually to the challenges she tackled in *The Making of Americans*, but in 1894, it lead immediately to her challenges writing with a coherent point of view as would be expected in English 22. In other words, her attempts to “capture the complications in her experience of herself” resulted in identifiable writing problems by her instructor Moody. For him, it was merely a technical problem, and it persisted through Stein’s themes during her first semester, expressing itself not just as an interest in subjectivity and objectivity, but a weakness in projecting her own subjectivity through narrative. Stein managed this weakness into a stylistic marker later in life, but it is worth noting that while it may be considered a unique style in Stein’s adult writing, it is far from unique in student writing, especially that of basic writers who lack facility in moving from first-person narratives of experience, to third-person commentary and objective narrative. In fact, this is one of the moves which occupies developmental writing instruction.

If we consider Stein’s themes truly as an extended student-moment, this wavering point of view noticed by Moody is absolutely common. What ties them together, as I have been exploring in these first sections, is the mediating role of “you” between them. The opening, which Moody describes as “very oddly awkward and formal” provides yet another point of view in this theme, not identified directly by Moody in his comment, with Stein employing the second person as a mediating function to introduce her tale. In this essay, she has finally clarified who the “you” is directly by drawing on a writing tradition with which she and Moody were both familiar. Archaic though her strategy may be, it is a moment of progress in defining herself as a writer in relation to both the subject of her inquiry – the protagonist and her lover – and the reader who, finally, is named.

---

8 Ibid.
Moody asks Stein to “rewrite the first page and revise the rest” effectively, producing in Stein’s revision the elimination of the “you” entirely in favor of a more contemporary opening, which includes a direct reference again to “sympathy” this time between the members of the audience at the musical concert: “The regular habitués of the symphony concerts soon learn to know the members of the audience and to feel strongly drawn to them by the bond of musical sympathy.” Following the elimination of “you” in this revision, she uses “you” only once more in the course on March 21 in an otherwise descriptive third-person theme about the “delicious, dreamy south.” It appears that this transitional pronoun no longer serves a purpose once she is able to define herself in relation to her audience and to her text. Point of view as revealed by pronoun choice limits her finally to either the third person or the first person depending on whether she is writing a description, critiquing a text with more skill than she had Pembroke in November, or whether she is framing an argument. We will be looking at these types of writing more carefully in the next sections. Before turning to these other generic forms, however, I would like to focus on one more aspect of Moody’s comment which is instructive, not only for Stein’s work in the spring semester, but also well beyond the course.

We cannot ignore the pedagogical impasse represented in Moody’s penultimate sentence in which he practically admits defeat in the face of Stein’s “disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation.” I have not focused heavily on that aspect of her writing – though I will turn to it briefly in this chapter – because while punctuation may have

---

9 See footnote to this theme in Brazier transcriptions. In addition to removing the “you” from the opening, Stein essentially removes the plot, emphasizing the static nature of the relationship, and even more prominently the character study nature of the two. In revision it resembles not a story so much as a character typology, even more, in revision, a precursor to her post-Radcliffe writing in “Melanctha” and QED.
been vital to Moody, other instructors of English Composition, and the Harvard Committee, it is patently not vital (Eats, Shoots, and Leaves notwithstanding) for clarity and allaying confusion to the extent that point of view is. Moody’s one-sentence plea for Stein to use conventional punctuation taken with the balance of this comment emphasizing point of view undermines the argument for the “necessary marks” of punctuation. In other words, punctuation is not necessary for clarity, but consistent point of view absolutely is. He doesn’t suggest that it is Stein’s “disdain” for punctuation that leads to the confusion in her writing. It must have been clear to her, as a result of his comment, that the confusion she generates, and that Moody identifies, was the result of the point of view shifts and not because of punctuation. Punctuation is not in fact necessary, but merely a formality that professors wanted. Moody’s comments are simply not convincing in the grammar camp. There is never a good argument for learning commas.

The other important observation about this punctuation comment is that Moody points to Stein’s “disdain” which suggests that he believes she is choosing to ignore punctuation on purpose, not because she is unable to produce. He assumes in this statement that Stein is capable of controlling her use of punctuation, and is intentionally not using it as convention requires. The relationship between reader and writer – literally Moody and Stein – is being formed in this very important context: a context which is determined against both the constraints of subject matter and convention, and is experienced by the reader as disdain for what he values. Moody can name his values. He can even require that she rewrite by them. But he cannot make Stein fix her sentences the way he wants.
All this hand-wringing about clarity and punctuation, regardless of how it was to be achieved, did not convince Stein at this time. Whatever resistance she began to develop in her writing career only solidified as she became more committed to her own objectives. Stein rejects even “clarity” later in life, referring back to these terms from English 22, and claiming that “force” is far more important than clarity.\textsuperscript{10} She revisits this idea in her piece on “Henry James” in \textit{Four In America}, written between 1932-1933, just after completing \textit{How To Write}, evidence for me that she had picked up her daily themes, recalled the compositional values and rubrics from English 22, and had begun to reconsider them in light of her contemporary writing life. Her vocabulary in this passage of “Henry James” is directly out of Barrett Wendell’s \textit{English Composition}:

\begin{quote}
It is not clarity that is desirable but force.
Clarity is of no importance because nobody listens and nobody knows what you mean no matter what you mean, nor how clearly you mean what you mean. But if you have vitality enough of knowing enough of what you mean, somebody and sometime and sometimes a great many will have to realize that you know what you mean and so they will agree that you mean what you know, what you know you mean, which is near as anybody can come to understanding anyone.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

This paragraph is a tour de force of Stein returning not only to these terms from English 22, “clarity” and “force,” but re-employing that second person “you” with the “vitality enough” that she relinquished while writing in English 22. She was cured of the second person as a student, and reclaimed it dramatically in her critique of the values from her undergraduate writing. What remnants have we in Stein’s adult recollections from the course English 22? Force and vitality. From these values, it becomes clearer that the primary lesson learned by this student is not correctness, not clarity, but “knowing

\textsuperscript{10} Recall Moody’s end comment on October 10: “…It possesses no inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force.” Force had been since her first theme in English 22 an area of strength for Stein.
\textsuperscript{11} Stein, “Henry James,” \textit{Four In America}, 127
enough of what you mean,” which, as I will also claim in this chapter, is merely another
way of saying that “intention” is the root of being a writer.

Gertrude Stein, Literary Critic: From “You” to “They” – February 26 & March 2
Lest we doubt that Stein was capable of producing punctuation as Moody had
requested at the end of December, or doubt that she became capable of representing a
clear point of view in relation to a text or an audience, we turn finally in this section
focusing on point of view to two themes, the first from late February, and the second
from early March, which demonstrate Stein’s prose at its best and most traditional in this
course. They also show that Stein had grasped a clearer sense of how to critique a text
without implicating either the reader or herself in the analysis. These two themes, in
relation to the Pembroke theme of December 1, show that Stein’s sentences are clearest –
and most correct in the purely grammatical sense – when she defines her point of view
clearly and unequivocally in relation with texts. In these themes, Stein finds more success
in conveying her ideas with syntactic clarity, and in creating a coherent set of paragraphs.
This technical soundness may seem unconnected to issues of point of view, but there is a
good reason to associate them: in these two themes, she is not responding directly to her
professor, she is not addressing him obliquely as she did in the Pembroke essay, or even
directly, as the “you” who is reading, the “you” of the critique. Neither is she sliding
between representing her own ideas as hers, using “I,” and generalizing those ideas using
“you.” The “you” is gone. What remains is Stein as “I,” her texts, and their authors.

Here she addresses the texts themselves, and in the removal from emotional
connection, Stein assumes a detached persona in the critique, that of literary critic. These
themes achieve the “objective standpoint” that Moody was missing back in October; and yet, she fully occupies a subjective point of view with her first person critique. With this overall detachment and coherence, the sentences themselves are also quite ordered. It is difficult to believe that these themes were written by the same author as the theme of October 10 in which text and author blurred into one another. What has changed from October to February in these themes? First, she has removed the reader/audience entirely from her consideration. Secondly, her relationship with the texts has shifted, and that shift is reflected in her handling of individual sentences. In other words, the evidence of error, or lack thereof, is not a cause, but a symptom of a clarified relationship between Stein as reader and literary critic of text, and the reader who will consume her critique. By this time in the semester, Stein has learned to position herself in relation to a text, to shift the instructor from active participant in the reading to passive in the receipt, and the results appear quite clearly in the themes themselves:

Gertrude Stein Special
Feb. 26 1895

In the last few books of Marius the Epicurean I felt a decided falling away in strength and truth. In trying to analyse the cause, insofar as it concerned the delineation of the character of Marius himself, it occurred to me that Pater gave us two decidedly antagonistic elements in the process of conversion.

On the one hand he discourses on the suddenness of the change, the deep impression that here was a revelation, a
something utterly different and shows us that the spirit was
the same and the ritual largely that of his old faith. Soon,
however, I felt that this far from leading in the direction I sup-
posed forced me to quite a contrary conclusion, and showed a
clear insight in the order of influence necessary to produce not
a violent conversion, but the quiet slow-working change that
took place in Marius.

I now found that my dissatisfaction consisted rather in
the purely emotional flavor of this new belief. It seemed
hardly probable that the student of philosophy would so com-
pletely throw all his systematic thought to the winds and rely
on the emotional wave alone.

*Shows acumen -*

More important still to my argument than the clarity in this theme – which is
notable given the previous themes – is the movement between first and third person. She
is writing from *her perspective* but it is not directly a theme about *herself*. In this theme,
Stein takes a more authoritative first person point of view critique both of the characters
within the book, and also of its author, Walter Pater. By addressing the author, who is not
present, who is not part of her reading audience, there is less personal mediation between
her as writer and Moody as reader, and the tone of the theme is less affected personally
because less aggressive outwardly. This explains why the second person was not the
default switch in this theme when moving into the criticism. In this context, the actual reader becomes incidental to the relationship between writer and text, and that, in fact, creates a more accessible, because not quite so direct, reading experience. The reader of the theme is no longer indicted in the writing, but is merely a witness after the fact of Stein’s reading of this text. One conclusion I draw is that by removing the direct address, Stein creates a more friendly reading environment, both for herself in laying out what this relationship is, but also for the reader of her own text.  

As to content, Stein’s dichotomy in this theme is the rational versus the emotional which she finds unconvincing in Pater’s character development. Stein’s critique is that his character development is unconvincing because of its being inconsistent. The insight here is philosophical, and also demonstrates Stein as a very skilled and objective reader. Stein, as literary critic, takes to task what she reads as the “two decidedly antagonistic elements in the process of conversion” in Marius the Epicurean. Stein, in her third paragraph pinpoints her objections: the “purely emotional flavor of [Marius’] new belief.” Her objection rests on the improbability that “the student of philosophy would so completely throw all his systematic thought to the winds and rely on the emotional wave alone.” The critique has two layers: Stein’s clarity of thought and clarity of sentence structure merge in this theme. She assumes an authority, based upon her critical reading, a methodical working through of the failures and flaws she finds in Pater’s character development. The depth of reading insight is clearest because of Stein’s logical approach. She critiques the kind of “emotional wave” that would very well describe her own persona from October 10, “In The Red Deeps.”

12 This observation resonates with Stein’s writing for “strangers” insight from chapter 4. It also harkens back to the Strunk & White “reader” epigraph in the chapter 4 section titled, “Gertrude Stein, Student of Writing.”
This critique of Pater is followed directly in the archive by another literary critical theme on George Meredith’s novel, *The Tragic Comedians*, telling of the final events of Ferdinand LaSalle’s life. Meredith does not fare any better in Stein’s critique than did Pater. It appears that Stein has read a contemporary essay published in English in 1893 by Eduard Bernstein on LaSalle. This becomes the occasion to return to Meredith’s book, written in 1880. Here again, I see Stein demonstrating – as she did in the fall essays – her breadth of reading: the Marxist Bernstein, and the Victorian novelists Meredith and Dickens. As with the Pater critique, the focus is not on her or her audience, but on the text she has read. Even more so than in her Pater critique, however, Stein demonstrates sentence-level and content control of her reading. In this effort, the first person gives way after the first sentence, which again begins with the self-consciously stated act of reading. The entire theme has an objectified, assumed reader of these texts. The only appearance of Stein the critic is in the first sentence, where she refers to “me” before turning her critical powers to the failures of Meredith to deliver on the reality of Bernstein’s portrayal:

Gertrude Stein
Special
Feb. Mch 2. 1895

On reading Bernstein’s LaSalle it has again been borne in upon me, how completely Meredith failed in the Tragic Comedian, to portray his character. He gives us only a bizarre and unnatural giant in place of the very human social-ist full of strength and weakness. It may seem sacrilegious to
Both literary critiques are lucid; in fact, they present the most lucid of Stein’s writing in this course by my read. What conclusions do I draw from this? First, Stein has successfully adopted a conventional form of addressing text in this course. Instead of commenting on her wavering point of view, Moody is able in March to applaud her simply for making a point. She has gathered the force of her interpretive insight and presented it with equally forceful prose. Finally, the writing of literary critique takes as its object not only the framing of a reading, but an argument, a case for Stein to make. In this sense, there is a connection for Stein between the reader/text relationship in these themes and the forensic relationship between points of view in argumentation, where she excelled by her own assessment and by the assessment of her Forensics professor at Radcliffe in her junior year, who gave her an A for that course.\footnote{See the Appendices for the full text of Stein’s Third Forensic, written in her junior year. It is a remarkable specimen testifying to Stein’s considerable power, even in writing, of framing and putting forth an argument.} We see in these brief themes glimpses of a writer who can control not only a point of view, but also an
argumentative position. The clarity of her literary criticism at the end of February and early March owes a debt to Stein’s working through in mid-February the relationship for her between written and oral argument, and her distinguishing between the goals of forensics and the goals, as she understood them, of English 22.

**Forensics and English 22: Argument and the “purely artistic form”
“Argument is to me as the air I breathe” – February 16**

Stein’s theme of February 16th can best be described as a “wink, wink, nudge, nudge” essay. It is clever to an extreme, but exposes as well a thoughtful consideration of her own strengths and weaknesses in writing, where they come from, and how they evidence themselves in English 22. Through her daily accumulations of text, Stein has become more aware about the generic possibilities in writing, and how to wield them in different contexts. In this theme she distinguishes between “argument” and the “tame process of writing.” By argument she means specifically verbal sparring, which she describes as having the following characteristics in which she takes great pleasure: “loudness of voice, number of words and violence of manner.” By contrast the “tame process of writing” she calls “set argument,” a form practiced in Forensics, the writing course Stein took in her junior year, and evidenced in the one Forensic she saved from that course.14 Opposed to both oral and set argument, Stein posits the writing of English 22, which she describes as a “purely artistic form” of writing, setting up in the first paragraph of this theme an opposition between the logic of argument and the art of description. Note how much like a set argument her theme is constructed, despite its turn in the final paragraph:

14 See transcription of this “Third Forensic” in my Appendices.
To the true lover of argument the tame process of writing firstlies, secondlies and thirdlies on paper does not seem a peculiarly valiant task. He is accustomed to win or lose his point in a drawn battle where all talk at once, each trying to outdo each other, not alone by argument but by loudness of voice, number of words and violence of manner. Thus and thus only does the true lover of debate feel himself in his glory. But his natural tendency to object can get some slight satisfaction in writing a set argument. But The question is, as he with his tendency to dispute will manage to get argument into every thesis he write for all his other courses should be not in English 22 restrain himself and indulge in the purely artistic form. On the other hand those poor benighted beings, who love not logic and who are content to betray man make any statement rather than contradict, a few feeble and ineffectual efforts are almost as bad as no effort if the soul loves not a drawn battle.

Now for the personal equation. Argument is to me as the air I breathe. Given any proposition I cannot help believing the other side and defending it. But I would be virtuous
and would rather make a \textit{dismal} failure of a description than
revel in an argument. The one I get all the time; the other in
English 22.

\textbf{Edifyingly ascetic.}

Let us first point out, in continuing our examination of pronoun use, that Stein posits a
“lover of argument” whom she calls “he” in the opening paragraph, and with whom, it
becomes clear in the final paragraph, she identifies with directly. By positing this
close character in the opening paragraph, she provides a comic set-up for her position in the
final sentences, a humorous critique of her strengths and weaknesses, but also of the
narrow demands of English 22 as she sees them.

In this theme Stein distinguishes between the “purely artistic form” of writing –
which she ascribes to English 22 – and the activity of engaging in logic and argument
which she associates with oral debate and the writing for her other courses. After drawing
this distinction between argument and description, she places herself between the “poor
benighted beings” whose very creativity causes them to fail at logic on paper, and those
who must get logic into every theme, in essence failing to produce “artistic” writing. For
one inclined towards argument and rewarded for that inclination in all other classes,
“should he not restrain himself and indulge in the purely artistic form”? Stein has learned
the game of English 22, and with tongue-in-cheek uses this theme to poke fun at her own
failure to produce successfully the kind of writing preferred in this course. She panders to
the professor through her acknowledgment of the course expectations, her claim to
“indulge in them” and the evidence of the theme, which clearly demonstrates that she has done nothing of the kind. She says she will be virtuous by denying herself argument in her themes because she desires to use this one venue amongst all others in order to push against her natural tendency towards argumentation. The irony of this entire theme is that it is absolutely a set piece of argument, from the “firstlies, secondlies and thirdlies” that opens the theme, through the thesis, antithesis, and synthesis of the final paragraph where she offers her “personal equation.” This theme, though it protests an interest in the virtue of the “artistic form” is a “set argument” from start to finish. Of course, there is no description in this theme, and that is why it is not “dismal.”

Besides its sheer cleverness, and its argumentative solidity, it is cheeky to the extreme, and reveals a confidence in the use of the daily theme to put forward a position in direct opposition to the demands of the course and the expectation of the professor. Without conforming to the details of writing, she has begun to use the aesthetic for her own purposes, showing resistance while engaging in a debate about her own decisions to resist. This is an act of control, not simply resistance, and it is so because of the successful organization of her intentions. She is rewarded by an end comment which I must believe is as wry as her own theme, for if it is sincere, it is a tragic misreading of Stein’s humorous effort here. Moody writes: “edifyingly ascetic,” applauding her for denying the pleasure of argument and choosing her dismal description, in argument if not in fact. Both teacher and student are in on this joke, and I would claim that Moody participates, in part, because of the control that Stein exhibits in this theme. She has earned his indulgence in her humor and her ideas.

15 Resistance more resembles her opening gambit in her first theme, when she “disdain[ed] to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details.”
By this time in her year, she has no doubt discovered that her skills at writing have improved, and that the pen can be as useful for set argumentation as her voice in a collegial sitting-room debate. What she discovers, perhaps, is that there is little difference in the end for her, based upon what she wants to produce. She has begun to bring the virtues of speaking and writing together in a way that serves her inquiry if not her grade in English 22. She anticipates failure in her descriptive writing and claims to embrace it: she has learned what will make a “dismal failure” and what will succeed, and rhetorically claims a desire to pursue a kind of writing she knows will fail because of her inability to produce it well.

What is the difference here between “dismal failure” for Stein and the “purely artistic form”? For Stein – and this is the crucial point in reading this theme – they are one in the same as they appear on the page in English 22. Though couched in a clever theme, her point is revealing: she makes an argument here for the virtue of choosing dismal failure. Had she continued for the rest of the course to produce only argumentative writing, we may have said that this theme was pure comedy, that there was nothing sincere about it. But this essay is, in fact, the only deliberately self-conscious argument that Stein saved from this course. English 22 remains for her a refuge for description, meditation, observation, and as such, the tongue-in-cheek reveals a truth as well. Though Stein might have excelled at argument, at Forensics, at logic, these were not the forms of writing she wanted to indulge in. We have the balance of her adult writing to prove that. But we don’t have to wait until then to see her indulging in them. We turn now to her first descriptions.
Observation and Description, Science and Writing
“A Modern Sonnet” – November 15

I take as the starting point in looking at Stein’s descriptive successes and failures her theme of November 15, entitled “A modern sonnet to his mistress’ eyebrows.” This theme is useful for me in a number of ways because of the interplay Stein brings to it: 1) indebted in its title to Shakespeare and so analogous to Stein’s first essay “In the Red Deeps” for its oblique allusion to texts; 2) it is a study of one of her scientific experiments in the Psychology Lab and so opens up our inquiry into the relationship for her between science and writing, between the work of the lab, and the work of the English Composition classroom; 3) and finally, despite its Shakespearean beginnings, and its subject matter of a lab experiment, its formal role is as a description of an event. In this sense, it is a Daily Theme in the purest sense that Barrett Wendell intended; an event drawn from lived experience and recorded not as an extended story or argument, but as a brief, vivid, description of a lived moment.

As noted frequently in this dissertation, the adult Stein was a self-described reader. She insisted in Lectures in America that she had read the entirety of 19th century literature. Her parody of November 15 indicates that she stretched farther back in the British canon to Shakespeare’s Sonnet 130, “My Mistress’ Eyes are Nothing Like the Sun” and Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress” for her inspiration here. As with her theme of October 10, the reference to Eliot hidden in the title, so with this Shakespearean homage. But where texts subsume Stein in “In The Red Deeps” she subsumes them in her “modern sonnet,” playing Shakespeare at his own parodic game. Where we might anticipate a 14-line poem, Stein gives us something quite different. She uses the template
of sonnet as love poem—if not the formal convention—to "read" an experience in her lab as a romance between lab partners:

Daily Theme 1. 
Nov. 15 1894
Gertrude Stein
Special.

A modern sonnet to his mistress’ eyebrows

She was certainly a charming bit of womanhood as she sat carefully imitating rhythms with the electric hammer. The youth gazing at her so earnestly was evidently of one mind. Poor Cupid almost exhausted at his last gasp in this home of psychological analysis seeing the tableau plucked up heart and stole a sly peep at the youth’s rhapsody. He saw “Noticeable winking of the eye at every beat. A trembling of the lips before the repetition of the rhythm. A contraction of the neck muscles distinctly noticeable.”

Has humor. Some misuse.

As with later themes, Stein shifts the point of view in order to analyze her own behavior, in this case her imitation of stimulated rhythms by repetition with an electric hammer. She must have found the scene upon reflection humorous for the decision to render it thus in her daily theme. This brief theme draws on Stein’s reading of Shakespearean poetry and her experiences in the Psychology Lab with her Harvard peer. The decision to use
Sonnet 130 is intelligent, positioning the female as less than an ideal beauty who nevertheless inspires admiration in the youth who is her lab partner. But here, too, Stein’s title undercuts reader expectation. The sonnet being written is not, in fact, the theme under Stein’s pen, but the lab report written by the youth, what Stein calls the “youth’s rhapsody.” It would seem that the psychological lab was the last place for Cupid to take up his arrow, but Stein uses this conceit to render the lab report as a mash note. It is a charming theme, demonstrating Stein’s intelligent humor, but also her interest in bringing disparate parts of her education together, and using the daily theme as a place to explore her own knowledge while fulfilling a descriptive writing assignment.

A quotation of this rhapsody concludes the short theme, with Stein referencing the report with an unusual attendance to proper use of quotation: “‘Noticeable winking of the eye at every beat. A trembling of the lips before the repetition of the rhythm. A contraction of the neck muscles distinctly noticeable.’” The report notes keen observation of the face and neck, especially those features that signal attraction: winking of the eye, trembling of the lips, contraction of the neck. These descriptions became fodder for Stein’s “modern sonnet,” modern in the subject matter, if not convincingly modern in any self-conscious rejection of the sonnet form. And yet, I would point out that this cavalier use of “sonnet” to describe a form which does not resemble a traditional sonnet becomes a marker for the later Stein, who in the 1910s began to write “plays” and “portraits” which no more resembled their traditional counterparts than this “sonnet” resembles the 14-line poem it is named for. Whether her intention was this acute in 1894, Stein is manipulating form, in this case poetic form, just as much as she intentionally chooses
“modern” subject-matter in order to parody Shakespeare’s own parody of the 17th-century sonnet, “My Mistress’ Eyes Are Nothing Like the Sun.”

As an attempt at integrating her daily living and daily writing, turning her observations in the Psychology Lab to a fruitful theme in English 22, she is quite successful. Moody’s comment is even, affirming her inventiveness and calling attention to minor errors that do not, in this case, mar the effect of the composition. On balance, this description is a success. Now let’s take a look at one later in November that Stein and her professor would both describe as “a dismal failure.”

“A Conference”: “Yes birds do twitter in autumn …” – November 27

From the observations of the Psychology Lab on November 15, the scene moves to an English Professor’s office on November 27. Student and teacher are having a conference about the student’s work on a theme. Stein’s meta-theme from the end of November is called “A Conference,” a mini-drama depicting a “meek girl student” and her oblivious, accommodating English professor:

Gertrude Stein  
Nov. 27 [1894]  
Daily Theme  
English 22  
Special.

A Conference.

English Prof. “Yes that is a very good stroke. Twittering birds always remind me of spring. Ah but let me see your description is of autumn, yes birds do twitter in autumn too not so much perhaps.”
In her monograph on Stein’s themes, Rosalind Miller provides a concise reading: “One of her sarcastic gems is the theme entitled 'A Conference' (November 27). Many students before and since Miss Stein's undergraduate days have ridiculed the absent-minded professor, but few have done so with her terseness. The unamused instructor's only comment was a question mark.”16 This theme is one confirmation we have of the way in which English courses at Radcliffe were taught. It shows that female students had conferences with their professors to discuss the writing they did in their courses. It also shows this “meek girl” student’s dismissive attitude towards the instruction she was receiving on at least one occasion. More than simply sarcasm pointed at the “absent-minded professor” as Miller describes him, it is specifically an “English Prof.” and he is responding specifically to a “description” that he misreads, not once, but twice, and then requires the student to correct him in order to provide what is, in this case, a compliment. In this theme, the professor is an incompetent, though affable, reader whose “meek girl” student corrects respectfully. An incisive theme, it is a gentle indictment of this

---

16 Rosalind Miller, Form, 103.
relationship between professor and student, in which the student is both unsure of her authority, but aware that she is a better, or more attentive, reader than her teacher.

The “dismal failure” here is not the theme “A Conference;” rather, it is Stein’s depiction of a previous failure to describe a simple scene of nature such that an English professor can understand it. This is all the more poignant because of Moody’s response: a question mark. The relationship between Stein and Moody is reduced to no comment, neither praise, nor criticism, but to bewilderment. When Stein questions the legitimacy of the writing project as supposedly understood, a contract of sorts, she reduces her reader to puzzlement. I find this the most remarkable response: either Moody plays along with his oblivious role by delivering his own confusion, or he has admitted defeat in his job to respond to a student. Regardless, the question mark is a failure on both sides. Her professor in English 22 fulfills the caricature Stein presents by giving her a question mark. And yet, there is the earnest desire by the “meek girl” to be successful, to be understood, even to conform in this theme. We look at one last theme in which Moody’s comment affirms what he wants to see in description, and Stein is rewarded for her success at conforming.

**Success and Conformity: “Birth of a Legend” – March 6**

Stein’s theme, “The Birth of a Legend,” dated March 6, is her first lengthy piece of prose that elicits more affirmation than criticism from her professor. It is also one of only several short stories that Stein saved from the year-long course. It tells of a long hike the narrator took as a child with her brother, Harry. It is a short story told in the first person, likely a fictionalized account of an experience Stein had with her brother Leo,
and in the retelling of the story, Stein conforms to the expectations of her course. To give
a sense of the tone and sentence-level control of this theme, the opening paragraph:

Gertrude Stein Special
Theme 10
Due Mech. 6 1895.

The Birth of a Legend.

When we were Californians we used regularly to
spend our summers in the mountains of Napa County. In order
to reach the Springs, we had to stage a distance of twenty
miles, from the town of St. Helena. One summer my father
suggested that my brother and myself walk instead of riding.
Harry was just thirteen and I but eleven, and so we agreed to
the proposition in high glee. We decided to perform our pil-
grimage on a Sunday, a day that the stage did not run, so that
all temptation to give up our project would be removed.

Her final paragraph brings closure to the long narrative with an assertion of local fame as
a result of their trek:

We never lost that reputation in spite of all disclaim-
ers. Many years after when we went back to the old place, we
heard the legend told, of a tiny boy and girl, who had walked
twenty miles up the mountain in half a day. Thus will we fig-
ure in the future folk-lore of California.
This theme is marked throughout by an overblown sense of importance. And yet, Stein’s control of sentence boundaries structurally reins in the melodrama. It is the first draft of an utterly conventional narrative, and Stein handles it with ease. It is possible in this theme to read primarily, and comfortably, for content because Stein’s sentence structure allows us to process her ideas more simply and clearly than in her previous efforts. The reason is that the form fits the content, and as such, Stein demonstrates her control of a conventional approach to writing that conforms, thematically and stylistically, to the expectations of a short story. We can ascertain from Moody’s end comment – one of the more complimentary ones – what Moody and his cohort valued in the essays they received. His comment on “Birth of a Legend”:

In this essay Stein has apparently given the professor what he wants: “careful and clear” prose with “description” and “narrative” and a “style” that is “well adapted” to the content. Her conformity yields praise, directed towards her adaptation of content to a style that he deems acceptable. She shows in this essay that she is indeed capable of producing standard written English in the “purely artistic form” that she herself
associated with the ideal writing of English 22. In a sense, Stein’s peak of progress in March – which as you may recall was the same month in which she shone with her literary criticism of Pater and Meredith – shows more than just her ability to write standard written English; it also shows that she was either unable to maintain this sentence-level control through to the end of her second semester, or that – following Moody’s plea to attend to her punctuation in December – she chose not to invest the effort in doing so, finding the details of punctuation uninteresting, and the pay-off for attending to them in English 22 underwhelming. Stein had produced examples of what would earn her the praise of her professors. She knew what received positive feedback, and what did not. But the praise of her professors does not seem to be worth the conformity, or effort, that it would demand of her writing.

This indicates to me that her less successful themes in English 22, following this demonstration of clear and controlled prose by March of her second semester, are either a form of persistent inconsistency, or a form of resistance to the course requirements, as she understood them, and of resistance to the perennial demands of her professors. My evidence for this so far falls mainly with the earlier descriptive themes which bend convention, mock expectation, and insist – in their “incorrectnessess” if we may quote the later Stein – on not attending to shifting point of view or placement of commas, even as she makes a “very appreciable advance” over her former work. The assumption is that both Moody and Stein want the same thing, and that is “improvement.” But I am not so sure that is Stein’s goal. I would go out on a limb, and argue that Stein discovers that refusing to participate in the conventions of this course is every bit as rewarding as the rather bland praise she received for this theme. To refuse or reject convention was a very
simple and effective means of rebellion against the absent-minded professor more concerned with grammar than with ideas. The “meek girl student” caricatured on November 27 need not remain in the position which she occupies while at Radcliffe. By upsetting her English professors’ sense of conventional expectation, she could begin her rebellion by grammar as a meditation on what her purposes for writing will be, whether argument or dismal description.

The December Cluster: Themes from the 19, 20, and 21

Stein began to claim her own purposes for writing several months before this confidence and success with Moody emerged in March. She was more concerned with ideas than with the “necessary marks of punctuation,” and a cluster of essays from mid-December begins to reveal those issues which were most pressing on Stein’s mind. These three essays also form one of the few opportunities for us to see Stein working successively from day-to-day. Here we have three consecutive daily themes to examine Stein’s daily living and writing process. This sequence of three texts is where we see a writer’s project emerging for the first time. They show Stein starting to become aware of writing as something that is useful, writing that does something in and of itself because of what it allows her to do in contemplating her place in relation to time, her own learning, and the creation of knowledge around her at the university. We see here a will to coherence that the writing project serves for her. This cluster of themes represents a development that she preserved as distinct from the discrete and chronologically disconnected themes that we have otherwise.
This cluster also shows the beginning of where Stein starts to consider the relationship between description, with which she has been contending somewhat unsuccessfully, and verbal argument, to which she is inclined; we see her realizing that writing becomes purposeful for communication, that writing argument can serve for her a similar function as verbal argument. The goal is not to win the drawn battle but to understand her own thoughts. I would deliberately introduce the word “composition” as understood in my chapter 4 to describe the process that unfolds for Stein in December. She begins to compose herself in these themes, and by compose, I mean both “to write” and “to gather herself together.”

Stein’s daily themes for the first months of the course have taken many forms to varying degrees of success: descriptions of events, aphorisms, persuasive essays, parodies, meditations. They are not cumulative in their sense of exploration. Unless directed to revise or rewrite, she leaves a topic and moves on to something quite unrelated in the next theme. As discrete observations, the insight or narrative power of each theme ends when the pen stops moving. But in mid-December, she begins to string along her thoughts on paper between themes. She still writes each theme as a discrete unit, but with a memory in evidence that extends from the previous day of writing. Equally important, she saves three themes from three consecutive days, suggesting that she sees value in the cumulative insights she has begun to form.

In other words, she begins to use her daily themes to organize extended critical thinking. I read the three themes dated December 19, 20, and 21 as a cluster – an extension of thinking from one day to the next – to argue that she is beginning to use writing as a process and forum for synthesizing her life as a student, and to provide a
written record of daily living through intense observation. Finally, and most importantly, in these three themes, the act of writing becomes a subject for meditation, becomes the subject of the writing itself. She began the course by meditating on reading. By December, she has shifted that meditation to the process of writing, even when the context for the theme is the laboratory, and the writing itself is designed to be “automatic,” as we will see now in her theme of December 19.

**Automatic Writing and Intention: “So now the morning’s work is over” – Dec. 19**

These three daily themes in the December cluster work together to build a profile of Stein’s work in English 22 as compared to her work in science lab. She uses her own experience as a subject in the lab for her theme of December 19, titled “In a Psychological Laboratory.” We have seen this theme once before, through Richard Bridgman’s reading of it in chapter 4. We revisit it here in its context as a description of an experiment involving automatic writing in the Psychological Laboratory:

Gertrude Stein
Special.
Dec. 19 1894
Daily Themes

*In A Psychological Laboratory.*

One is indeed all things to all men in a laboratory. At one moment you find yourself a howling mob, emitting fiendish yells, and explosive laughter, starting in belligerent attitude hammer in hand and anon applauding violently.
Before long this vehement individual is requested to make herself a perfect blank while some-one practices on her as an automaton.

Next she finds herself with a complicated apparatus strapped across her breast to register her breathing, her finger imprisoned in a steel machine and her arm thrust immovably into a big glass tube. She is surrounded by a group of earnest youths who carefully watch the silent record of the automatic pen on the slowly revolving drum.

Strange fancies begin to crowd upon her, she feels that the silent pen is writing on and one forever. Her record is there she cannot escape it and the group about her begin to assume the shape of mocking fiends gloating over her imprisoned misery. Suddenly she starts, they have suddenly loosened a metronome directly behind her, to observe the effect, so now the morning’s work is over.

Interesting

This essay is the second cross-over we have of Stein’s science courses with her work in daily themes, the first being her sonnet of November 15. In both the writing serves to process her lab work, in this case, specifically the experience of being a subject in an automatic writing experiment. This essay, in particular, has been the subject of much speculation into Stein’s stylistic choices later in her writing career. In the critical portion
of her monograph, Rosalind Miller traces the early reception of Stein’s scientific work on automatic writing in conjunction with her early literary experiments such as *Tender Buttons* (1910-1912). The seeds of this discussion began in the *Atlantic Monthly* in the 1930s, when B.F. Skinner – well-known behavioral psychologist – wrote an article in which he claimed that Stein’s most experimental work was merely evidence that she had produced “automatic writing” of the sort she was studying as a Radcliffe undergraduate. The critical response to Skinner came from the *American Journal of Psychology* in 1941. The article, “Gertrude Stein, William James, and Grammar,” by Professor Ronald B. Levinson of the University of Maine, took issue with the unconscious aspect of Skinner’s argument. To the contrary, Levinson wrote that “most if not all of Miss Stein’s writing . . . is an attempt to put into practice some notions of the ideal function of language, notions which were in all probability derived from the distinguished teacher of her Radcliffe days, William James.”¹⁷ This did not include, according to Levinson, any direct relationship with automatic writing, but rather a thoughtful consideration of the parts of language. To use one of my key terms, her writing was intentional even if it appeared to be random. He claimed:

> [Stein’s writing] is founded upon a conception of the “stream-of-consciousness” quite similar to that of James. Her accent on the more fluid and moving elements in language (the verbs and adverbs), her corresponding depreciation of the static moveless noun, what is this but the counterpart of James’ plea in behalf of the “flights” as against the linguistic predominance of the “perchings”? It is difficult not to suppose at least an initial arousal and some permanent direction of interest toward the philosophy of grammar, as having passed from the persuasive teacher to the girl whom he evaluated as the most brilliant of all his feminine students . . . From whatever the quarter the wind of doctrine blew, it propelled Miss Stein toward an appreciation of the potential interest to the literary craftsman of the subtle issues, half psychologic, half philosophic, which turn upon the finer categoreal analysis of the creative word. It is this intellectual concern with linguistic experimentation, though one may quite deny the success of the

¹⁷ Levinson in Miller, *Form*, 52
experiments, which may supply a clue for distinguishing the products of Miss Stein’s literary workshop from those early automatic fruits of the Harvard laboratory of psychology.\textsuperscript{18}

Beyond validating, yet again, the importance of Williams James to Stein’s undergraduate education, Levinson’s observations support another of my central claims regarding her undergraduate writing: that is, that the central lesson to emerge not only from the Psychology Lab, but also from her English course was an intentional, rather than accidental or automatic, consideration of language; secondly, that it is the intentionality of those choices that made Stein a writer. Neither Skinner nor Levinson, however, address the actual writing of this theme. They focus on the story told rather than the story revealed.

William James introduced the concepts identified by Levinson in a chapter of his book, \textit{Psychology} (1892), a few years before Stein entered Radcliffe. She surely was a student of these Jamesian ideas as \textit{Psychology} was the textbook used in his courses. James identified two aspects of language which he claimed make up the total: “substantive parts” or “resting places” and “transitive parts” or “places of flight” in language. He discusses the temperament of language which is always present regardless of the part of speech which is used. Ultimately he argues that all parts of speech express feeling, a claim which becomes very important to understanding Stein’s peculiarly functional use of words in her adult writing as well as her focus on feeling and sympathy. James proposes:

\begin{quote}
There is not a conjunction or a preposition, and hardly an adverbial phrase, syntactic form, or inflection of voice, in human speech, that does not express some shading or other of relation which we at some moment actually feel to exist between the larger objects of our thought . . .
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 52-53.
We ought to say a feeling of *and*, a feeling of *if*, a feeling of *but*, and a feeling of *by*, quite as readily as we say a feeling of *blue* or a feeling of *cold*. Yet we do not: so inveterate has our habit become of recognizing the existence of the substantive part alone, that language almost refuses to lend itself to any other use.\(^\text{19}\)

James’ observations may have been inspiration for the elder Stein, but for the student Stein they would yield only failure if put into practice. Stein’s composition professors were not interested in the philosophy of language so much as its plain sense as expressed through the newly developed rubrics of A.S. Hill and Barrett Wendell. If we return to the world in which this theme was submitted, rather than the world in which it was interpreted retroactively, what we see is a description of a science experiment. English Composition was not ready for the philosophic work coming out of the Psychology Lab at that time. Jamesian categories for words and sentences were at odds with the goals of English Composition as set out by the compositionists. An educational tension was playing out in Stein’s courses between the philosophy of language and the usage of language. We can see this directly in her handling of the themes which attempt to answer to the demands of Daily Themes in their presentation, and to address the subject matter of scientific inquiry in their content. This tension comes to a head towards the end of the course, and is reflected not so much in the themes themselves but in Moody’s evaluation of them as divided between the artistic and the scientific, the weakness being their “laboratory atmosphere.” The problem with an asynchronus evaluation, such as provided by Skinner or Levinson, is that it reads the literary Stein as the product of science. I am reading the scientific Stein in the product of her literature.

\(^{19}\) James, *Psychology*, vol. 1, 245-246.
"Why struggle, you must submit sooner or later" – December 20

The following theme dated December 20 takes a meditative stance on the discovery of new knowledge, such as she was participating in on the previous day in the Psychological Lab. It is yet another articulation of struggle, this time against the weight of knowledge building that has preceded her. Her frustration in this theme seems to be that whatever work she does has been done before, and that it is everyone’s destiny merely to repeat the actions and thoughts of their predecessors. The theme reads in full:

Gertrude Stein
Special
Dec. 20 1894
English 22.

It is a very painful fact in human experience that each of us must go over the same old ground of mental develop struggle and development. To be sure it is a reflection old as the hills but it is still new for I have just rediscovered it. The worst of it is, that the recognition of it as fact is of no value.

I know perfectly well that I will hold some time in the future the same opinions in large measure that I have just been combating. I know perfectly well that when my opponent⁴ of was my age he held mine and yet I cannot spare myself the intervening pain and struggle.

I know I will believe, but as I don’t believe there is no help in that. Sometimes I fiercely and defiantly declare that I won’t believe neither now nor in the future. “Be still you fool” then says my working other self, “why struggle, you
If we are going to draw some analogy between the student Stein and the adult Stein, this theme seems the much better option than the previous one. Though she may have struggled as a student in the face of such daunting repetition, she managed, arguably more than any other modernist, to stave off the effects of being “ground in the same mill with [her] fellows.” And yet, she is quite conscious of her place in relation to those who come before, and those who come after, moving from the first- to the second-person pronoun, “us,” standing in the first two sentences both as an individual and in collectivity. Her prose is free of grammatical error, even sporting quotation marks when shifting to the second person to dramatize her internal conversation. She is quite astute in reasoning until the following sentence: “The path is straight before you can but choose to follow.” The despair in this sentence, accentuated by its structural collapse, is of the lack of control, the inevitability of a chosen trajectory, the inability to change her circumstances. It is a quotidian complaint couched as it is between the descriptive theme of the day before and the confident theme of the day that follows; but the urgency is palpable even in the return of the melodramatic tone we saw earlier in the semester. It is a convenience for me in reading this theme that the only grammatical breakdown occurs in the sentence in which Stein contemplates her choice to follow, or not, the path that is straight.
“Living in and writing about” – December 21

Having recovered from her melodramatic despair, Stein continues the philosophizing on the belated nature of self-discovery on December 21, showing a trajectory of thought from her own place in history to the unfolding of history through the ages. In this theme, Stein continues her meditations from the previous day about the inevitability of retracing someone else’s steps in academe. This is an interesting move, for in expressing these ideas for a second day in a row, she retraces her own steps as well as those of her professors and colleagues. She has noticed the inherently repetitive nature of history and of education:

Gertrude Stein
Special
Dec. 21 1894
English 22.

Was there ever an age which those living in and writing about it did not characterize as an age of transition. They always announce the fact as if it were something new, and peculiar to their own age time.

The position is eminently illogical. From the very nature of progress, all ages must be transitional. If they were not, the world would be at a stand-still and death would speedily ensue. It is one of the tamest of platitudes but it is always introduced with a flourish of trumpets.

Hegelian.
Though her first sentence is a question, she does not use a question mark. She asks in a statement. She is declarative. If Stein is concerned about the impact of her work in these two ways, first as a repetition of what has gone before, and second, as unperceiving of the repetition of every age in history, she is clearly struggling with an artistic problem as much as a scientific one; and the advantage of writing in working through this problem is that it allows all of the thoughts to be recorded so as to show the movement of the thinking. This may be why philosophy and psychology had originally attracted her attention, for they not only allow, but encourage the kind of dialectical thinking that Stein had begun to use in her daily themes.

As an academic exercise, she accomplishes more in this theme than in the less controlled, more personalized theme of the previous day. It’s not just her struggling with this problem, it is every scholar, she finds. Articulating this helps her in two ways. First, it makes her seem more like a scholar because she has written controlled, more scholarly, less histrionic, prose. Second, articulating this gives her control over her situation as one of a group. And yet, much of her work turns on uniqueness, at least her desire to be unique; consider again her claims to uniqueness in “In The Red Deeps” where she folded all of human experience into her own experience, thus setting her apart from everyone because of the magnitude of her feeling. Her dilemma as a student, then, is how to be both unique and part of a scholarly discourse. Instead of “I” she is part of “an age which those living in and writing about it” (sic), an insightful, if fractured sentence. She disappears into an entire age, which she then collapses into all periods of research. She normalizes her individual conflict with learning as a normal part of research and knowledge-building. And how does she describe this age of learning? As an “age of
transition.” So instead of railing against being “ground in the same mill as [her] fellows” as in the previous day, she redefines the experience as an “age of transition.” It’s almost sweet in its grandiose sweep because she is defining what she previously could not define; she offers a characterization that connects her with the community around her, rather than alienating her from it, or despairing of her lack of choice in the collectivity of academe. This is a scholarly move, indebted, as Moody notes in his end comment, to Hegelian dialectic. She defines it, names it, and for her this becomes “categorizing it” and will become within a decade the beginnings of The Making of Americans, perhaps the largest single categorization of “human nature” and the “nature of progress” ever written.

In her move from “I” on December 20 to “they” on December 21 she also distances herself from the “eminently illogical” position she had adapted the previous day. She can both participate in the observation and critique it. This is a very sophisticated move for a student. And yet the great insight in this idea theme is again couched in a “wretched sentence” to quote Moody from earlier in the year: “Was there ever an age which those living in and writing about it did not characterize as an age of transition.” The only syntax error in this theme revolves around the word “writing.” She is thick in this theme in the business of daily living, daily writing, and daily themes. Despite carrying on in all of these in December, honing her ideas, using the writing itself to think over a period of days, her sentences remain unpredictable, untamed, unconventional. What does Moody have to say about these three themes in succession?

Interesting

Shows discernment

Hegelian
Though he will turn once again by the end of December to his “necessary marks of punctuation” the intervening oblivion to these train wreck sentences must have had their affect. What matters it not what Moody says, it is what Stein thinks, what Stein writes, what Stein discovers that is new. She will choose meaning over orthography, force over clarity, ideas over rules, what she knows over what her teachers know. She will choose the 20th century over the 19th.

**Daily Living, Daily Writing – November 16 & February 20**

Stein’s self-discovery in December’s themes could be seen as the fulcrum between two themes in opposition – the first in November, the second in February – in which Stein’s insight was focused directly on her work in English 22, that is, the work of writing her daily life. Gertrude Stein began English 22 with a very narrow idea of what writing in this course could be. In some ways the course itself validated her narrow views: Moody’s attempts to shape Stein’s attention to punctuation and grammar, his praise of her vividness and force, his criticism of her inconsistency in point of view, the modeling through literary study, and the focus on descriptive writing. But in another more important way, Stein’s narrowness was broadened by the course and what it asked of her at its most basic: to live, to observe, and to write.

As you will recall, Stein began the semester with a firm rejection of writing on the terms of the course as she understood them: “I disdain to waste a passing stroke on such paltry details,” she wrote of the outside world, preferring to focus on her own rich inner life. By November 16 she rejects, with similar melodrama to the October 10 theme, a basic demand of the course; that is, to write a “daily” theme on any aspect of her life,
whether the outer or inner world. In this over-the-top theme she opposes “pleasure” with “writing,” such that the demands of producing a daily theme, on any subject, becomes a burden that she resents.

In this short melodrama, Stein reconfirms her initial feelings about writing for the course. In the first theme of October 10, she rejects the subject matter of the outer world, and here again, she balks at being persuaded to turn her “living” into writing for the Daily Themes course. She evidently wants to separate her living from her writing, because at this point in her education, writing takes away from the “joy of living.” This is an important observation because as a student in November, she does not regard writing as a part of living, or even a means of contemplating living or processing it. Writing for a course, even one whose primary requirement is to produce a daily piece of work, is an imposition on her sense of the separation between writing and living. Clearly, her final salvo of “Never” is not true, for these student objections become a part of the requirement itself, the theme serving its daily purpose regardless of its complaint.
What is it about the expectations of this low-stakes writing course that bothers her enough to write such a melodramatic rejection of using her “pleasure” in life as a subject for her assignment for that day? If we take that her primary joy at this time was argument – as understood by her themes from February – then we have some idea about how she regards the writing for English 22. That is, for her, joy in living comes from personal interaction, from argument, from debate. Pleasure does not come from the solitary practice of daily writing, and by November 16 she is able to articulate this aspect of her displeasure. She does not see writing as a meditative practice through which she might filter her lived experience, and she certainly does not find the same kind of pleasure in writing these daily themes as in living her daily life. Writing is an externally motivated process; that is, the only reason she would choose to write is because of the expectation of the course. Since she does not derive personal pleasure from the activity, the external motivation is the only one she has, and therefore the focus of her resistance.

By February, however, Stein’s motivation has shifted from purely external – either to resist or comply – to a more internal and intrinsic motivation. She is finding the purpose of writing for herself rather than relying on the expectations of the course. As a result of this shift, she displays a greater sense of humor about the writing itself, an easier relationship towards the expectations of the course, and as an extension, a more accommodating stance towards her reader. Rather than producing stories as she did earlier, she uses the writing to meditate on writing; and to communicate her meditations.

---

20 Consider once more the passage from *The Making of Americans* in my introduction to this chapter: “It came to 925 pages and has been a pleasure to do and rather strange to do …” I believe Stein had discovered that pleasure in writing before 1903 when she began *MAO*; it’s hard to fathom her taking on that massive project without already having found more joy in writing than she did in November 1894. In fact, I think the roots of that pleasure are to be found in her year-long experience of English 22 as we will see in the next theme I address, from February 20, 1895.
to her professor. The course itself has become a subject of her themes. She has learned to
evaluate her writing with a wry acceptance that it may not be what her professor wants,
and she uses themes to accentuate this fact. Most importantly, instead of opposing
“living” with “writing” she can choose for them to be mutually constitutive. That is, the
writing can become an extension of the living without taking away her joy of either. In
allowing for this merge between living and writing, she finds more joy in both:

Gertrude Stein
Special
Feb. 20 1895
English 22

Once my Not many years ago, my self-analysis always
ended in heroics; but now it simply turns into mild medita-
tion, with a flavor of cynisism, and contents itself with invent-
ing wise saws to garnish a Daily Theme.

A happy consummation

In this progress towards becoming a writer between November and February – from
having “all pleasure blasted” to “inventing wise saws” – Daily Themes no longer
prevents her from enjoying life. In short, antagonism between living and writing is gone.
“Meditation” has replaced “cynisism.” The wise saws are her translation of observations
into thought. This is a glimpse of the later Stein, not so much in content, but in attitude
towards writing, where writing becomes living, and loving, and being. She has moved in
this one year from thinking of herself as actively not a writer, to seeing a purpose for her
writing. In English 22, then, she is first confronting the project of writing as an activity for critical thinking, for processing her day, for producing a “set argument,” even for displaying her cleverness. Here her attitude is shifting from self-absorption of the first semester, to writing as something outside of her self that can be a place to process. Daily Themes as a daily ritual, a daily requirement, is still driving her relationship to the writing she does, but she is “content” to do it rather than fight against it.

This is a reading confirmed by the teacher’s comment: “A happy consummation.” This choice of words at first seems odd, but is rather astute: it is a marriage of sorts, an ending of sorts, for Stein to be content to use Daily Themes to help her objectify her experience, her “self-analysis” as she calls it in this theme, and to transform it into “mild meditation.” This is a step that every writer must make: the motivation for writing becomes internalized, but the product of that writing is intended for external consumption, not a particular audience or reader, but all readers, or, as Stein later calls them, “strangers.” No longer focused on the “heroics” of self-analysis as her end-game, the student Stein sees a purpose for these living experiences; even if that purpose is only to “garnish a Daily Theme,” this recognition is invaluable. It shows a writer conscious of her audience and the expectations of the reading, capable of distancing herself from the writing, but content to use her life as the template for embellishment. The consummation that interests me here is between living and writing, for it is in Stein’s valuing of that consummation that she begins to leave the student behind for the writer she will become. She will do so by daily living, daily writing, and making a writing life of daily themes.
Conclusion – The Making of Gertrude Stein

Introduction

I offer in my conclusion a series of mini-essays that take our history of Stein's writing education at Radcliffe in English 22 beyond the original contexts, to connect the student Stein to the adult Stein, the student writing to the adult writing. This is both a conclusion, in that sense of finishing my brief history of Stein’s education in composition at Radcliffe, and an introduction, in the sense of opening the space between the end of Stein's undergraduate education, and the continuation of her writing life. I approach this by engaging with three 20th and 21st century critical responses to Stein's early writing: from the modernist perspective, from the compositionist perspective, and finally from Stein herself. My goal is to reaffirm that continuity that I have found between Stein's education and learning in English 22 and the course of her writing life. Through the modernist and compositionist critiques, I show how our disciplinary reading practices – what we see and what we don't see – have shaped our understanding of Stein, our own making of the artist, as I suggest in my title. Turning to Stein, we examine two of her texts, meditations on grammar and writing later in life, to trace backwards to the origins of those meditations, not only where she points us – for example, in the Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas – but where we can see the evidence of those early lessons on grammar, on paragraphs, on the structure of composition. In short, my conclusion is meant to connect her education in English 22 more firmly to the innovations she gave to modernist thinking, not, finally, because of its similarity on the page, but because of the foundational nature of that educational moment, English 22, in her thinking about language, writing, and daily life.
Two Centuries, *Three Lives*, One Modernist

The more or less common-place incidents of the outer world are well enough for those poor unfortunates whom nature has given no inner one. As for me who have lived in my short life all the intensest pains and pleasures that human nature is capable of experiencing, I disdain to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details.

- Gertrude Stein, Daily Theme from English 22, October 10th, 1894

Passionate natures who have always made themselves, to suffer, that is all the kind of people who have emotions that come to them as sharp as a sensation, they always get more tender-hearted when they suffer, and it always does them good to suffer. Tender-hearted, unpassionate, and comfortable natures always get much harder when they suffer, for so they lose the fear and reverence and wonder they once had for everybody who ever has to suffer, for now they know themselves what it is to suffer and it is not so awful any longer to them when they know too, just as well as all the others, how to have it.

- Gertrude Stein, “Melanctha” from *Three Lives*, written 1905, published 1909

We conclude our history where Stein began, with the opening theme of Stein’s sophomore year in English 22 followed by a paragraph from her first non-academic published work, *Three Lives*.1 We’ve addressed the first epigraph in chapter 4. Let’s consider the second epigraph, a fairly typical paragraph from “Melanctha,” the most critically acclaimed of the three stories that comprise Stein’s debut publication *Three Lives*, her first noted contribution to literary modernism. Juxtaposed with Stein’s debut performance in English 22, we can see that some of the same issues are still of interest to her. Stein’s theme in this paragraph from “Melanctha” is the contrast between “passionate” and “tender-hearted” natures, and their experience of suffering. In the decade that has passed since her sophomore year, she appears to have softened a bit

---

1 Her first published work was a scientific article co-written with graduate student Leon Solomons when Stein was an undergraduate. “Normal Motor Automatism” (1896) was published in the journal of the Harvard Psychological Laboratory. She was also the sole author of “Cultivated Motor Automatism: A Study of Character in its Relation to Attention” (1898), also published by the Harvard Psychological Laboratory.
towards the “poor unfortunates” who are unlike her, and in 1905 presents two kinds of opposed natures she has observed rather than the one nature – her own – that she had experienced. Stein has likewise chosen the third person point of view rather than first person, creating a distance between her and her characters. But there are similarities too. She is still more concerned with the inner world than the outer world; she still exudes the ethos of Eliot through human connections, suffering, and sympathy; and she still has trouble with her sentence structure, her punctuation, and her clarity. Ah, but does she?

This last observation is controversial, where the others are not. Though we can see the fingerprints of the earlier Stein in this epigraph from “Melanctha” – both in form and content – literary critics have read them as worlds apart. What do modernists see in the sentences of “Melanctha” that they do not see in the sentences from “In the Red Deeps”? Why style in the second excerpt, and error in the first?

Even in this limited comparative analysis, we can see the challenge posed by Stein’s juvenilia, when focused on basic sentence structure. In this representative passage from Three Lives, Stein’s composition instructor William Vaughn Moody would have seen the following: misused commas, dangling modifiers, fused sentences, made-up words, and confusing syntax. Stein was no longer a student when she wrote it, but if the markers are similar, what difference does that context make? For Stein as a writer? For us as readers? We can catalogue the similarities and differences we see in these two examples. We can make arguments about one being student writing, and the other being one of the most influential texts of the early 20th century. But when taken together, we see certain errors in the first epigraph, and we see certain errors in the second epigraph; and yet, history reads this second kind of error as style, Stein’s writing impulse developed.

2 For the most recent edition of critical essays on this story from Three Lives, see DeKoven (2006).
into a recognizable signature. The first mini-essay of my conclusion takes up this issue which in some senses had been the inspiration for this entire project: Stein’s move from error to style, and our – sometimes reluctant, sometimes dazzled – move as 20th-century readers from error to style with her.

During her English 22 course, William Vaughn Moody had instructed Gertrude Stein to “Rewrite” and rewrite she did. One of her first creative efforts post-Radcliffe was a thinly-veiled autobiographical novel called *Things as They Are or QED* (1903), a tale of her failed love affair with May Bookstaver, a fellow student at Johns Hopkins, the events of which took place between 1900-1902. With a troubled lesbian relationship at its center (documented in detail in Steinian biographies), this novel remained unpublished until after Stein’s death. “Melanctha,” it has been noted by critics, was a re-fashioning of *Things as They Are* into a relationship impasse between two heterosexual African Americans, Melanctha and Jeff. The other two stories in *Three Lives*, “The Good Anna” and the “The Gentle Lena” were based, respectively, on a Flaubertian imitation of “Un Coeur Simple” (from *Trois Contes*) and Stein’s housekeeper while she lived in Baltimore prior to her arrival in Cambridge. The suggestion to “translate” Flaubert supposedly came from her brother, Leo, but we could just as easily argue its origin as her training in imitation from her experience from the Daily Themes practices of English 22. We might

---

3 See Leon Katz’ *Introduction to Fernhurst, QED, and Other Early Writings* (1973/1996) for the background on this period of Stein’s life.

4 Diana Souhami notes in her introduction to *Three Lives* that Stein herself considered calling this collection of three tales, *The Making of an Author Being a History of One Woman and Many Others*, connecting quite directly the story of her becoming an author, “making” herself an author, with the history of that “one woman” she was telling (viii).

5 One assumes, when reading Stein’s biographies, that this “translation” was to be from French to English. It occurs to me now that the “translation” may have been from Flaubert to Stein, an imitation of Flaubert’s story based upon Stein’s life. Stein herself credits the “composition” of *Three Lives* to a certain painting by Cezanne, removing even from Flaubert the fundamental inspiration, and modernist sensibility, for these stories.
even observe, using Moody’s terms from his first end comment to Stein in English 22, that she has transformed a “personal experience” into a “study from an objective stand point.” But she ignored Moody’s other observations and recommendations for revision: her writing is still “marred by awkward and unidiomatic uses of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional patches of melodramatic writing.” These aspects of her writing remain consistent between her student writing in 1894 and her post-Radcliffe writing.

The main difference between the sentences from “In the Red Deeps” and “Melanctha” is not that one is clearly student work and one is not; rather, the main difference is that one was published and one was not. It was Stein’s assertion of herself as a writer who deserved to be published that launched her career, not a marked change in the skill of the writer, nor the discrimination of a printer who saw in her writing what she did. The history of Stein’s style could not begin until her work was published, and that took several years of submissions to many publishers (recounted in the Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas), many rejections, and eventually $660 out of her own pocket paid to a vanity publisher who was a friend of a friend.6

Stein’s first publisher was Frederick H. Hitchcock, director of the Grafton Press of New York. Based on his correspondence with Stein, it is clear that the criticism that faced Stein’s student writing in 1894 clung to her first publication in 1909. Hitchcock wrote a letter to Stein in April 1909, following the publication of Three Lives: “I want to say frankly that I think you have written a very peculiar book and it will be a hard thing

6 Three Lives was published in a run of 1500 copies by the Grafton Press, paid for by Gertrude Stein, and mediated by her love-interest from her college-days, May Bookstaver, who served as one of the agents in the publishing transaction. Bookstaver was one of the subjects of Stein’s novel QED, and married Charles Knoblauch in 1906. See Souhami, Introduction to Three Lives, xix.
to make people take it seriously.” He had been so concerned about this “peculiar” book prior to its publication, that he sent one of his editors to Paris to speak directly with Stein. She records this exchange many years later in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*.

Note in particular my italicized sentences below which draw attention to Stein’s response to the personal visit by the publisher’s agent:

One day some one knocked at the door and a very nice very american young man asked if he might speak to Miss Stein. She said, yes come in. He said, I have come at the request of the Grafton Press. Yes, she said. You see, he said slightly hesitant, the director of the Grafton Press is under the impression that perhaps your knowledge of english. But I am an american, said Gertrude Stein indignant. Yes yes I understand that perfectly now, he said, but perhaps you have not had much experience in writing. I supposed, said she laughing, you were under the impression that I was imperfectly educated. He blushed, why no, he said, but you might not have had much experience in writing. Oh yes, she said, oh yes. Well it’s alright. I will write to the director and you might as well tell him also that everything that is written in the manuscript is written with the intention of its being so written and all he has to do is print it and I will take the responsibility. The young man bowed himself out.  

This account of the Grafton Press publication of *Three Lives* shows that Stein can laugh at herself as well as at the publisher, and still insist on the publication. Stein didn’t need different sentences; she needed conviction and financing, and by 1909 she had both. The claim she makes is to “intention.” This assertion by Stein is essential to our understanding of her place in modernism, and it has affected our absorption of Stein’s work in the 20th and 21st centuries.

What we read depends not only on what we want to read, our agenda, as I argued in chapter 4, but also upon who wrote it. The young man from the Grafton Press was confused because he had expected a foreigner, not an American. When faced with an American insisting upon her strange sentences, and backed by money, the only option was to “bow out.” We are back, as we were in chapter 4, to considering the production-

---

7 Stein, *Selected Writings of Gertrude Stein*, ed. Van Vechten, 63; italics mine.
consumption relationship, this time not with her student writing, but with her first modernist contribution. My broader point with this example is that the publisher’s need to “trust the writer” or to “trust the writing” collapses the distinction between authorial identity and the writing object produced. That is, Stein’s identity as an American, and her insistence on sentences that read more like non-standard English prompted the publisher to turn from text to author for explanation. The fascination with Stein the person, Stein the icon, as a result of her perplexing writing, indicates the false connection that the reading public can foist upon texts, especially when those texts are abstruse or inaccessible by common reading practices. This means that only as these two aspects of writer-writing diverge does the need to consider authorial intention emerge because we separate out the controller from what is controlled, the author from the sentences she writes. As soon as Stein insists upon her sentences, she has nudged us from error to style, regardless of what is on the page. Here the author is not incidental to the reception of text, but integral to it.

Some may argue that the text itself is primary, that the text makes the connection between reader and writer irrelevant. The relevant interface, they would say, is between reader and text. I’d like to push against that idea using the consumption of Stein – the public fascination with her as a person – as one consequence of the failure of connection between her readers and her texts. Readers will turn to the writer when the writing fails them, and this will always produce a false – or skewed – relationship with the writing itself. Hence the humor in Stein’s story, her description of the publisher’s confusion. But

---

8 This tendency to shift focus from text to author to seek interpretative help is another factor contributing to the biographical interpretations of the student themes. What are we to do with them critically? Having spent many years working on Stein, I empathize quite literally with the difficulty in addressing Stein’s texts effectively.
it is only humorous if we believe in her version of the story, not only the facts within it, but the intention behind it. That is exactly what has happened with contemporary criticism, both of the stories in Three Lives, and of Stein’s account of its publication history.

* * * * *

In the final paragraph of her preface to the Norton critical edition of Three Lives and QED, editor Marianne DeKoven encapsulates the unusual publication and reception history of Three Lives. As with my approach above, DeKoven’s source for the publication history is Gertrude Stein’s Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas (ABT). DeKoven’s contextualization of this story in 2006 takes for granted the chasm between the publication history as described by Stein, and the reception history of which the Norton edition is merely the most recent, and the most critically acclaimed. Note in particular the final two sentences below, and the gap that DeKoven deliberately places between them. She writes:

Stein could not find a publisher for Three Lives, as she explains humorously in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. She finally published it at her own expense with the Grafton Press in 1909. This press, unaware that Stein was American, and making assumptions based on her Parisian residence, sent a representative to Stein’s home to ask whether she might need some help with her English. Since that time, Three Lives has become one of the most important works of literary modernism in any language.9

DeKoven takes Stein’s 1934 version of this story, and amps it up, concluding her introduction with two sentences designed to demonstrate just how misguided Mr. Hitchcock was. In the penultimate sentence, DeKoven describes a reader who has assumed Stein is a non-native speaker and writer of English. In the final sentence, the folly of this misunderstanding is understood by the contemporary critic because history

9 DeKoven, Three Lives, x.
has born out a different critical response. The joke is on the poor publisher from the
Grafton Press who did not know how to read Stein. Both sentences describe *Three Lives*,
but in the first, the text is assumed to be written by a foreigner requiring ESL assistance
or editing, and in the next, it has secured its place at the center of literary modernism,
reconfiguring the critical reception of *Three Lives* in one dramatic sweep.¹⁰ This
observation reveals perhaps as much about our construction of early literary modernism
as about Gertrude Stein, the editor of the Grafton Press, or *Three Lives*. How could that
publisher have been so blind? What happened “since that time” to turn this text from a
foreigner’s attempt at a novel to a modernist masterpiece? DeKoven pinpoints that
discrepancy without explanation, highlighting the misunderstanding of the reader. In
doing so, she reconfigures the critical reception of Stein not as text-based, but as reader-
based, the Norton critical edition serving as collective evidence. How Stein’s writing is
received depends upon the understanding of the reader: a truism perhaps. The dramatic
aspect to this, however, is the chasm between one understanding and the other that is
traversed by that one phrase, “Since that time...”

I had planned in my dissertation to delve into the figurative space between
DeKoven’s penultimate and final sentences, exploring the gap that DeKoven’s rendering
exposes, between Stein’s ostensible error, her assertion of style, and modernist criticism’s
affirmation of this distinction. How did Gertrude Stein begin her life as a writer by being
mistaken for an “imperfectly educated” or foreign writer of English in 1909 and come to

¹⁰ DeKoven attributes the misunderstanding solely to the Parisian address. But Stein’s own account quite
specifically fingers her sentences as well. As Stein tells the story, the reason for the misunderstanding was
orthographic, not purely geographic, that the publisher had the impression that she “was imperfectly
educated” or that she “might not have had much experience with writing,” not simply that she lived in Paris
and was not an American. The Parisian address may simply have given him an easier justification to
question the author’s competence. The non-native element was only the first of the reasons given by Stein
in her account in *The Autobiography*. DeKoven leaves these latter two possibilities, relating to Stein’s
education and writing experience, out of her own telling of this narrative.
be recognized, for that same text, as one of the most important writers of the 20th century? What happened “since that time” that shifted our disposition to read Stein from an inadequate, or non-native writer, to the author of “one of the most important works of literary modernism in any language”? But my focus on her student themes, and then on her undergraduate education, pushed this transitional period into my conclusion, to become a prelude to my next project when I, like the author of *Three Lives*, am no longer a student: exploring more deeply the relationship between error and style in Stein’s adult writing as it relates to our reading and understanding of basic writers in contemporary composition, with whom I find a common thread, both in production and consumption. I read Stein’s writing, especially through that transitional period from student to non-student, as a point of departure for examining how and when we read for error or style: her initial critical reception as a student (promising, but seriously flawed), her initial critical reception as a young adult (not promising, but well-funded), and her unlikely place in the pantheon of 20th century writers (exemplar of style). I have laid the groundwork for such a study here in this dissertation.

The publication history of *Three Lives*, the persistence of signature errors – what I might call, borrowing from linguists and compositionists, “idiosyncratic grammar”11 were I opposed to calling them errors – from the student writing into the adult writing, the ease with which most Steinian scholarship has erased that close association between error and style, suggests to me that interrogating that association is a natural extension from my final chapters of this dissertation. In short, for Stein’s readers – of her student work or *Three Lives* – hindsight is not so much 20/20 vision based on the text, but 20/20 based upon the moment in which we have read, and how we have been trained to

11 See David Bartholomae’s “The Study of Error” (1980). I address this essay later in this conclusion.
evaluate the text in front of us. We saw this with Stein’s student writing in my chapter 4. DeKoven provides us with yet another example. The difference, however, is that DeKoven is not concerned with the student themes, but with Stein’s first recognized contribution to literary modernism, confirmed by the very fact of its Norton annotated edition. Part of its publishing history – an accentuated part in fact – involves questions of mediocrity, sloppiness, lack of writing skill, even of native capacity in English. Indeed, the publisher’s response to this effort is less encouraging than even Stein’s teacher, Moody. What does this show? Despite the ten years that separate them, the line between the early adult writing and the student writing from English 22 is hardly distinct.

Though faced with similar criticism of her writing post-Radcliffe, Stein’s work from 1905 onward – *Three Lives*, and her magnum opus, *The Making of Americans* – have become part of the modernist canon, and for many composition theorists and Stein scholars, now exemplify modernist innovation at its best and a style to be deciphered and marveled at, not dismissed or ridiculed. Stein shares with other eminent stylists the projection of a unique voice, cultivated, inimitable. Thus our contemporary understanding of Stein, and the commonplace that interests me, depends upon a distinction between her student essays and her innovative work as an adult, upon a forced distinction between error and style.

No contemporary critics are as certain as Mr. Hitchcock of Stein’s error as error in *Three Lives*. But some contemporary critics are not certain that it isn’t error either. They are just not sure what to call it. Some create or borrow terms from other disciplines such as “idiosyncratic grammar” as I suggested above, or “semi-grammatical” as

---

12 In addition to DeKoven and Souhami, the modernists, we will also look at compositionists who ascribed to Stein’s self-assessment as genius.
DeKoven has done, making powerful, theoretically-based arguments for Stein’s conscious and intentional manipulation of grammar. And then there are contemporary Steinian critics who admit to being confounded by *Three Lives*. Diane Souhami, in her introduction to the Bantam Classics edition, wonders whether Stein was simply working at the limits of her ability. “It is unclear,” she writes, “how far [Stein] was in control of her odd style. She did not, like her main literary rival James Joyce, write a formally constructed book before experimenting with form, nor like Picasso, work realistically before choosing abstraction.” Besides drawing attention to Stein’s lack of conventional success prior to her experimental departure, she almost echoes Mr. Hitchcock’s concerns by referencing Stein’s German-Jewish first-generation American parents for whom English was a second language, pointing to Stein’s childhood in Europe as well as California, and drawing attention to her semi-literate brother Simon. “Something of her family’s strange speech patterns and anti-grammar found its way into her unmistakable originality.” Even more impressive, this originality, given Stein’s humble origins! For DeKoven there is no doubt about Stein’s control in *Three Lives*, and for Souhami, yet another turn to biography to explain away her doubt. The commonality in both contemporary critical approaches, however, is a decided rejection of the term “error” to describe any of Stein’s sentences as an adult writer. Souhami calls them “grammatical eccentricities, unusual locutions, experimental dialogue, and a sudden instructive authorial voice” (all of which extend directly, by my read, from Stein’s Daily Themes period). One must assume that Souhami sees these kinds of ticks as intentional if not

---

14 Souhami, introduction to *Three Lives*, ix-x.
15 Souhami, Introduction, x.
completely controlled. Error thus becomes something “unintentional” in Stein, not something “incorrect.” The logic follows then, if it is “intentional,” it is not error. It becomes style.

This is, of course, what Stein was getting at in her story about the publisher in the *Autobiography of Alice B.Toklas*. She was, in short, demonstrating without explaining how a single text can be reinterpreted from error to style. She shifts our attention from control to intention, leaving us with the option to either believe in that intention or not. By wondering whether Stein was in control, but affirming her intention, Souhami has the right idea in examining Stein’s earliest texts post-Radcliffe, for they urge us, then, to question where and how that style was developed beyond simply taking Stein’s word for it. We *should* question Stein, for education has much to teach us about how writers learn, how teachers teach, and what composition can do. In recasting the *ABT* incident as she does, DeKoven removes any question marks: “odd style,” as Souhami had called it in her assessment, simply becomes a true misreading of Stein, an assumed transformation from error to style: the erasure of the error is complete. We have arrived at style. We have arrived at modernism.

What has changed? For Stein, the shift from a Radcliffe classroom to Paris, France, from financial dependence to relative independence, from following her brother to insisting upon her own instincts, the arrival of Alice. These are relevant for Stein’s writing life. But for our reading, nothing is more important than the cultural moment in which Stein presented them publicly. Literary and cultural modernism intervenes in the early 20th century, both for Stein in her moment of production, and in the reading of her work. She called this, in several of her essays from the 1920s and 1930s,
“contemporaneity,” what an artist does to record the moment in which he is producing art.16 In that sense, Stein’s student themes, written in the 19th century, are not simply products of a college student, but products of a time; that is, they represent not only a time before Stein professed that she was a writer, but before she could be recognized as a modernist. By 1909 that context had shifted, and though the press – naturally conservative as a business – could not see this, Stein could. About one thing there is no doubt: Stein was prescient in what modernism would become and where she could fit. What her student themes could, and could not, do in 1894 was no longer relevant. And yet, their place in her writing history was absolutely essential, for they place-marked where she had emerged from, and what she was writing against from 1903-1909. Stein’s forward-thinking was produced not only against the 19th-century writing that she had consumed as a reader, but the writing she had done as a student.

We are still pushing against that student writing in contemporary criticism of Stein the modernist. But we have absorbed her next phase of writing as a departure rather than as a continuation of her student work. I would like to see us revise this view. I would like the modernist perspective to include an understanding of Stein’s origins as a writer, back to the first texts she saved, those Daily Themes that rankle and confuse, but are still undeniably, Steinian. It was Stein’s life’s project to make people take her writing seriously, and she did succeed, her first publisher’s caution about the public

16 From her lecture, “How Writing is Written” (1935): “So what I am trying to make you understand is that every contemporary writer has to find out what is the inner time-sense of his contemporariness. The writer or painter, or what not, feels this thing more vibrantly, and he has a passionate need of putting it down; and that is what creativeness does. He spends his life in putting down this thing which he doesn’t know is a contemporary thing. If he doesn’t put down the contemporary thing, he isn’t a great writer, for he has to live in the past. That is what I mean by ‘everything is contemporary.’ The minor poets of the period [people like William Vaughan Moody, for example] are all people who live under the shadow of the past. A man who is making a revolution has to be contemporary. A minor person can live in the imagination. That tells the story pretty completely” (158).
notwithstanding. She succeeded so well, in fact, that today, despite continuing detractors and the bewildered, her writing is often held up as an exemplar of style: the strongest assertion of an individual’s writing identity, what differentiates that writer from all others. Stein exercises authority through and over her writing in *Three Lives* because she is sure of what she is doing, even if her readers are not. By the time she has written *Three Lives*, so the modernist critical narrative goes, Stein has made a project of writing, is in control of her ideas, if not her sentences, and sure of her intentions.

**Gertrude Stein and the Compositionists**

I turn in my next mini-essay from the modernist perspective to the compositionist perspective: one might expect this to include a refocusing from the adult to the student writing. Not so. Strangely enough, contemporary compositionists who take an interest in Stein have not taken up an equal interest in her Daily Themes. David Bartholomae is one of those compositionists who holds up the writing of the adult Stein as an exemplar for his students, and who writes about Stein in his scholarly work. He began in the field in the 1970s with an interest in basic writers, when compositionists were just beginning to catalogue and define this new class of student entering the university and perplexing the professorate with their writing.¹⁷ We should sense here some resonance with my histories of Special Students in chapters 1 and 2: a new breed of student entering the university with fewer skills, lack of preparation for college work, especially in literacy, reading and writing, and an institutional mandate to teach them. The Special Students of Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1870s may have been separated by a century from the students coming

¹⁷ The foundational text for the study of basic writers and basic writing is Mina Shaugnessy’s *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing* (1977). For a smart look at the response of the professorate to Open Admissions in the CUNY system, see Mary Soliday’s *The Politics of Remediation*. 
into the CUNY system through Open Admissions in the 1970s, but the institution, and its
teachers, were faced with many of the same challenges.¹⁸

Coming from his background in literature and transitioning to composition at this
time of institutional transition based upon a new and growing student body, Bartholomae
noted, with exasperation and impertinence, similarities between the work of his basic
writers and the work of Gertrude Stein, who at that time was all the vogue as well with
the emergence of feminist theory and its tools to open our understanding of Stein’s adult
work. He tells a story in one of his later essays, “Living In Style,” about looking back on
his own origins as a compositionist, arguing for basic writers’ place in the university, and
wishing that his literary colleagues could value them – read their work, invest in them –
as he did. His exasperation was tied, in part, to the value difference between literary and
composition studies, whose unequal foundations at Harvard I touch on in chapter 3. But
the direct comparison of their writing – Stein with a basic writer – raises questions for
both modernists and compositionists. I felt a kinship with Bartholomae’s story of his own
beginnings in 1970s, for I began my dissertation with the same kind of associative
observations between Stein’s adult writing and the basic writing produced in my
developmental composition classes at Rutgers, though I did not feel the same authority to
proclaim that to my modernist professors. For Bartholomae, this experience induced an
intense study of basic writing and error. For me, it induced a study of the student writing
of Gertrude Stein. Bartholomae, to my knowledge, has not looked at the student writing
of Stein. As we move to the compositionists next, I pick up where he has left off.
Extending our modernist terms control and intent, with help by Bartholomae, we add two
terms, failure and genius, the first of which is often used when talking of students but the

¹⁸ For more information on CUNY and Open Admissions, see Shaughnessy, Rich, Lu, and Horner and Lu.
latter of which is not. Both, however, are particularly apt, when talking of Stein.

Bartholomae uses all four of these terms in his foundational essay on basic writing and the study of error.

Failure, Genius, Control, and Intent

All writing, of course, could be said to only approximate conventional discourse; our writing is never either completely predictable or completely idiosyncratic … The distance between text and conventional expectation may be a sign of failure and it may be a sign of genius, depending on the level of control and intent we are willing to assign to the writer, and depending on the insight we acquire from seeing convention so transformed.

- David Bartholomae, “The Study of Error”

In this essay from 1980 David Bartholomae judges the capacity of a writer from one of two modes of reception: 1) as a critic, teacher, or expert: what “level of control and intent we are willing to assign to the writer;” and 2) as an acolyte, student, or learner: the effect the writing has upon the reader and “the insight we acquire from seeing convention so transformed.”¹⁹ To put this in the context of my dissertation, in the first case, we read as the teacher, as Moody, as the critic who asserts his own authority over the text, through an assumption of what the text reveals about a students’ control or lack thereof. In the second case, for a reason ascribed to the text itself, our relationship to authority as a reader is inverted; the reader becomes the student of the text. And because of this inversion, the authority is transferred to the writer.

Bartholomae’s observation in this quotation is rich in many ways, but I’d like first to focus on the line he draws between failure and genius, and the role of the reader in determining which is which. Bartholomae moves away from these terms in his essay,

preferring to see “failure” as a transitional stage of learning. As for “genius,” this word drops out completely, for his essay is focused on basic writing and error, no place for the consideration of genius. I, however, take those two words – failure and genius – very seriously because of the resonance they have with Stein, not only the sense of her failure as a student writer to impress, but also her claims of genius as an adult, well-documented in her own texts, and discussed in the literature. For Bartholomae, failure or genius is not dependent upon some identifiable and intrinsic quality of text, (though he does go on to define some of these qualities in a ‘basic writing’), but upon a much less definable relationship that implicates the reader’s ascription of authority far more than any adherence to conventional expectation. Whether we consider a text to represent failure or genius depends largely on how we view the author, first, and what we learn from the text, second. In fact, that is the point he appears to be making about basic writers, whose lack of assumed control automatically diminishes the extent to which any deviation from convention is acceptable to a reader. The more “talented” a student writer becomes, the more we are willing to accept “idiosyncracy” in the writing, that is, the further from failure, the closer to genius:

For a basic writer the distance between text and convention is greater than it is for the run-of-the-mill freshman writer. It may be, however, that the more talented the

---

20 For Stein’s personal claims to genius, see The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. In the following quote, Stein is speaking “as” Alice: “I may say that only three times in my life have I met a genius and each time a bell within my rang and I was not mistaken, and I may say in each case it was before there was any general recognition of the quality of genius in them. The three geniuses of whom I wish to speak are Gertrude Stein, Pablo Picasso and Alfred Whitehead” (5). The other amusing passage from ABT is “Alice’s” claim that the geniuses came and sat with Stein, and she sat with their wives. For the study of genius and Stein, see Catharine Stimpson’s essay, The Mind, Body, and Gertrude Stein” published in Critical Inquiry in 1977: “In 1908, [Stein] read that dreary classic of male supremacy disguised as science: Otto Weininger’s Sex and Character. She apparently praised it, for in 1909, a friend wrote to tell her that it was lunatic even if Stein did say it ‘exactly embodied’ her views” (137). Stimpson continues: “That Stein would approve of Weininger points to some confusion and ambivalence. For Weininger despises both women and Jews, who are, to him, womanly. He asserts that no woman ever has been or will be a genius, an exalted status to which Stein aspired…” (Stimpson in Bloom 137). Stimpson makes the following direct claim in the first few paragraphs: “[Stein] was a genius, whom I honor, but one with several disagreeable traits” (131).
freshman writer becomes, the more able she is to increase again the distance between text and convention. We are drawn to conclude that basic writers lack control, although it may be more precise to say that they lack choice and option, the power to make decisions about the idiosyncracy of their writing.\footnote{Bartholomae, “The Study of Error,” 21.}

My point is that if we are to understand this move between failure and genius adequately, we must begin to read in more nuanced ways than this either/or fashion that seems to be the default mode, driven by the need to understand who is the “teacher” and who is the “student,” who is the authority, and who has control over the reader-writer relationship. One of Bartholomae’s vital contributions here is demonstrating how easily and unconsciously we move from one to the other based entirely on whether we see idiosyncracy or error. His subjects in this critique are “basic writers” such as those identified by Mina Shaughnessy in the 1970s. But as I hope is becoming clear, this mode of reading is quite apt when approaching both the student and adult writing of Stein.

In reading though this transition with Stein’s writing, I want to go even further than Bartholomae by explicitly disaggregating the idea of control from the idea of intent as we did in the previous section. In other words, the tendency to read in this polar opposites way – “failure” or “genius” – arises because of the collapse of control with intent. Bartholomae ascribes both control and intent to the reader in this case, through what the reader is “willing to assign” to the writer. But control is more easily objectified through conventional expectations, hence the interest in the “study of error” – error is of course a basic metric of control in composition courses. But here, with Stein as subject, not only is control in question, but the very definition of error is also up for grabs, as I’ve shown previously. If Stein is not read in the classroom, where error will be identified and corrected, she is still assumed to be a non-native speaker of English. We ascribe the
assumption of error to the control as evaluated within the sentences themselves, and reinforced by the foreign address in Paris. Stein undercuts that assumed lack of control, evidence of error, by claiming intent. To use Bartholomae’s terms from above, Stein becomes “idiosyncratic” when she asserts her intention, not when Hitchcock, or any of her other early readers, recognizes her “talent” by increased control. Indeed, measured in conventional terms, Stein never employed this metric of control in her published writing.22

We can see control in sentences most obviously if they are correctly rendered by standard conventions. It is more difficult with avant-garde writing, and with student writing of the basic variety, because control is not necessarily conveyed through “correctness.” This shifts our reading practices to other means of evaluation and hermeneutics, as feminist theory showed us for Stein, for example, and as Shaugnessy and Bartholomae’s efforts showed us for basic writers. One difficulty with reading Stein is that, unlike many other modernists, she does not convince fully and extensively—before her departure into avant-garde experimentation—that she has control of her sentences. This difficulty is present for her supporters as well as her detractors, as we saw with Diana Souhami’s assessment. And so, the tension between control and intention for Stein is fraught. As Souhami also suggested in that same foreword, it’s not important in one sense whether Stein is in control or not because, like David Bartholomae, we all read in this either/or way regardless of whether the author is in control of the sentences. But it

22 Where we see this kind of control exhibited most strongly in Stein’s writing is in her Third Forensic from Radcliffe College, English C, 1895-1895; transcribed by Amy Feinstein, and published in the *PMLA*, 116:2, 416-428. I have also included a transcription of it in my appendices. More than any of her work as an adult, her essays, or her lectures, this argumentative piece demonstrates convincingly that Stein could write clear, standard written English. It is her only piece of writing which does not contain the kinds of markers that we expect of Steinian prose. As a manuscript in her hand, we also know that it was not edited.
does matter whether Stein means what she writes, and whether she is aware of what she is doing: intention is the critical metric, not control.

The primary consequence of this shift from control to intention is uncertainty about what we are supposed to understand, and secondly, whether or not we can trust the writing. To use a popular Steinian expression, it depends whether there is any “there there,” and this assessment relies on intention, not on control. But how do we read for intention? And more importantly, if intention becomes what we are reading for, how do we reconcile this with what we see on the page? How do we evaluate the writing? The implications for this in student writing are profound and varying: do we grade what the student meant to say? Or do we grade what she actually wrote? Do we respond to what a student seems to be arguing? Or do we respond to what she argued? And what are we teaching when we respond one way or the other? What would Stein’s instructors have been teaching if they had focused less on what she was writing as it corresponded with their conventions, and more on how what she wrote departed from them? Would she have cultivated a dislike of commas? If her professor had not made them so important, for such a frivolous reason as grammatical propriety, would she have argued later in life that commas actively disturb the flow of sentences, citing this as the reason for her decision to eliminate them from her writing?23

23 She explains her elimination of commas in her 1935 lecture, “How Writing Is Written”: “…when I began writing, the whole question of punctuation was a vital question. You see, I had this new conception: I had this conception of the whole paragraph, and in The Making of Americans I had this idea of a whole thing …. So the element of punctuation was very vital. The comma was just a nuisance. If you got the thing as a whole, the comma kept irritating you all along the line. If you think of a thing as a whole, and the comma keeps sticking out, it gets on your nerves; because, after all, it destroys the reality of the whole. So I got rid more and more of commas. Not because I had any prejudice against commas; but the comma was a stumbling-block. When you were conceiving a sentence, the comma stopped you. That is the illustration of the question of grammar and parts of speech, as part of the daily life as we live it” (153).
In chapter 4 we considered the impact of multiple readers’ intentions on our understanding of Stein’s student essays over time. In this conclusion, I want us to meditate on Stein’s intentions in her writing – as much as we can determine them – and how they are connected to this issue of control on the sentence level. It’s important to me that this assertion of control, in the context of the writing classroom, requires a wrestling of authority from the teacher. We could use a less violent term than wrestling: transfer of authority, granting of authority, passing on of authority, acknowledgement of authority. But I do not feel that any of these peaceful transitions describes Stein’s position with relation to Moody in her Daily Themes, or her exchange with Hitchcock, as cordial as it was, or her need to say that she wrote only for herself and strangers. If authority is transferred between teacher and student, or between a difficult avant-garde writer and perplexed public, it is sure to be a strained transfer on both sides.

Living in Error, “Living in Style”

David Bartholomae began his career with the study of error and basic writing. He has traded that study of error for “Living in Style.” He opens his essay of that title with a series of epigraphs, what he calls a “kind of found poem,” selected from a book of quotations he has kept over the years. The quotations are meant to serve collectively as an entrée to Writing at the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching, a collection drawn from his quarter-century teaching and writing career. Several of his examples are from Gertrude Stein, one from her 1934 lecture, “Poetry and Grammar,” and a set of three passages from her book How To Write (1932):

When you are at school and learn grammar, grammar is very exciting. I really do not know that anything has ever been more exciting than diagraming [sic]
sentences. I suppose other things may be more exciting to others when they are at school but to me undoubtedly when I was at school the really completely exciting thing was diagraming [sic] sentences and that has been to me ever since the one thing that has been completely exciting and completely completing. I like the feeling the everlasting feeling of sentences as they diagram themselves.

- Gertrude Stein, “Poetry and Grammar” (210-211)

A sentence is an interval in which there is a finally forward and back. A sentence is an interval during which if there is a difficulty they will do away with it. A sentence is a part of the way when they wish to be secure. A sentence is their politeness in asking for a cessation. And when it happens they look up. A sentence is an allowance of a confusion. There are different ways of making of, of course.

A sentence is really when they are allowed without their properly felt in feeling an exchange. How are hours felt in their allowance.

A sentence is why they take pains to do it twice. Twice they take pains to do it twice as often. A sentence is with their liking to do it slowly. With their liking to do it slowly they allow themselves to advance.

- Gertrude Stein, How To Write (133)

Bartholomae follows these quotations from Gertrude Stein, nothing but white space in between, with two student sentences from Mina Shaughnessy’s Errors and Expectations, in which she first identified and catalogued “basic writers,” students admitted following CUNY’s Open Admissions policies in the 1970s who demonstrated a new challenge to the teaching of composition:

If a person feels that by getting a college degree would make him a better person although the jobs to fit his education might not be in demand of course it makes sense. (50)

In my opinion I believe that you there is no field that cannot be effected some sort of advancement that one maybe need a college degree to make it. (62)

Bartholomae prefaces all of these quotations with a proviso: he sees them all, including the student sentences, as “moments of striking eloquence.” They are to be read with equanimity, without judgment. Under this directive, Bartholomae juxtaposes Stein with these basic writers from Shaughnessy’s seminal text intentionally, provocatively. For
Bartholomae, this series of quotations – which also includes Don DeLillo, Charles Bernstein, and Ludwig Wittgenstein – beg for him the following two questions: first, “How do we understand the relationship between our students and the languages of power and knowledge that circulate inside and outside the university?” and second, “Or, from the position of the student, what might it mean to match wits with the language, to see yourself in sentences?” Despite Bartholomae’s inclusion of them here, it is likely that the students who wrote these last two sentences found their wits matched with the following list of errors: syntax and pronoun agreement problems, verb tense shifts, and an inability to work with commas and subordinating conjunctions.

Later in his essay, we get a sense of why he juxtaposed these sentences of Stein and basic writers. He confesses that back in the 1970s, when his primary interest in composition was in basic writing, he had asked of his colleagues in literature, “‘If they can read Gertrude Stein and value what she does, why can’t they read the work of basic writers – why can’t they give it the same time and attention, why can’t they value the work?’” 24 His goal is to use the validation these scholars have of Stein to validate the basic writers. His intention is not to question the competence of Stein, but to engage the interest of those who see value in her writing. But either way, his comparison depends on a similarity – at least one seen by him – between Stein and his basic writers. His impertinence in making such a comparison speaks to the unbalanced valuing of composition and literary studies, but also to his participation in the former and chosen exclusion in the latter: by equating these two kinds of writing, he deliberately claims the part of the fool, and I mean this in the Shakespearean sense: the character who speaks truth which nobody else sees. He is confident enough in his own authority to risk being

accused of ignorance of Stein. It is his posed ignorance of her genius which allows a clarity of observation that Steinian experts rarely have. From the Steinian, modernist perspective, anyone who would equate basic writers with Stein – even humorously to draw attention to a great need in academe to attend to our students – is expressing a fundamental misunderstanding of Stein. Bartholomae tells this story out of a deep respect for Stein’s thinking about language and a devotion to teaching basic writers. But why compare them in the first place? Why choose Stein, of all writers, to draw attention to basic writing? Because for Bartholomae, as for myself, her sentences are reminiscent of those of basic writers, sometimes amusingly, sometimes disturbingly.

The questions I would ask of Bartholomae are the following: What does he see in the white space between these particular quotations, between Steinian sentences and those of the basic writers that Shaughnessy studied in the 1970s and 80s? Does he see them differently? Does he value them differently? What if, rather than the sentences of the adult Stein, we were to quote the sentences of the student, to juxtapose Stein’s student writing with that of Shaugnessy’s basic writers? How would that change the calculus of this provocative opening? Would the similarity between the basic writers of Shaughnessy’s book and Stein’s sentences from English 22 be as thought-provoking for Bartholomae? Or would they, perhaps, be more thought-provoking still?

By my read, Bartholomae’s risk in using Stein in this opening gambit – and he is not alone amongst compositionists in taking an interest in the adult Stein – becomes apparent a few pages later when he asserts that “within the conditions of the sentence, [Stein] taught herself to write with a precise attention to the workings of parts.”25 This is the position taken by other compositionists who engage with Stein, and who find in her

25 Ibid., 4.
writing evidence of a unique and authoritative voice, the assertion of a personality through writing, such that the writing can only belong to one person. She is for them a “stylist.” 26 The problem with Bartholomae’s claim is that Stein’s style frequently does not play “within the conditions of the sentence,” at least not within the kinds of sentences that Bartholomae or Shaughnessy have spent most of their careers teaching and reading, those produced within the composition classroom, or more broadly, within academe.

The other strategy in working with Stein – far more common because taken up by modernists and Steinian apologists – is to argue that she deliberately does not work “within the conditions of the sentence.” For these scholars, Stein is, in fact, doing everything she can to demonstrate how limiting the conventions of a sentence are to the potential meanings and doings of language. And yet, I find this an equally unsatisfying and partial reading of Stein because it must argue away what Bartholomae does convey in this introduction to his 25 years of study in and on the field of composition: a reason – some reason, unexplained – to place the sentences of basic writers next to those of Gertrude Stein. Having juxtaposed these sentences in the beginning of his article, he backs away from analysis and leaves for the Steinians and the feminists – Terry Castle, Marianne DeKoven, Marjorie Perloff, Ulla Dydo – to explain why Stein is Stein and

26 For example, see Min-Zhan Lu’s “Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone” (1994). She uses the publication story of Three Lives from The Autobiography to show that Stein’s “ethnic” identity as an American, and her “education” at Radcliffe gave her the authority to insist that her “style represented self-conscious and innovative experimentation” rather than “blundering ‘errors’” (168). In opening her discussion of the politics of style, she also cites a story about Theodore Dreiser. As with Bartholomae’s limited analysis of Stein, Lu devotes one large quotation (the same one quoted directly by me and referenced by DeKoven) and one paragraph to the analysis of Stein’s story; Dreiser, on the other hand receives five paragraphs of analysis and a sympathetic reading for his submissive reaction to a critique of his style. Lu attributes this to “his acute awareness of the criteria used by ‘educated America’ when dealing with the writing of the son of an impoverished German immigrant with extremely sporadic formal education” (168). Lu is clearly not familiar with Stein’s Jewish-German immigrant background, her peripatetic youth spent partially in Europe, the financial issues with her family, or her sporadic formal education prior to Radcliffe. Stein’s insistence on her lack of error, her claim to style, is enough for Lu to pass the inquiry from Stein’s writing.
Basic Writers are Basic Writers. He takes the “now accepted way of accounting for the
difficulty or the oddity of Stein’s style” from the experts, reducing it to “sexual politics.”
Adding, from the compositionist’s point of view, “in these sentences, we see and feel and
understand the work of the writer in relation to the work of the writing.” They all can be
stylists, Bartholomae suggests in this introduction, as long as they pay attention to
sentences. The irony is that Bartholomae can only do this by not paying attention to a
basic observation: even in the quotations he cites, from How to Write, Stein doesn’t write
sentences, not the kind we teach either basic writers or those in freshman composition.
They may look similar, but for the students we assess, we teach, we try to change them,
or make them aware of the differences between their writing and ours, and for Stein, we
marvel at what we don’t understand, hoping for insight at the next reading.

The real value I see here is that deliberate comparisons of Stein’s surface-level
style with basic writing may, in fact, show more than we want it to show: the possibility
that beyond providing insight into the workings of sentences, Stein’s “style” may be
evidence of a well-managed inability to master conventional writing.27 Of course,
Bartholomae does not go this route. He does not see error in Stein, even as he sees in her
work the shadows of basic writing. Taking his cues from Richard Poirier and Bill Coles,
he writes, “If a writer’s education is to matter, if it is to be anything more than a
conventional exercise in correctness, it must confront the question of style – the record of
where and how the writer matches with the language.”28 He uses Stein as an exemplar,
one who “annoys” both students and colleagues with her writing. We do not ask of Stein,

27 Stein’s friend, Mabel Weeks, suggested as much in her 1950 foreword to the letters, papers, and journals
of Leo Stein. Though Weeks offers a broad generalization about Gertrude, it could be easily applied
specifically to her writing: “Gertrude successfully integrated her character around her limitations” (Weeks
in Leo Stein, Journey Into the Self, viii).
when we like her, why she doesn’t write “correctly.” We know why: she doesn’t write correctly because she has a plan, something to teach us about how language works.

But rather than seeing Steinian possibility in order to value or validate student writing, as Bartholomae does, why not see our students in Stein, and use their departures from standard written English to examine where Stein’s writing came from, and what she was truly able to accomplish given her own disadvantaged background? Why not see the struggle with language that they have, as evidenced in the sentences we reify in Stein? Bartholomae doesn’t go far enough in his effort to use Stein to “[teach] students to pay attention to sentences.” What happens when we pay attention to Stein’s sentences? They look wrong, as Stein herself acknowledged to Sherwood Anderson regarding her sentences for *The Making of Americans*. The difference was that she chose to accept them, argue for them, rather than force them to conform. This is one lesson she teaches.

As Bartholomae had noted in “Study of Error,” this is one move a basic writer lacks.

The problem is not Bartholomae’s observation that Stein “taught herself to write.” I believe this, perhaps, more emphatically than he does, noting her departure from academe in order to write as she wished. Neither do I take issue with his characterization of her attention to sentences and their structure. Stein did pay “precise attention to the workings of parts,” and not just in writing, but also in late 19th and early 20th century painting, psychological character studies, and car engines. Stein’s attention to parts of speech in writing is just one manifestation of a larger philosophy on the relation between

---

29 I believe I have offered sufficient historical background to warrant this description for Stein given her context at Radcliffe. This is not to say, however, that the context of CUNY in the 1970s is comparable; only that any background which is not in the mainstream of academe during a given moment will place a student at a disadvantage that must be overcome if there is to be success according to the academic culture that has accepted them.

parts and whole, and one of her primary contributions to modernism. My point is that when using Stein as an exemplar of “style” in this introduction, and by assigning Stein to his students to “get inside” her sentences, to “write a piece in a similar style,” Bartholomae deliberately suspends one of the reading practices common to composition classrooms, to read not only for style, but also for error, also for correctness. In leaving these behind, he and his students take the easy road, if such a thing exists when working with Gertrude Stein. They miss an opportunity to examine the relationship between error and style that Stein’s writing exposes, and that encompasses so much effort in every composition classroom. They miss an opportunity to consider their own roles in determining when the texts they read are a study in error, when a study in style, and why.

The real irony in Bartholomae’s use of Stein with his own students is that Stein, in the context of her own writing classroom, was a failed version of the student. She exemplified neither the ability to cultivate her own style by the standards of the day, but she also was prone to errors of the basest sort. This was not, at the time, because she was an undiscovered genius, or because she was already charting her own stylistic course, but because she had been ill-prepared for the writing expected of English 22. Though Bartholomae probably was unaware of this when he wrote “Living in Style,” Stein the student was truly not so unlike the basic writers who had first prompted Bartholomae to compare their writing to hers. The teaching of “style” was, for Stein, a lost cause. What composition taught Stein was not style, but imitation, and she was not successful at

---

31 This is not to suggest she was incapable of writing complete sentences. By the very next year, in her Forensics course, she demonstrated a very firm grasp of Standard Written English. See Appendices. But Forensics and English 22 were two very different courses. Forensics was written argument. Stein did very well in this course; by her own testimony in one of her Daily Themes, “argument is to me as the air I breathe.” For the student of Stein’s kind – someone who began by breaking the language unintentionally, and later wanted to break the language deliberately – forensics was pliable, natural, pragmatic, but also less interesting than verbal argument and more restrictive than the writing she intended to do.
imitation. For one year in college she tried, and found her skills lacking. She was a failed stylist within the context of English 22, a course not unlike the course in which Bartholomae’s students were using the adult Stein’s writing as a model. But within ten years of that course, Stein returned to that writing, and began living in error with the relentless insistency that would become her genius, her claim to living in style.

The Genius and the Student

“But,” the student may ask, “what if it comes natural to me to experiment rather than conform? What if I am a pioneer, or even a genius?” Answer: then be one. But do not forget that what may seem like pioneering may be merely evasion, or laziness – the disinclination to submit to discipline. Writing good standard English is no cinch, and before you have managed it you will have encountered enough rough country to satisfy even the most adventurous spirit. 

- Strunk and White, *The Elements of Style*, 84.

During our early conversations about my dissertation, my director, Richard Miller, cautioned me about using the word “genius” in my discussions about Stein’s student writing. It is not a useful term, he observed, in discussing writing pedagogy because you can’t teach genius. If Stein is a genius, there’s nothing else to say. She was a genius who wrote and changed the landscape of 20th century literature, but our students are not geniuses, and they struggle with sentence construction.32 I’d like to upend this idea of the essential genius in our discussion of Stein and consider, instead, the genius who becomes rather than the genius who is. What if we *can* teach this kind of genius? What if the kind of genius Stein became is actually teachable, that her genius was

---

32 We who work with basic writers “know” this (and try to find in idiosyncrasy patterns of error), but non-compositionists may instinctively read idiosyncrasy as innovation, and possibly evidence of genius. This occurred with a well-known linguist at Rutgers who, when faced with sentences drawn from a developmental writing course designed to demonstrate patterns of difficulty with demonstratives, assumed they were poetry.
cultivated? I think, in fact, that many compositionists believe, in their hearts, in this kind of genius, in fact, teach it every day as if a holy grail: it’s called style. That is why compositionists hold up Stein as a model to emulate; not because they necessarily want students to emulate her style (though they do assign imitations of her), but because they want students to emulate the process by which she came to her style. This is complicated, difficult to fathom, but – or and – vital. This move to Stein as a model for composition confounds even me, a self-proclaimed Steinian and compositionist – so we will look at it closely in the next section.

As an artist, Stein had pockets of genius, and pockets of deficiency. The strange thing about her success in writing is that one pocket of her deficiency was also in writing: sentence correctness. And – or but, again depending upon whether you see failure or genius – that inability was directly related to her cultivation of genius, a decision made, a life pursued. Part of this cultivation of genius is due to her ability to exploit her inability to conform – for whatever reason she can give and support – and to accept, without paralyzing discouragement – the reactions she got from what she produced: call it literary genius, social genius, psychological genius. Whatever you call it, it was hard work and Stein devoted her life to it.

One consequence of that hard work was that it changed the readership of her writing profoundly during the 20th century. Stein found a way to indict every reader who did not understand her by asserting that one of them must be the fool. I mean this, again, in a Shakespearean sense; that the fool may be the only one who sees clearly. The

33 Stein suggests as much in The Autobiography, that Alice knew she was a genius “before there was any general recognition of the quality of genius in [her].” In this telling, Alice knew Stein was a genius before Stein actually was. You could say she was a genius in training.

34 This needs a footnote, a documented list of teachers of style who would ascribe to this.
teleology is that if they do not understand her, it proves she is a genius, because the public, which lives in the past, cannot see that she will be the recorder of their present. She theorizes about this in two of her essays – “Composition as Explanation,” and “How Writing is Written” – which I will address in the final mini-essay when we look at Stein’s assessment of her own work. She appears to be the fool, and the reader, mistaken or misguided like Hitchcock, is unable to see what she sees. She will only be recognized as a genius when the people of her time have caught up. If that reader comes to understand her, nobody is the fool; unless the emperor is wearing no clothes. This is the risk inherent in reading Stein: laden with her volumes from the 20th century, it is the main challenge when reading the Daily Themes she produced in Moody’s class. And if we incorporate those Daily Themes into our understanding of her as a writer, it retains some of the risk in the reading of Three Lives and The Making of Americans. She experienced her own doubt and continued to write. Her genius was thus in recognizing the potential in undermining the writing of the day, and the possibility of asserting herself as the most important writer of the 20th century. She made a living of this practice. She wrote daily, a ritual developed in her Radcliffe days, alternated between doubt and conviction, straddled that divide between genius and fool, and to this day makes everyone who reads her struggle as she did with the writing she produced.

**Saving the Daily Themes: Education and Learning at Radcliffe**

I turn in my final mini-essay of this conclusion to Stein as the agent of her own creation, and to argue that this self-creation began as a Radcliffe sophomore, not as the author of QED, Fernhurst, or Three Lives. It began not after she was a student, or solely
from her psychological training, but emphatically emerged from the conflict and struggle she experienced in English 22, the foundational course for her thinking about writing. One major difference between the basic writers in Shaughnessy’s *Error and Expectations*, or even the students in freshman comp in Bartholomae’s classroom, is that Stein, the student, saved her own work, rather than having it preserved by her professors as time-capsule samples to discuss pedagogy. Why do we have these Daily Themes? Of the 60 other students in Stein’s English 22 class we have none. Why do we have the themes of her contemporary colleague at Harvard, Melville Stone? Both of these young writers had some idea that their writing would be important, to whom, we don’t know, but it would be either to themselves or to others. In any case, they see their student work as the beginning of an archive. They have chosen themselves to begin their writing careers at this moment in their sophomore year in Cambridge.

What causes students to value their own writing? I am looking at the practice of students making themselves “special” as writers, distinct from their peers, not because of the administrative function of “Specialness” that I have outlined in my first two chapters, but because this kind of special can only be designated from within by the student herself. This is related, for Stein, to the practice of becoming a genius. I’m looking at the difference between her history of learning and her history of education. What did Stein learn in her composition class? What was the education supposed to provide? These are two very separate issues. The writing, as we have it today, with her teacher’s comments,

---

35 Remember: she saved none of her writing from her psychology courses, or at the least, did not archive them at Yale. Equally important, she did not save all of her Daily Themes, only 47 of the hundreds she wrote. This was not a “shove them all in a drawer” preservation. She culled them, saving the ones that she might likely return to later in life, or that she wanted historians of her work to be able to read, suggesting an even more conscious act of starting an archive of herself as a writer.

36 This is one definitive difference between Gertrude Stein as a student and Basic Writers. Richard Miller noted in conversation – and I concur – that many students in developmental writing courses do not even retrieve their portfolio of papers at the end of a semester, let alone save them for posterity.
shows more of the history of education than it does of learning, as I demonstrated in chapter 3, and as can be seen in my transcriptions of the Daily Themes in the Appendix. It shows us what the institution valued. What I can say about the history of learning is more based upon what Stein did with this work after the class was over. It appears that by saving this work, she kept the learning, but rejected the education. For in her adult writing, we see few positive, direct, effects of Moody’s comments. If there was learning, it was a negative learning. For Stein, an adequate student in 1894, and a modernist by 1905, this was not perhaps the education she was given, but it was the education she chose.

Stein has been marked a success as a modernist writer. Was she a success as a student writer? Certainly the fact that she received her Radcliffe diploma after five years, and earned mostly As and Bs – her C in Daily Themes being her lowest grade – points to success as a student. But is her difficulty in passing the broad-based entrance exams at the end of her narrow education in psychology a signal of the difficulty to both conform and satisfy academe’s requirements? To open up the question even broader, what of her departure from graduate school a few years later without her degree? She was a Radcliffe graduate – with a great deal of struggle demonstrating proficiency – and she was a Johns Hopkins drop-out. Can we say she succeeded as a student, given her premature departure from academe? If she was a failed student, what does that mean? Is it a failure of the university to follow-through on its courses of instruction to someone who does not enter on a traditional path? Or is it simply the failure – or resolve – of the student, who for whatever reason, claims “boredom” for her rejection of scholarly work, as Stein did at Hopkins? To open our question out to the one step that brings us back to the beginning of
her published career, the most important question of all: why writing? Why the life of the writer? After such a pointed pursuit of science in academe? Perhaps the desire to be a writer was there all along, through the struggles of those Daily Themes, the intense course of Psychology at Radcliffe, the study of neuroscience at Johns Hopkins. She kept her Daily Themes, and when she began writing again after Johns Hopkins, she started there. She couldn’t become a writer until she could set her own terms for what successful writing was.

The Making of Gertrude Style

The year was 1925, and Gertrude Stein was finally preparing for the publication of her “Long Book” as she called *The Making of Americans* in a letter to Carl Van Vechten in June of that year. The “monumental work”\(^{37}\) was largely written, according to Leon Katz, between 1903-1911,\(^{38}\) and, as has been noted by several scholars, the opening vignette was drawn from one of Stein’s Daily Themes from English 22. I have italicized her self-quote in the passage below from the beginning of *The Making of Americans*:

> Once an angry man dragged his father along the ground through his own orchard. “Stop!” cried the groaning old man at last, “Stop! I did not drag my father beyond this tree.”

> It is hard living down the tempers we are born with. We all begin well, for *in our youth there is nothing we are more intolerant of than our own sins writ large in others* and we fight them fiercely in ourselves; but we grow old and we see that these sins are of all sins the really harmless ones to own, nay that they give a charm to any character, and so our struggle with them dies away.\(^{39}\)

---

\(^{37}\) Both quotations from Steven Meyer’s Introduction to the 1995 Dalkey Archive Press edition of *MOA*.

\(^{38}\) Stein claimed the writing of this text occupied her from 1906-1911. That has been disputed with scholarly attention by Katz and others, moving her work on this enormous work back by three years. I mention this as a prelude to my own claims later in this conclusion that Stein’s chronology of her work, as asserted in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, may not be supported by the evidence of the work itself.

\(^{39}\) Stein, *Making of Americans*, 3. For the italicized passage see Stein’s theme dated December 14 in the Brazier edition in the Appendices.
I open the final sections of this dissertation with this quotation for several reasons. First, to emphasize the actual presence of Stein’s student writing in what she considered her greatest contribution to literary modernism, indeed, “the beginning, really the beginning of modern writing,” as she put it. Second, to remind afresh that this idea of struggle was not a new one, but was part of her meditations on writing from that first course in English 22. And third, that during the process of preparing this enormous manuscript for print, Gertrude Stein must have been thinking a great deal about her earliest writing, not only the writing that she did after Radcliffe – QED, Fernhurst, and Three Lives – but also, given the jumping off place of this text, of the writing that she did as a student. The Making of Americans is not only the history of an American family, an attempt to categorize every human being. It is also a documentary of Stein’s reworking, as an adult, of some of her earliest writing, and thinking through her own self-determination as a writer and author.

The publication of The Making of Americans in 1925 was the end of one project stemming from her earliest writing, but also the beginning of the next that reached back even further to her origins as a writer. In the midst of working on her landscape plays in the late 1920s, she began a serious consideration of grammar and of poetry, as she explains in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. I propose here that this period of her writing life emerged from the deep consideration of the writing of her youth, not only of the manuscripts that she produced as a young woman in 20th century Paris, but before that, to the time she spent struggling in her writing class at Radcliffe in 19th century Cambridge. She was finally ready, having accomplished the publication of The Making of Americans, to stake a claim on her own origins. This was not to be a study of human
beings, but a study of grammar. Having written a history of the 19th century family into the 20th century, she set about contemplating the history and framework of 19th century language giving way to the language of the 20th century. The first essay in this collection she called “Saving the Sentence” and the full work comprising seven other pieces, she called *How To Write*.

*How to Write* is a compilation of essays which include conventional titles such as “Sentences” (1928) “Saving the Sentence” (1929), “Sentences and Paragraphs” (1930), “More Grammar For a Sentence” (1930), “A Grammarian” (1930), and “Forensics” (1931), and less conventional titles such as “Regular Regularly in Narrative” (1927), “Finally George A Vocabulary of Thinking” (1928) and “Arthur a Grammar” (1928).\(^{40}\)

In his forward to “What Are Masterpieces,” Hass described *How To Write* as a “meditation on grammar.”\(^{41}\) But as I will show in the next sections, it is not only a Steinian meditation on grammar in the present tense, but a reflection on her origins as a writer, a dramatic remodeling of 19th century grammar and style, as constructed by Barrett Wendell and his colleagues at Harvard. It was her version of a 20th century grammar textbook and manual of style.

**How To Write: “Saving the Sentence” and the Discovery of QED**

I begin my discussion of this new grammar with a close reading of the first of those essays in *How To Write*, titled “Saving the Sentence.” I do this in part to engage actively in a reading of Stein, not the student texts as I did in chapter 5, but one from the fullness of her modernist maturity, as David Bartholomae put it, to “get inside” the

\(^{40}\) Dates from the *Yale Catalogue* of Stein’s works, as referenced in Richard Bridgeman’s appendices, the essays of *How To Write* were all written by Stein between 1927-1931.

\(^{41}\) From “Another Garland for Gertrude Stein” by Haas, forward to “What Are Masterpieces”
writing of Stein. My reading has an argument: I believe “Saving the Sentence” tells the story of Stein’s discovery of her manuscript for *QED*. This is important because it places the beginning of Stein’s adult contemplation on grammar and sentences at a time when she was also deeply engaged with her earliest non-student writing. With the publication of *The Making of Americans* in 1925, we know she was working directly from these early texts during this time. But nobody has connected her work on grammar during the 1920s with the same era of textual revisiting. *How To Write*, and the essays it contains, have been imagined to have sprung from a new phase of Stein’s thinking, a new entry into creating her own grammar, if anything, an extension of her essay “Composition as Explanation” in 1926, which finds its inspiration in *Three Lives*. I would like to argue that with these essays she is returning not only to her discovery of *QED*, but to the period in her life when she began to assert herself through sentences with a freedom she did not have as a student. In so doing, she was engaging directly with the work of the 19th century composition classroom, with the remnants of her writing education, with throwing off the compositional restrictions of that period in her writing life.

Stein tells the story of finding the manuscript for *QED* in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. It has been noted that Gertrude Stein was an historian with a personal, and somewhat loose, sense of history. Here is one of the minor stories she tells, of the finding of an old manuscript, which Stein scholars have determined was the manuscript for *QED*:

She wrote a short novel [in 1903]. The funny thing about this short novel is that she completely forgot about it for many years. She remembered herself beginning a little later writing the *Three Lives* but this first piece of writing was completely forgotten, she had never mentioned it to me, even when I first knew her. She must have forgotten about it immediately. This spring just two days before our leaving for the country she was looking for some manuscript of *The Making of*
Americans that she wanted to show Bernard Fäy and she came across these two carefully written volumes of this completely forgotten first. She was very bashful and hesitant about it, did not really want to read it. Louis Bromfield was at the house that evening and she handed him the manuscript and said to him, you read it. 42

Stein, the critical story goes, got into a great deal of trouble with Alice for never having told her about the personal affair that served as the basic storyline of this novel. Her retelling of the incident here speaks of a guilty former lover being insistent that she had “completely forgotten” about this novel of her first affair, despite having saved it amongst her manuscripts of *The Making of Americans* on which she had been working earlier in the decade. The story of finding the manuscript of *QED* is placed in *ABT* as “this spring before going to the country” which Donald Gallup believes was the spring of 1932.

I’m going to propose, based upon another text Stein wrote around that time, that the finding of *QED* was actually a few years earlier, sometime between 1927 and 1931, when she was working on her essays which would become *How To Write*. I believe that Stein’s protestations that she had “completely forgotten” this first novel are no more credible than her placing its finding during that spring, or that she began her work on *The Making of Americans* in 1906, when her notes and drafts began to accumulate in 1903. 43

42 *ABT*, 79-80. Leo Stein, Gertrude’s brother, was likely the primary source for scholars to determine that “Melanctha” published within *Three Lives* was actually based upon this “‘forgotten’ first novel, which was indeed *Q.E.D.* As recorded in a letter from Leo to Mabel Weeks dated February 6th, 1934: “I read that first novel which she says she had completely forgotten, and though the stuff was interesting – it was the original material of Melanctha and had nothing to do with Negroes – the writing was impossible. There was no objectification” (Leo Stein, *Journey*, 137).

43 Though we could preface this as a “she said, he said” comment, it is worth considering Leo Stein’s assessment of Gertrude’s story-telling as well, since he was very much present during this time of Stein’s life and experiences as recorded in *ABT*. From a letter from Leo to Mabel Weeks in 1933: “I read Gertrude’s autobiography the other day and thought it maintained very well the tone of sprightly gossip rising at times to a rather nice comedy level. But God what a liar she is! … practically everything she says of our activities before 1911 is false both in fact and implication, but one of her radical complexes, of which I believe you knew something, made it necessary practically to eliminate me” (Leo Stein, *Journey*)
My claim is that the first essay in *How To Write*, called “Saving the Sentence,” is a veiled description of her finding *QED*, and realizing that she would have to explain to Alice about her failed affair with May Bookstaver, caught by the fictionalization of the experience in her writing, which would demand back-story. Alice, it must be understood, read everything Stein wrote, was in essence Stein’s secretary, typing up the manuscripts each day. The reading I give below of “Saving the Sentence” serves as evidence that Stein had been thinking about *QED*, and her other earliest writing during the late 1920s beginning with her meditations in “Composition as Explanation” in 1926 and continuing as she drafted the essays for *How To Write*, from 1927-1931. “Saving the Sentence” would thus be not only about sentences in general, but the literal saving of sentences that she had written in 1903 and that would remain unpublished until after her death, and only with the heavy editing of Toklas and the publisher to protect the names of those still living.

One of those names was May Bookstaver, Stein’s love-interest in *QED*, and the friend who helped her to publish *Three Lives*. Another of the apocryphal stories associated with May was the forced replacement, by Alice, of the word “may” by the word “can” in one of Stein’s texts following the discovery of *QED*. This story was my first signal that perhaps “Saving the Sentence” was not only about grammar, but also about May, as you will see below. The other passages within “Saving the Sentence” which suggest the finding of *QED* can be derived as a mini-narrative of apparently random sentences towards the conclusion. They are in order, though not directly next to one another, building the story of discovery towards the end of the piece. When Stein

*Into Self*, 134). My claims are based more on what I’ve found in the texts, but Leo Stein’s assessment of Gertrude Stein’s flexibility with truth and telling certainly reinforces a skepticism about her dates.
writes of “him” and “her” she is referring to herself (as “him”) and Alice (as “her”). The first sentence of my quotation, I believe, refers to the visit by Louis Bromfield, mentioned in the *Autobiography* above. The rest of it follows as Stein’s meditation on the discovery of the manuscript, the implications for her writing, and for her relationship with Alice:

> It is an hour after they came.  
> May be with them  
> No doubt may be with them.  
> No doubt may be with them no doubt may be.  
> May be with them may be. May be they may be.  
> It is easy to hide a hope.  
> Have meant….  
> Hers and his the houses are hers and his the valley is hers and his the dog named Basket is hers and his also the respect of the populace is hers and his.  
> He has found something which is and has been his which has been left for him by him and by this time means something insofar as they say they hope that it is satisfactory.  
> What will it look like, it will happen so quickly although it is all there that it will not be left with them…  
> It was when he did behavior as a blessing. Yes not being with remembering that is what is going if it was not looked at. If having asked it to be put away. He put it away having asked it to be put away…  
> One thoroughly two thoroughly three thoroughly. Three is after all. They were there after all.  
> Painstaking.  
> She impressed me.  
> What makes forty forfeit.  
> No man no men do.  
> Are three arrangements.  
> I made a mistake.

In this episode, as I read it, Stein gives the manuscript to Bromfield, who takes it to read, knowing that May Bookstaver is within the pages themselves – “May be with them” – leaving Stein to wonder, or hope, about what he finds in the novel worth reading. This is followed by an affirmation of her shared life with Alice, Basket, their dog, the valley in Southern France where they summered. This is followed by Stein’s contemplation again
about saving the manuscript and finding it: “He has found something which is and has been his which has been left for him by him and by this time means something insofar as they say they hope that it is satisfactory.” She has done these things deliberately, and hopes for satisfaction in the reading. It appears, in the next few lines, that she decides not to pursue it for publication: “He put it away having asked it to be put away…” and then a reference to the love triangle that serves as a basis for the text: “One thoroughly two thoroughly three thoroughly. Three is after all. They were there after all.” The piece ends with a declarative sentence, “I made a mistake,” which refers to Stein’s failure to tell Alice about the love affair from years previous, hiding the manuscript of the novel from her, and the way in which she handled this whole episode.

Whether or not my evidence for the discovery of QED is sufficiently compelling, this episode written into “Saving the Sentence” suggests that whatever Stein has found in this passage is old, is controversial, is connected with her youth, and has been rendered within a book she calls How To Write. We’ll get to that title and its resonance shortly. She herself was contemplating her earliest work, and her response to this was the first chapter of her meditation on writing, on “how to write” as an adult. Of course, this may seem natural. But why include the story of finding this text within her “meditation on grammar”? Stein was not yet, in 1903, using language in the same way that she did later in life, and certainly not in the way that she did in these pieces on the parts of speech, sentences, paragraphs, and grammar. But if How To Write is intimately connected with a reconsideration of her origins as a writer, then our own inquiry into those origins makes much more sense. Stein herself presents “Saving the Sentence” as related to her own history as a writer, and that “saving these sentences” was both an act of salvation, and an
act of preservation: one of which looks backwards to history, and one of which looks forwards to redemption. These two nodes are connected by the process of writing through an understanding of what it means for her to write, to save her writing, to give it to publishers to publish.

Following her straightforward essay in 1926, “Composition as Explanation,” How To Write comprises one of her first meta-narratives on the writing process, how she began, where she was at the moment of writing. How To Write is Stein’s answer to the 19th century grammar and style manual. By making the connection between Stein’s discovery of QED, the writing of “Saving the Sentence” and the assembly of the rest of these essays into a book called How To Write, I am claiming that Stein’s book on grammar in 1931 emerged not from new thinking, but from the oldest thinking, a revisitation of her origins as a writer. She is proposing, through her title, a system and manual for writing, and the manual itself starts with the discovery of her earliest non-student writing, the first text of her opus that she would ask a publisher to read, even though she did not permit its publication during her lifetime. What else was she thinking about when reading these early texts? English Composition, Barrett Wendell, Daily Themes, and English 22.

“How Writing Is Written”: Gertrude Stein and Barrett Wendell

Barrett Wendell’s pedagogy of Daily Themes was about chronicling a life through minute observations day by day such that the accretions of these observations told a story over time that otherwise would be lost to a belief that each observation was merely a mundane description of the quotidian. Let’s consider, then, how this pedagogy, derived
for college students in a composition class, may enlighten our understanding of Stein’s notebooks, her nightly ritual of writing, her lack of interest in revision, that urge to look forward rather than back, to chronicle the ever-changing present by writing only in the present, listening to her dog lap from a bowl, watching cows in a field, magpies in the sky, her conviction that “you know you will be laughed at or pitied by every one and you have a queer feeling and you are not certain and you go on writing.”44 In writing in the inexorable present, in what may be described as an inscrutable way, she is fulfilling, like a fine young student in English 22, the daily themes of her adult life. We may think of them collectively as a life spent observing and rendering, observing and rendering, such that explanations become superfluous, for the act of that observation and its permanence on paper is the practice she was cultivating; to leave a record of the moment-by-moment, day-by-day. To record the mind, life, observations of the writer, just as she had learned to do in English 22, Daily Themes.

We should consider seriously why Stein used these “composition” notebooks for her writing. We should consider her manifesto, “Composition as Explanation,” as emerging not only from her application of spatial composition in painting (as influenced by Cezanne) to the process of writing, but also from the clear analogue of writing composition itself, the history of the field, through her window of participation at Radcliffe. “Composition” for Stein was visual, but it was also “writing composition” pure and simple. Consider John Brereton’s description of the Harvard-Radcliffe themes produced in late 19th-century:

The personal writing course is often thought of as “pure” composition; it consists of just students and teacher, with no rhetoric textbook, no anthology of readings, maybe just a handbook for reference. This course’s roots lie in the quite personal

topics students wrote about in Harvard’s writing courses, descriptive sketches that captured a moment or a mood. At Harvard such themes were not meant to explore the inner self or to be regarded as truly expressive pieces of writing; rather they were to represent an individual perspective on experience, and so topics were never assigned. They are remarkably close to some forms of creative writing and also have affinities with an artist’s sketchbook.45

Stein, as an adult, replicated the composing process of the student producing her daily themes. To be clear, she did not use these composition booklets as an undergraduate; she wrote on looseleaf paper. But these composition books, when she used them as an adult, were student books, cahiers, used for writing composition, for sketches. She was producing adult daily themes in her adult composition textbooks.

Echoing Brereton’s description, and writing specifically about Barrett Wendell’s pedagogy of Daily Themes, Sue Simmons observes: “…the daily themes might be compared to the sketchbooks and journals that artists and professional writers keep. That is, the daily themes functioned to keep writers engaged in the processes necessary for effective, successful composing.”46 The difference between what Wendell had his students do and what Stein did as an adult, though, was profound. Rather than use her composition books as mere sketches of her later works, those sketches became the later works. The sketches were themselves the process and product of her art. We might say in that sense that her writing as an adult fully embodied both aims of her English 22 course: the dailyness of the themes attending to her “compositional” commitment to intense observation and recording; and the rhetorical frameworks underpinning the purposes for writing, except that she was committed to destroying the formulaic categories of writing in favor of replicating the forms. Using the subject matter to determine the form rather than the other way around. Stein’s peculiar 20th century genius underlined as an

45 Brereton, Origins, 15.
46 Simmons, “Constructing Writers,” 337-338.
assimilation of the practices of daily theme writing, and a rejection of the rigidity of the product as defined by its late 19th century practitioners.

Stein offers her perspective on these very issues in “How Writing Is Written” a lecture she delivered at Choate Rosemary Hall in 1935.47 Published originally in The Choate Literary Magazine, this has become a well-referenced piece of Stein’s later writing, her public lectures becoming the inroads to understanding as her career progressed. Her Lectures in America were given on this same tour in America from 1934-1935, and continue to provide us the most insight into what Stein was thinking when she wrote that way. I make a point of its being well-referenced because it is no secret that “daily living” and “daily writing” were integral parts of the Steinian aesthetic. All the more amazing to me that I am able to make a fresh argument tying these bedrock Steinian ideals to historical composition, showing that Stein’s aesthetic of contemporaneity, her ideas about the relation between parts and whole, her interest in “daily lives” and “daily living,” are a decades-long theory directly descended from, owing the kernal of its growth to, the pedagogy of English 22, the practice of writing of daily themes, and the concepts in Barrett Wendell’s English Composition. It is all there lying in the open to see, if only we regard Stein’s education in English, in writing composition, as much as we regard her education in Psychology.

Let’s consider, then, before we close, a few of Stein’s own thoughts as an adult on what this means, this daily writing that began her writing life. On her sense that she is

47 “How Writing is Written” was “a lecture delivered under the auspices of The Choate Literary Magazine on January 12, 1935” (header of typescript notes for lecture. Published in The Choate Literary Magazine, February 1935, Volume XXI, No. 2). Typescript in Yale Stein archive. It was also published as a book of previously unpublished works edited by Robert Bartlett Haas. It is this volume, How Writing Is Written, that I reference following footnotes.
part of a generation of artists who had represented the daily essence of the transition from the 19th to the 20th century, and what it means to be contemporary in that transition:

Each generation has to do with what you would call the daily life: and a writer, painter, or any sort of creative artists, is not at all ahead of his time. He is contemporary. He can’t live in the past, because it is gone. He can’t live in the future, because no one knows what it is. He can live only in the present of his daily life. He is expressing the thing that is being expressed by everybody else in their daily lives.  

This is not unlike the claim Stein makes in the first paragraph of “In the Red Deeps” – even then she claimed to be able to express the pain and pleasure of all humanity. In 1935 the only thing she is doing differently is applying a form to that belief; in other words, a theory of contemporaneity derived from living a daily existence. She has made a métier, as she called it, from the pedagogy of Daily Themes. 

On her relationship to the present and the past, the origins of her writing, moving out from under the shadow of what has come before, and what she carries of that shadow with her, the challenge of presenting something new, she writes:

When one is beginning to write he is always under the shadow of the thing that is just past. And that is the reason why the creative person always has the appearance of ugliness. There is this persistent drag of the habits that belong to you. And in struggling away from this thing there is always an ugliness. That is the other reason why the contemporary writer is always refused. It is the effort of escaping from the thing which is a drag upon you that is so strong that the result is an apparent ugliness; and the world always says of the new writer, “It is so ugly!” and they are right, because it is ugly.

The retrospective offered in this lecture is of course understood through the public reception of The Making of Americans and her other early published work. But it makes
just as much sense to begin her writing life when she encountered her first teachers at Radcliffe; it was here that the rules were set, the standards for beauty and ugliness, where she learned the “vitality of the struggle,” as she writes later in *How Writing is Written*. In this lecture she reduces the resistance she faced to a challenge between “beauty” and “ugliness” where her teachers had seen it as force, elegance, or barbarous language. When Stein writes, “When I began to write …” we should take her at her word, and consider the effect those English courses had on her approach to writing from the very first strokes, on her way of seeing writing, on her understanding of history.

And finally, to come back to those irritants to Moody, the punctuation that he had so tried to correct, and what makes our reading of Stein so obviously “Steinian,” consider her thoughts on the importance of punctuation at the beginning of her writing career, which, again, she marks as *The Making of Americans*, and I mark as her experience writing as a student:

… when I began writing, the whole question of punctuation was a vital question. You see, I had this new conception: I had this conception of the whole paragraph, and in *The Making of Americans* I had this idea of a whole thing. But if you think of contemporary English writers, it doesn’t work like that at all. They conceive of it as pieces put together to make a whole, and I conceived of it as whole made up of its parts. I didn’t know what I was doing any more than you know, but in response to the need of my period I was doing this thing. That is why I came in contact with people who were unconsciously doing the same thing. They had the Twentieth Century conception of a whole. So the element of punctuation was very vital. The comma was just a nuisance. If you got the thing as a whole, the comma kept irritating you all along the line. If you think of a thing as a whole, and the comma keeps sticking out, it gets on your nerves; because, after all, it destroys the reality of the whole. So I got rid more and more of commas. Not because I had any prejudice against commas; but the comma was a stumbling-block. When you were conceiving a sentence, the comma stopped you. That is the illustration of the question of grammar and parts of speech, as part of the daily life as we live it.51

---

51 Ibid., 153.
She ties the discussion of commas, one of the most mundane of topics from her English 22 course, to the transition from the 19th to the 20th century. This is where, and how, it is difficult to deny a genius in this writer, even more so when we consider the clay with which she works. Not only does the humble comma which she had been accused of “disdaining” play such an important role in her first major work, but her focus on the parts and the whole comes from the same well. “It was not prejudice” or “disdain” she finally articulates, it was a “nuisance,” a “stumbling block.” Indeed, the simplicity of that statement is breath-taking. And note, for the final throwback to those sophomore themes, the “you” in the very next sentences: “you” of course meaning “me.”

Stein learned two major lessons in English 22 which persisted through her life’s work. She learned the daily ritual of writing, and she learned attention to the working of parts: words, sentences, paragraphs, and whole. For both of these – the process by which she worked, and her major contribution to modernism – she was indebted to English 22 and the pedagogy of Barrett Wendell. Her fellow students may have absorbed the techniques and strategies of forming first words, then sentences, then paragraphs, then a whole work, and put them to good use. Stein inverted this process, working backwards from the whole. These ideas were not born of psychology, or developed solely in conversation with the artists in Paris. They stretch back much further to the origins of her writing life. She restructured the foundations of compositional theory from her own moment in its history, 1894-1895 at Radcliffe, when her daily living became the source of her writing life, and the grammatical rules and elements of style of the 19th century became fodder for the 20th century genius who turned them on their head.
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If we reconsider the passage from “Saving the Sentence” which I read as the discovery of QED we get a small sense of just how difficult it is to understand what Gertrude Stein is doing in these pseudo-sentences, when she is not delivering a lecture designed to clarify her ideas and writing for her readers. She has so removed the context and denotation of these words in How To Write that she has made it nearly impossible for readers to make a connection between her words and the meaning they are capable of conveying. As she says in her essay “Henry James,” it is “force” that is important, not “clarity.” If we understand this to be directly in dialogue with Barrett Wendell’s English Composition – from which these two terms are actually drawn – we see much more clearly (despite her protestations against clarity) the meaning of what she is arguing: that is, she is arguing not for or against, but with the principles, the “elements of style” that were to produce late 19th century writing. She chooses what she will – force – and rejects what she won’t – clarity – but the important element for me is that neither of these terms are hers, but are derived from her education at Radcliffe.

She claims that one of her goals is to “kill the 19th century” but nobody has seen in that statement an effort to kill the composition instruction that emerged from it, and that shaped her own undergraduate experience. How to Write is her manifesto in response to the composition textbooks that were written by the professorate of the 1880s and 1890s, and that shaped the writing of her fellow students. It was not until the 1920s and 1930s that she had the authority to make these arguments with the force necessary; that is, to dismiss the necessity of clearness out of hand, and to start the new elements of style with connotation alone; that is, everything is a reference to something else rather than a
direct expression of an idea that denotation suggests. For me to find meaning in “Saving the Sentence” gives us one layer of that denotation, but not all of it, and that is her point: force not clarity.

No wonder that so few people feel comfortable interpreting what Stein “means” when she writes. Her aim is to remove denotation from writing, and leave us with pure force. Though the writing is hers, the ideas backing that writing belong to her education. She has borrowed them, liberally, without reference, just as she did in her first themes as an undergraduate – “In the Red Deeps” for example – and in that sense, she became a writer but was never interested in being taught to write; that is, as a writer of fiction she erases her education, her inspiration, where a diligent student or academic footnotes it. She refused to learn that technique in academe which is giving credit to those from whom you have borrowed ideas. Thus, Stein’s genius was in some sense about creating herself out of others, against others, and then erasing any hope of finding that trace back through the writing itself, without years of reading and research, and not just a little bit of luck.

Stein scholars enjoy the chase. We enjoy the mystery of finding these references, these clues, and making sense of them. Perhaps this is some of the genius of Gertrude Stein. If we believe in her writing, we also believe that there is a meaning somewhere, and that the richness of reading produces a connection through that search for connotation. For my discovery that How To Write is a Steinian grammar book which owes its form, its vocabulary, its concept, to her undergraduate teachers of 30 years previous, this is a form of scholarship that not only can enrich our understanding of Stein, but also can help us to consider how Stein’s modernism is directly connected to her experience of learning to write. Stein scholars have noted this through her veiled
projection of lesbian identity, her education with William James, her rejection of medical school. But we see this also through her struggle as a student writer, through her adaptation of the grammar books of her past, such that for that final category in the elements of style, according to Barrett Wendell – that of “elegance” – the real coup of Gertrude Stein is not that she has masked the relationship between her new grammar and the old grammars of the 19th century, not that she has made connotations but made them deliberately difficult, but that she has adapted them so thoroughly, creating a new standard for elegance, one that Barrett Wendell would hardly recognize, but if shown the logic of his rhetoric, would have to tip his hat towards.

It’s not simply that Stein didn’t, or couldn’t, do what her teachers wanted her to do, but that she learned to articulate why she could not, or did not, want to do it – in this case, even using their terms. Modernists and compositionists alike – perhaps because we have not talked with one another – have missed that connection which now seems so obvious looking at this text, How to Write, through the lens of composition as a field, as a history of which Stein is a product, just not the kind of product prone to giving credit where credit – even negative credit – may be due. Neither has the field of composition known what to do with Gertrude Stein or her words except to find them fascinating and liberating examples of newness and style. I hope that my research has made that fascination a bit less treacherous an area to tread, that the web of connections – institutional, administrative, pedagogical, literary – that I have made helps us to use Gertrude Stein sensibly to interrogate not only modernism, reading, writing, and thinking, but also the landscapes of teaching and learning, of being a student and becoming a writer.
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Gertrude Stein
Daily Themes for English 22
Radcliffe College
1894-1895

Brazier Edition
Explanation of Editorial Markings:

1. **Black Ink**: All original text as penned by Gertrude Stein is rendered in black ink, as in the manuscript themes.

2. **Red Ink**: All comments by writing instructor William Vaughn Moody are rendered in red ink, as in the manuscripts. His markings include editorial comments and corrections within and over Stein’s text, as well as marginal and end comments. For longer themes (such as the first two), the end comments follow on subsequent pages.

3. **Green Ink**: Gertrude Stein occasionally edited her own themes, either before or after submission. Occasionally she made these corrections using pencil, but most often using the same black ink in overwrite as she did for the original text. All of these edits are rendered in green ink to indicate where Stein reconsidered her choices of words during the initial writing of her themes, or made corrections based upon her teacher’s comments. I choose to use the green ink rather than overwrite in black to highlight just how few corrections Stein actually made to her writing as a student.

4. **Blue Ink**: In the penultimate theme of the semester, dated May 8, Stein has two different edits, one in black ink, rendered here in green, and one in pencil, rendered here in blue. The distinction is important, as I believe the pencil edits were made in the early 1900s when Stein was beginning her work on *The Making of Americans*. This is suggested strongly by one sentence in particular on page 99 of these themes. I choose to distinguish these pencil edits in particular because they function differently from the ones Stein made in marginal dialogue with her instructor during the semester.

5. Where Stein has omitted or inserted punctuation incorrectly, or committed spelling
or grammatical errors, I have remained faithful to the manuscript student theme.

6. There was no consistent way to represent original line-breaks (ie, hyphenated words) without reproducing the exact location of Stein’s words on the pages. I have chosen not to attend to this level of detail. If there are unusual line-breaks or hyphens employed, I make comment on them in the footnotes.

7. Stein’s headers (name, date, Theme #) are often on the recto of page 1 in the series of looseleaf pages for each theme. The header page also occasionally includes Moody’s end comment. The first page of these themes, is thus on the verso. I have decided to represent Stein’s header on the same page as the first page of each theme, and the teacher’s comment after the theme for two reasons: first, each theme is dated, so placing the header before the theme confirms the chronological order and assists with identifying the themes by date; and second, to set up in the reading experience the pedagogical relationship between student theme and instructor’s response, that is, to recreate the original order of events.
In the Red Deeps.\textsuperscript{2}

The \textit{(more or less) common-place incidents of the outer world} are well enough for those \textit{(poor unfortunates) whom have nature has given no inner one. As for me who have lived in my short life all the intensest pains and pleasures that human nature is capable of experiencing, I disdain to waste even a passing pen-stroke on such paltry details.}

My mind from childhood was one which constantly fed on itself. I would seize every possible excuse to be alone so that I might dream, might lose myself in intense emotions by the side of which all else paled into insignificance. How I loved even the cold piercing air that made my flesh quiver and tingle, and~ then the delight of crouching down behind some shelter to\textit{ feel the reactionary returning}\textsuperscript{4} warmth and

---

\begin{enumerate}
\item Gertrude Stein was a Special Student at Radcliffe and always wrote “Special” following her name in the headers of her themes in English 22. Chapter 1 of my dissertation lays out the history of Special Students at Harvard from 1825 to the 1880s; Chapter 2 focuses on the growth of the Special Student population at Radcliffe from its origins in 1874 into the 1890s, historically contextualizing Stein’s opportunity to study at Radcliffe through this non-traditional mechanism for admission.
\item The title for this theme is taken from George Eliot’s \textit{The Mill on the Floss} (1860). “In the Red Deeps” is the first section of Book V entitled “Wheat and Tares.” See my dissertation Chapter 4 for background and critical commentary on Stein’s non-referenced use of Eliot in this theme.
\item This penciled question mark — indicated here in green ink — is Stein’s, a written response to Moody’s marginal comment, “Idiom?” The penciled question mark suggests that either Stein did not know what “Idiom?” meant or questioned why Moody made this comment here in the margin.
\item These overwrites were made by Stein in black ink. Based upon the marginal comments, I believe she made these changes after the theme had been graded.
\end{enumerate}
then once more to rise and be chilled and shrink and tingle

As in the previous sentence, Stein offers this word substitution in response to the teacher’s comment, with “pain” standing in as a less “inflated” word than “anguish.”

As in the physical so in the mental world did I revel in

the joy of suffering. I was never content to rest with the cru-
elties that Richard the Thirds and Gesslers could invent, but

while dreaming over their torture, I would invent others even

worse and enjoy inflicting them. Thus I came to feel keenly

every possible delight to be found in the sufferings of others.

Shortly after this period there came unconsciously a

complete reaction and now Instead of enjoying the pains of

others I came to have a horror of being possibly forced to in-

flict them. With this came a terrible and haunting fear of loss

of self-control and consequent indulgence in those enormities

I once dreamed of with so much delight. This fear of madness

reached its climax one night when I went to see Mansfield

5. As in the previous sentence, Stein offers this word substitution in response to the teacher’s comment, with “pain” standing in as a less “inflated” word than “anguish.”

6. Stein has crossed out the “s” at the end of each word in response to Moody’s questioning her use of the plurals in this sentence. Her references here are to Richard the Third, King of England, 1483-1485, and Albrecht Gessler, also known as Hermann, legendary ruler of Austria who ordered William Tell to bow before him, be executed, or to shoot an apple off of his son’s head. Both references give testimony to Stein’s claims both later in this theme and as an adult that she was immersed in reading and culture as a young woman, in these cases, through the histories of Shakespeare and European mythology, possibly by way of Schiller (Wilhelm Tell, 1804) or Rossini (William Tell, 1829) both of which may very well have been familiar to Stein. During her college years, she attended the opera, symphony and playhouses in Boston, as referenced in many of her themes for English 22.
7. Actor Richard Mansfield became most well-known for his dual portrayal of Dr. Jekyl and Mr. Hyde. My own fear was so completely expressed and so terribly portrayed that I fled at the end of the second act with the fearful story burned into my brain. No pen can describe the torments I endured during the nights that followed. How sleepless night after night I tossed passed sleepless by until just at dawn from sheer exhaustion my brain would cease its struggle (with wild fears). How listening to my sister’s quiet breathing fearful thoughts would crowd upon me (dreadful possibilities of dark deeds,) until, distracted I would try to cool my burning head. I would would by knocking it against the wall, (in desperation anything to silence that dreadful iteration of horrible thoughts,) How often have I tried to pray to heaven whose ministrations I had alas! no faith in so even here I found no peace.

One night I was alone down-stairs reading a practice x

I loved to read in spite of the fact that often when thus engaged

---


8. Stein drew several arrows here, apparently trying to address Moody’s question of “Construction?” in the margin. It’s unclear what revision she intended based on the lines themselves.

9. By this point, Moody’s marginal comments have become more frequent, and his excisions more heavy-handed, with the red ink flowing liberally, and somewhat chaotically, over Stein’s sentences.

10. Moody here first draws a question mark and then scratches it out, indicating bewilderment solved.
there came suddenly into my consciousness (without my being able to explain why) a sudden fear of something unknown, intangible, that seemed to be around me everywhere. This night it was the Cenci of Shelly,\textsuperscript{11} that I was reading. I went on and on until I came to the passage where Beatrice having just left her father returns to her mother and brother fear, horror, almost madness in her face; I dropped the book, for before my eyes,\textsuperscript{12} shrinking toward the wall was the veritable Beatrice in her flowing white robes. This was truly the most horrid of the deeps. Oh her beautiful face! I can never lose sight of it as I saw it that night and none can paint the look with which she gazed one me. Gazed no gazes on me now, enough enough! I cannot tell you more. I fear it, I fear it still.

\textbf{Construction?}

\textsuperscript{11} Percy Bysshe Shelley, \textit{The Cenci} (1819). Another tale of brutality referenced by Stein in this short theme; this one a verse drama about the Roman nobleman, Francesco Cenci, and the cruelties he inflicted upon his family including rape, incest, sodomy, and torture. The tale ends in patricide, with one of assassins and the instigators, his daughter and wife, beheaded for their arguably justifiable actions.

\textsuperscript{12} Those familiar with Stein’s disinterest in commas in her mature work may note with interest Moody’s insertion of four commas (in red ink) on this final page of Stein’s first theme. Stein does use commas in this theme, sometimes where none are called for, for example: “This night it was the Cenci of Shelley, that I was reading.”
An extraordinary composition. One is puzzled to decide whether it is a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms, or a study from an objective standpoint of a morbid psychologic state. In either case, it possesses no inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force. It is marred by awkward and unidiomatic uses of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional patches of melodramatic writing which give a jarring effect of bathos.

Rewrite.

W.V. Moody.
Only a Question of Rent.

Two girls strolled into the park one summer day and threw themselves on the grass: (one full on her back, the other raised herself) on her elbow and as if continuing a conversation said, ‘Yes I fully understand your feeling toward my father. He is moody bitter and often tyrannical at home; we all recognize that but poor the the poor dear old dad we love him anyway. Wait, I’ll tell you a little of his life, it’s only just that you should know it.’ She was silent for a minute and then with an effort recommenced. “He has a brother in this town as you know, and perhaps you have often wondered why we never speak of him. He and my father were the only children of a peasant away off in Deutchland. Shortly after my grandfather’s deaths, uncle left home and finally settled off here in the West. My father soon followed him to their land of promise, taking his old mother with him. He supported her as well as he could for some time unassisted by his brother. Yes I—

13. This theme number “3” is the next chronological theme preserved by Stein in the archive. The archive does not contain Theme 2. With only 47 themes total, it is clear Stein chose not to save many themes from this course. See archive of Melville Stone, English 22, 1894-1895 for a sense of a more complete set of themes from this course in the same year that Stein was enrolled.
14. When Stein does not include the year in her header, I supply it in [brackets].
will do my best to be impartial and only tell you facts as they stand. At last

At last my uncle having established a good business sent for his brother who had meanwhile grown into a handsome and attractive young man. He was invaluable to my uncle as a salesman and (made all the friends) while his brother made all the money. Finally father married and left his brother’s employ much against uncle’s wish.

My grandmother joined her sons in this new home and of course she went first to her Joseph, her best beloved. My poor mother was young and inexperienced and managed before long to imitate Grossmutter who had just such a temper (as we are all cursed with.) We children although we loved her, never could approve of her and we still remember how we suffered under her cruel tongue when her anger was roused.

It was only a slight discussion about olives at first but my uncle made it a pretext for hatred. He encouraged Gross-

15. This excised sentence by Stein appears to be in dialogue with a previous comment by her instructor, perhaps from Theme 2, which we do not have, or from a conversation in which he has asked her to “be impartial and only tell [him] the facts as they stand.” Having explained that she would do this, she chose to remove her editorial comment and continue with the facts in the next paragraph. Sue Simmons notes that this kind of dialogue was common in the Daily Themes courses taught by Barrett Wendell, and appears to be taking place here between Stein and Moody: “Over time, students used the daily themes as a way of ‘speaking’ directly to Wendell in regards to the course or to his criticisms of their papers … [the dailies] provided a forum where students could carry on a particular type of conversation with Wendell” (Simmons, “Constructing Writers,” 338, 340).
mother in her anger until finally she left my father’s house and went to him. He forbade his children speaking to their uncle, calling him a dastardly ingrate who turned his old mother out of doors.

Poor old dad, he had to enter a house where he was shunned as if he were a leper, or give up seeing his old mother altogether. This continued for some time until grossmutter getting older and older began gradually to fade away. She was very near her end and for the first time in years the brothers stood together by her side. She revived slightly and opening her eyes said to my uncle so beseechingly and so lovingly, “Dave, be good to little Jo. You know he’s only a boy. He’s got no one but you, my little Jo.” Yes the feud was at an end but only till the last clod of earth had fallen on the mother’s grave, for the brothers had not gotten outside the cemetery before their hate sprang into life again. (My father was insulted and by his brother,) fiercer words were almost followed by fiercer blows, they were repeated and once more my uncle dropped out of our lives.

During the years that passed my uncle grew constantly...
richer, while my father only made a fairly good living. His
land-lord wished to use the store he was occupying for some
other purpose and so my father began to look about for new
quarters. My uncle came to him and told him that he was go-
ing to move out of his present place into a larger store, and
that he would gladly rent his old store to him. He said that he
wished to bury the old troubles and proposed that they live as
brothers should. My father, always ready to keep the peace
with his brother, although in all other relations a high-
tempered man, consented and took a lease for 3 years. During
this time the street lost prestige and rents went down very
much.

At the end of his lease my father went to his brother to
get a renewal. He told him that under the circumstances he of
course expected a reduction in the rent. My uncle handed my
father a paper and said with that slight foreign accent which
makes cruelty more cruel because more hopelessly, removed from
ourselves “Yes Jo here is your renewal.” My father opened it,
read it, looked at his brother then at the paper then said, “Why
you can’t mean this Dave, you have raised my rent, and a
lease of 10 years too. I don’t want that.” Quietly came the answer. “If you don’t want it you leave my store immediately. “But I can’t do that, that would ruin me think of my wife and children. What do you mean?” “Yes” the words came slowly, coolly, “Yes I 16 ruin, I know it, it is as I have long wished. You see. I have you between my thumb and fin-

gger so and now I crush you. “You sign my lease or you leave my store.” (Silence dead silence and then the quiet scratching of a pen). - _ _ _ _

Seven years after my father met a little girl on the street who smiled at him brightly. He was fond of children and began talking to her so they strolled on together. He happened to ask her name. The little one re-

plied, “Why don’t you know me uncle I’m little Minnie.” The poor old dad could not help it, (he instantly left his brother’s child who looked) sadly after him too surprised even to cry.”

16. Based on the professorial edits in this sentence and following, Moody appears not to be compelled with Stein’s dialectal and dramatic decisions. The insertion mark within “Yes I ruin” suggests a problem with the grammar, indicating a need for connecting words such as “Yes, I cause your ruin.” The incoherence noted in the next sentence is more a lack of imagination; the uncle is gesturing just “so” with his thumb and finger squeezing together. Stein attempts to capture both the gesture and the contempt that accompanies it within the dialogue. She did not succeed and revises with more description in the rewrite dated November 28th, on page 23 of this Appendix.

17. I am unfamiliar with this editing symbol, but assume it refers to the sentence in parentheses.
Your theme begins very abruptly and runs on in a rather rambling fashion. Your sentences are sometimes incoherent, and often awkwardly phrased; this hampers the reader and spoils the effect. You are careless too about punctuation and do not always express yourself clearly. Since the narration is all quotation, the quotation marks that occur within, as on pages 3, 4 & 5 (please number your pages) should be single – not double.

Your dialog paragraphing is uncertain — particularly with reference to dialogue. It would pay you to review those parts of the text books which treat of sentences and paragraphs.

Rewrite.

F.E.F.

18. F.E.F. is Frank E. Farley, one of William Vaughn Moody’s two colleagues teaching English 22 in 1894-1895. The final instructor during this year was Lewis E. Gates. Based on handwriting and vocabulary analysis of all of the marginal and end comments in these themes, I’ve concluded that this is the only theme of Stein’s graded by F.E.F. that exists in the archive of the Radcliffe Manuscripts. Those themes signed by the instructors are easy to identify; but based on my research, I believe Moody was Stein’s primary instructor during the year, and was responsible for grading her themes.
A modern sonnet to his mistress’ eyebrows

She was certainly a charming bit of womanhood as she sat carefully imitating rhythms with the electric hammer. The youth gazing at her so earnestly was evidently of one mind. Poor Cupid almost exhausted at his last gasp in this home of psychological analysis seeing the tableau plucked up heart and stole a hop sly peep at the youth’s rhapsody. He saw “Noticeable winking of the eye at every beat. A trembling of the lips before the repetition of the rhythm. A contraction of the neck muscles distinctly noticeable.”

Has humor. Some misuse.

---

19. November 15th, 1894 was a Thursday. It appears that Stein numbers her themes week by week, this being “Daily Theme 1” for the week of November 15th. I surmise this because she has preserved the theme for November 16th (here on the following page), and it is number Theme 2. Stein is inconsistent about numbering her themes which makes it impossible to know exactly how many she wrote.

20. During this semester, Stein was enrolled in three Philosophy courses, which were focused on Psychology and were accompanied by lab work. This theme is probably inspired by her work in the lab.
Avaunt thou baleful spectre! What! shall I submit to losing all my joy in living? Can I endure having all pleasure blasted by that eternal refrain “Wouldn’t it make a good Daily?” Never.

Pathetic but not convincing.
Woman.

Never again will I ever try to reason with a woman. She immediately gets hysterical and thinks she is calm. She acknowledges that you are right half-a dozen times and then deliberately repeats the statement thinking she has gotten hold of a new point of view. At last in despair you either smile or frown according to your temperament and she goes home convinced of remarkable argumentative powers. The eternal feminine is nice to be sure but its painfully illogical.

Point of view nobly remote.
She is a bit of New Englandism but unfortunately not a complete bit. She has just a small quantity of Western freedom, imagination and unconventionality in her composition but unfortunately it is not strong enough to make her attractive from that standpoint. It is enough though to make her disrelish keenly the appreciation she receives for her New England attractions which naturally are most evident to the casual observer. Poor girl its very hard to be neither flesh nor fish and which ever as to always be always wanting to be the other.

Last sentence queer
A Conference.

English Prof. “Yes that is a very good stroke. Twittering birds always remind me of spring. Ah but let me see your description is of autumn, yes birds do twitter in autumn too not so much perhaps.”

Meek girl student. “But excuse me sir my description is of mid-summer.”

Professor undaunted “Mid-summer, why yes, yes of course birds always twitter in mid-summer.”

?21

21. This is by far my favorite end comment provided to Stein during her year in English 22. In this theme she taunts the reading practices of her English professor, and his only response is a question mark. A few more specific observations: in this theme, the professor is actually supportive of the student, and yet demonstrates that he has not paid any attention to what she has written. The pedagogical failure is of distractedness, which the question mark only serves to confirm more strongly.
Only a Question of Rent

The two girls were still under the shadow of a painful domestic scene. They hurried along anxious to escape from themselves but soon the perfect beauty of the day calmed their nerves. Their rapid pace slackened and they strolled quietly along but still in unbroken silence. At last they turned into the park and soon found a beautiful plot of soft grass all surrounded by dark firs. With one impulse they threw themselves down full on their backs. After some moments of quiet contemplation one of the friends raised herself on her elbow and began, “I will not attempt to excuse my father to you. He is moody, bitter and often tyrannical; we all recognize that, but the poor old dad, we love him anyway. Wait I’ll tell you a little of his life. It is only just that you should know it.”

22. This is the first rewrite we have preserved from Stein’s semester. English 22 is structured around daily themes with a longer theme every two weeks, followed by a rewrite of that theme. This structure is maintained in both the Harvard and Radcliffe versions of English 22. See my Chapter 3 for the fundamental differences.
23. Following on her instructor’s comments on paragraphing in the first draft of this theme, Stein directs this marginal inquiry to her professor in this rewrite. She has apparently not understood the rules for paragraphing dialogue that Prof. Farley had noted. There is no written reply on this final draft.
After a pause, she continued, “He has a brother in this town as you know and perhaps you have often wondered why we never speak of him. He and my father were the only children of a peasant away off in Germany. Shortly after grandfather’s death, uncle left home, and settled out here in the West. My father soon followed him to this land of promise, taking his old mother with him. He supported her for some years although nothing but a boy, unassisted by his brother.

At last my uncle having established a good business sent for his brother who had meanwhile grown into a handsome and attractive young man. He was invaluable to my uncle as a salesman. He made friends while my uncle made money. Finally much to my uncle’s disgust, father married and left his employ.

My grand-mother, not long after, joined her sons in their new home and of course she went first to her Joseph her best-beloved. My poor mother was young and inexperienced and managed before long to imitate gross-mutter who had just such a temper as all our family are cursed with. We children although we loved her, never could approve of her and we
still remember how we suffered under her cruel tongue when
her anger was aroused.

As I was saying, at first it was only a small misun-
derstanding, some question concerning olives, but my uncle
soon made it a pretext for hatred. He encouraged Gross-
mutter in her anger, until finally she left my father’s house
and went to him. He forbade his children speaking to their
uncle and called him a dastardly ingrate who had turned his
old mother out of doors.

Poor old dad, he had to enter a house where he was
shunned as if he were a leper or give up seeing his old mother
altogether.

This continued for some time until gross-mutter get-
ting older and older began gradually to fade away. She was
very near her end and for the first time in years the brothers
stood together by her side. She revived slightly and opening
her eyes said to my uncle lovingly. ‘Dave, be good to little
Joe. You know he’s only a boy. He’s got no one but you my
little Joe.’ Yes the feud was at an end but only till
the last clod of earth had fallen on the mother’s grave. Before

24. Recall the first draft of this passage: the professor’s comment here was “not specific.” In response to
this criticism, Stein has inserted the phrase, “As I was saying,” a most evasive and oblique way of
increasing the specificity of her details. She appears either not to understand what the professor
wants, or is lazy about providing the kind of detail she knows he wants. Instead she turns to a decid-
edly colloquial, as opposed to narratively rich, transition into this paragraph.
the brother’s had left the cemetery their sp hate sprang into life again. My uncle insulted my father. Fierce words were followed by fiercer blows and once more my uncle dropped out of our lives.

During My father made only a fairly good living while his brother grew constantly richer. The man who owned father’s store wished to use it for some other purpose and so the dad began to look about for new quarters. My uncle came to him and told him that he was also going to move and that he would gladly rent him his old store. My father always ready to keep the peace with his brother although in all other relations a high-spirited man, consented and took a lease for three years.

During this time the street lost its prestige and rents began to lower. My father went to his brother at the end of his lease in order to get a renewal. He told him that under the circumstances he expected a reduction of his rent. My uncle handed my father a folded paper and said with his slightly foreign accent, ‘Yes Jo, here is your renewal.’ My father opened it, read it, looked at his brother, then at the paper and said
'Why you can’t mean this Dave, you have raised my rent:25
and a lease of ten years too, I don’t want that’

Quietly came the answer, ‘If you don’t want it, you
leave my store immediately.’ ‘But I can’t do that, that would
ruin me, think of my wife and children.’

‘Yes’ the words came slowly, coolly, Yes, ruin, I
know it, it is as I have long wished. You see,’ bringing his
fingers together ‘I have you between my thumb and finger, so,
and now I crush squeeze you.26 You sign my lease or you
leave my store.’ - - - Nothing more was heard but the quiet
scratching of a pen and the brothers parted. - - -

Seven years after my father met a little girl on the
street who smiled at him brightly. He was fond of children
and began talking to her. As they strolled along together he
happened to ask her name. The little one replied, ‘Why don’t
you know me uncle I’m little Minnie.’ The poor old dad,! he
wanted to be kind but he could not help it. He hated even his
brother’s little child. He left her instantly and she stood look-
ing after him, too surprised even to cry.27

25. Stein employs a colon here. It is not the correct punctuation for the context, but more interestingly, it
is an uncommon punctuation mark in Stein’s writing, both as an undergraduate and as an adult.
26. See the original text of this paragraph on page 12 of this appendix.
27. The revised and rewritten themes do not have marginal or end comments from the professor.
I have just been reading Pembroke by Mary Wilkins\(^2\) and it has left me with a feeling of soul sickness and utter hopelessness. The intolerance of these New Englanders is overwhelming. There is never a curve all the lines are hard and straight. The word sympathy is not in their vocabulary. To me it seems such a pitiful waste of human life to see that each struggles on alone no help no sympathy.\(^2\) Poor humanity even when sympathy is offered and though the subject\(^3\) man yearns with all his heart for it he turns his head to the wall and will have none of it. You New Englanders say that you have more feeling because you conceal it. Its palpable falsehood.

All things die with misuse disuse and you have been so hard all your lives that can you know nothing of sympathy.

---

28. Mary Eleanor Wilkins (Freeman), American novelist and short story writer, 1852-1930, married Dr. Charles M. Freeman in 1902.

29. Notice the number of times Stein uses the word “sympathy” in this short theme. As with her first theme “In the Red Deeps” this interest in sympathy is resonant with George Eliot. In this theme, however, she uses the idea of sympathy to argue for a position against her reader, who she addresses as “you.” She moves this theme from 3rd person in referencing *Pembroke*, to 2nd person in deploying her argument against New Englanders. See my chapter 5 for a discussion of point of view in this theme as a reflection of progress in working with text from her first few themes.

30. This appears to be the first three letters of the word “subject,” a clinical word from the psychology lab that she replaces with “man” for this context.

31. Stein’s number 1 and 2 added above these words indicate that she wants the word ordered reversed.
You have feelings to be sure but always feelings of supreme egoism. Egoism so all-embracing that you fail to recognize it. You never struggle with yourselves. You think you do but you never really do so.

“Vox clamantis in deserto”.32

32. Translation of Moody’s comment: “the voice of one crying in the wilderness” or “a voice crying in the wilderness.” The biblical reference is to the book of Isaiah 40:3.
It had been snowing all day and about nine o’clock we started out for a stroll. We came to a bit of orchard and stood there spell-bound. The trees were all covered with snow and there reigned over the place that peculiar tense silence that always accompanies winter-beauty. The air was as balmy as in a spring evening in the South and through all the trees came the soft murmur of the spring song from the Walküre. The air was full of it even to the delicate pink haze overheard and yet all was so hushed so still.

Shows gain in descriptive power.

33. Die Walküre (1870) by composer Richard Wagner. The second of four operas in Der Ring des Nibelungen, known in English as “The Ring.” This was a relatively modern work when Stein was an undergraduate. The reference here indicates Stein had a contemporary knowledge of opera.
An Annex Girl.\textsuperscript{34}

There she stood a little body with a very large head.\textbf{and loaded}. She was loaded down with books and was evidently very dismal. Suddenly there broke forth a torment, “I don’t want to be superior” she wailed despairingly, “I am tired to death of standing with my head craned constantly looking upward. I am just longing to meet one simple soul that \textbf{don’t want to know everything}, one weak happy naive consciousness that thinks higher education is \textbf{either rot or has never heard of it}.” She gave a long-drawn ou Oh! and then \textbf{collapsed the books on top of the miserable little heap}.

\textit{Your vehemence runs away with your syntax.}

\textsuperscript{34} For a critical reading of this theme, see Priscillia Perkins’ essay, “A Little Body with a Very Large Head”: Composition, Psychopathology, and the Making of Stein’s Normal Self” in Modern Fiction Studies 42.3 (1996) 529-546. Fulltext available online: http://muse.jhu.edu/
There is nothing we are more intolerant of than our own sins writ large in others.  

Montaigne or Confucius?

35. Stein recycled this line in the second paragraph of The Making of Americans. The opening two paragraphs of The Making of Americans is as follows, with the quote from the theme in italics:

Once an angry man dragged his father along the ground through his own orchard.

“Stop!” cried the groaning old man at last, “Stop! I did not drag my father beyond this tree!”

It is hard living down the tempers we are born with. We all begin well, for in our youth there is nothing we are more intolerant of than our own sins writ large in others and we fight them fiercely in ourselves; but we grow old and we see that these sins are of all sins the really harmless ones to own, nay that they give a charm to any character, and so our struggle with them dies away.

For a discussion of this Steinian quotation of her own daily theme within The Making of Americans, see my conclusion, section entitled, “The Making of Gertrude Style.” Stein also notes her own quotation from her student work in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. See Stein, Selected Writings, 52.
Ocean Symphony.

The first movement begins with a soft murmur away off in the distance but soon we come to the most beautiful melodies. It as if the sea were again peopled by the mermaids of ye olden time and lapped in its soft embrace, they sang to each other of their loves.

As the movement progresses strange sea-forms rise out of the depths and greet us. Great mysterious monsters just appear and then are gone, the distant music of the Fingal’s\textsuperscript{36} cave is mingled in the harmonies and at times we hear the sighing chant of the sad-voiced lotus eaters. Then comes suddenly a thunder clap, the sea rises in its might and all its myriad inhabitants fearfully seek the vast quiet depths beneath.

After Apthorp?\textsuperscript{37}

---

\textsuperscript{36} “Fingal’s cave” is a reference to Mendelssohn’s work of the same title, also known as “The Hebrides Overture” (premier in 1832). Stein likely attended a performance of the piece by the Boston Symphony under the baton of Arthur Kikisch or Emil Paur, which is why her professor questions whether she is producing a music review “after Apthorp.” See footnote \textsuperscript{37}.

In A Psychological Laboratory. 38

One is indeed all things to all men in a laboratory. At one moment you find yourself a howling mob, emitting fiendish yells, and explosive laughter, starting in belligerent attitude hammer 39 in hand and anon applauding violently.

Before long this vehement individual is requested to make herself a perfect blank while some-one practices on her as an automaton.

Next she finds herself with a complicated apparatus strapped across her breast to register her breathing, her finger imprisoned in a steel machine and her arm thrust immovably

______________________________
38. At this time, in addition to English 22, Stein was enrolled in three Philosophy courses and a French course. Based on the transcript information presented by Richard Bridgman, I surmise that this theme refers to the lab work done in one of the Philosophy courses, which were focused on Psychology (Bridgman, Gertrude Stein in Pieces, 357).
39. The Rosalind Miller transcription of these manuscripts conflates the text of “Ocean Symphony” (December 15, 1894) with this theme, “In a Psychological Laboratory” (December 19, 1894), such that all of the text following this footnote citation appears as the conclusion of the previous theme (Miller, Form, 120-121). And the title and most of paragraph one to the word “hammer” are printed after the rest of this theme. This is one of several instances in Miller’s transcriptions where text is displaced and/or printed in the wrong order. This instance appears to be a printer’s error (for the entire theme is handwritten on only one side of a page, and there is no possibility of confusing Stein’s order of text). However, the mis-ordered text in the final two themes of the course (dated May 8 and May 22) appears to be Miller’s confusion, firstly, over the relationship between verso and recto of Stein’s hand-written sheets, and secondly, between he original submission and its revised version several weeks later. See footnotes for themes dated May 8 and May 22 for full explanation.
into a big glass tube. She is surrounded by a group of earnest youths who carefully watch the silent record of the automatic pen on the slowly revolving drum.

Strange fancies begin to crowd upon her, she feels that the silent pen is writing on and on forever. Her record is there she cannot escape it and the group about her begin to assume the shape of mocking fiends gloating over her imprisoned misery. Suddenly she starts, they have suddenly loosened a metronome directly behind her, to observe the effect, so now the morning’s work is over. 40

Interesting

40. Much has been made in the literature about this theme and its suggestions of “automatic writing.” The most famous article is by B.F. Skinner, entitled “Has Gertrude Stein a Secret?” (The Atlantic Monthly). For more information on this exchange, see my chapter 5, section entitled “Automatic Writing and Intention: ‘So now the morning’s work is over: December 19th.’” Stein herself responded to the public curiosity generated by Skinner’s article in Everybody’s Autobiography, denying that her writing was automatic, and moreover, claiming that the experiments she and her peers conducted in the Harvard Psychology Lab concluded that automatic writing was not possible.
It is a very painful fact in human experience that each of us must go over the same old ground of mental struggle and development. To be sure it is a reflection old as the hills but it is still new for I have just rediscovered it. The worst of it is, that the recognition of it as fact is of no value.

I know perfectly well that I will hold some time in the future the same opinions in large measure that I have just been combating. I know perfectly well that when my opponent was my age he held mine and yet I cannot spare myself the intervening pain and struggle.

I know I will believe, but as I don’t believe there is no help in that. Sometimes I fiercely and defiantly declare that I won’t believe neither now nor in the future. “Be still you fool” then says my working other self, “why struggle, you must submit sooner or later to be ground in the same mill with

41. Stein’s spelling of “opponent.”
your fellows. The path is straight before you can but choose to follow. Why waste your strength in useless cries! Be still, it is inevitable.”

Shows discernment
Was there ever an age which those living in and writing about it did not characterize as an age of transition. They always announce the fact as if it were something new, and peculiar to their own age time.

The position is eminently illogical. From the very nature of progress, all ages must be transitional. If they were not, the world would be at a stand-still and death would speedily ensue. It is one of the tamest of platitudes but it is always introduced with a flourish of trumpets.

Hegelian.
The Great Enigma.\textsuperscript{42}

It is to a symphony concert that I would conduct you reader, but do not expect to have your ears greeted by the perfect harmonies of a Boston orchestra for you are only in a Western city and musical culture is only in its first stages. I hope to compensate you, however, for your outraged ears by pleasant company.

Look carefully among the audience and you will see a girl rather stout, fair, and with a singularly attractive face, attractive largely because puzzling.\textsuperscript{43} Her mouth is just saved from complete severity by a slight fullness of the lower lip which seems rather an after-thought of her Creator. Her chin does its best to make up for this slip by hard lines of determination. Her nose just escapes being beautiful for at the last

\textsuperscript{42} This is Stein’s first draft of The Great Enigma. As one of the longer pieces (assigned each fortnight), she would expect to submit a revised version after receiving comment. This explains the many edits in green noted in this theme. Most of these edits by Stein were made after she received the theme back from her professor, her edits in response to his comments and in anticipation of the rewrite. Stein rarely rewrote as a student as evidenced in these themes, so this draft gives a rare glimpse of her reacting to criticism and inquiry. She rewrote even more rarely as an adult.

\textsuperscript{43} Stein’s use of the word “puzzling” to describe the face is notable given Moody’s expressed puzzlement upon reading Theme I back in October. In this theme, to be puzzling is to be attractive.
moment it drooped and spoiled its perfect shape. Still in spite of these features she is distinctly lovable and if you will watch her care-fully you will notice how her hard lines are success-fully contradicted. See just then the music pleased her and her eyes creased and wrinkled with an in imitable charm. It expresses the essential womanliness within her — that delicious crinkling about the eyes.

A young man who was quietly watching her also seemed to recognize the charm. He was busily twisting his little mustache and had a high but not particularly noble forehead. He is evidently an intelligent music-lover but to-night he has found metal more attractive… - - -

The young couple had never met although they had seen each other frequently at concerts and each knew who the other was. After this particular concert they had the good fortune to be introduced by a mutual friend.

The acquaintance ripened rapidly. Almost nightly the young man climbed the hill, rang the bell, and then sat quietly silently the whole evening twisting his little mustache,44

---

44. These red-inked commas inserted by Stein’s instructor are very large in comparison to her text and his marginal comments. They appear to be marked thus for extra visibility and emphasis.
and once in a great while bringing out a slow quiet remark. The girl did not know what to make of this strange unsocial creature who observed none of the forms of good society and knew no small talk. At first she was amazed, then puzzled and finally amused.

They were perfect antipodes, these two. He was a completely negative character, always peaceful, and slow both by nature and by drive with malice of aforethought for he had found slowness very useful to him in business relations.

He was very bashful, but most people did not recognize it in him. On the contrary they thought him a very consciously superior young man. He was always imperturbable, and whenever a storm was raging around him, he would look up sleepily peacefully and of one of the heated disputants inquire “Why what’s the matter?” or else he would make for the most comfortable chair and go peacefully to sleep. He was the most negative of men and yet lovable withall and he was always mildly surprised at other people’s moral flights. When he was sleepy he would drop off utterly oblivious of company [or no company]

---

45. Stein seems to have underlined this comment in black ink.
and when you tried to rouse him to a sense of his social duties, he would simply declare sleepily that he didn’t care, he was sleepy and the other people could go home. And the strangest part of it was that no one ever got angry with him. (He had no principles and yet he was thoroughly trustworthy.)

In short he was all negative in his good qualities as in his bad.

She on the contrary was fiery and impetuous. She could be cruel as only a woman can and then would become swiftly remorseful. She would be very thoughtless one moment and would do more mischief the next by an overly-conscientious effort to make it good. She jumped conclusions rapidly and changed them as rapidly. She had always been accustomed to rule and her family had been afraid of her and all men bowed before her. She had a glorious ideal of generosity but for the most part was thoroughly selfish. She was intolerant in the pride of her strength but no one could have theoretically, a broader out‐look. She was tremendously moral, riding with great vigor all those hobbies that belong to the women known in current phrase as advanced. She was painfully self‐righteous in the midst of most

---

46. The words “moral, riding” do not make sense by my reading of this sentence; however, this is the closest transcription I can fathom from the manuscript. Rosalind S. Miller also transcribes this passage as “moral, riding,” and though I have been able to correct some of her obvious errors, I cannot claim to have a more accurate reading of these two words than she has provided. Please see manuscript for Stein’s handwriting in this particular passage.
violent denunciations of her self-righteousness. So far the promise of her mouth and chin had not been belied but her eyes crinkled and creased in vain, that part of her nature was still hidden.

She had never met anything before like this man. She would grow vehement and fiery and then he would look at her and mildly, and sweetly remark, “Isn’t Sallie cute.” She began to think she hated him but yet she allowed him to take liberties with her, such as no one else had even dared to dream of.

Finally it was evident that he was very much in love and soon she began to be in the same condition. This seemed to produce a reaction in the philosophic lover and he began to doubt if he really were in love after all. He would come and gaze at her meditatively and then decide he wasn’t; but on leaving would wish to take all privileges of a lover. This she would resent, much to his (mildly injured) surprise for he did not see why it made any difference.

He would go home then and smoke a meditative pipe and finally write her a letter telling her that perhaps after all

47. R. Miller transcribes this phrase as “mildly imagined” (125). The parentheses are in black ink in the manuscript, likely added by Stein after the theme had been graded and returned to her.
he did love her. (but strongly advising her to burn it up for he was the most cautious of mortals.)

In the meanwhile this proud girl who had always been accustomed to be loved and never to love would struggle furiously with herself all through the night. The next evening he would appear again as peacable as ever twisting his everlasting little mustache and always persisting in demanding a lover’s privileges in spite of the fact that, as he assured her, he really did not think that he [did] loved her at all. She would forbid him the house, but nothing daunted, he would come the next night to tell her that on thinking it over he really believed he did. love her. (after all.)

This strange courtship reached its climax one night. He had not appeared at his usual time and she was just beginning to.

The girl’s nerves were completely shaken by this ceaseless struggle. One night her lover had continued his self-questioning far into the night. She had become even more violent than her want. She abused him as cruel, cowardly and unmanly. Finally he left and she was alone divided between her
great love for him and her contempt for his weakness.

She struggled with herself all that night but she could not

Slang kill her love. She saw him as he was and yet, hate
herself as she might, she knew that she loved him. He was
weak and unmanly. but he was more to her than all her past
ideals. At last her strength gave way and she lost conscious-
ness and awoke the next morning a miserable, cold heap on
the floor.

At last in desperation she declared that he must end
her torment. Hard as it was for her to speak she implored him
to decide and let her be at peace.

He did not see how he could but finally he agreed to
stay away a week and try and make up his mind. - - - - -

The next night the bell rang as usual and the strange
courtship was completed.
The analysis of character is, as far as the limits of your space have allowed, convincing and suggestive. The point of view wavers strangely. We have an instinctive feeling, from the tone in which the young lady is treated, that the point of view is really hers, and that the analysis which deals with her character is her self-analysis, but ostensibly the point of view is that of the author or omniscient spectator. The result is a trifle confusing – the opening is very oddly awkward and formal. I wish that you might overcome your disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation!48

Rewrite the first page and revise the rest.

W.V.M.

48. By this time in the semester, Moody’s approach to Stein’s “disdain for the necessary marks of punctuation” suggests that he believes she is capable of punctuating correctly, but chooses not to do so; hence “disdain for” rather than “inability to use.” His assessment here does not prove that Stein does or does not know how to punctuate by December. But it does demonstrate that Moody has assumed a control in her writing, and that by persisting in error, she is making a choice; that is, her “disdain” is intentional and therefore, her errors are intentional. See my chapter 4 for a discussion of this transitional moment.
By their fruits ye shall not know them.

It is not by men’s actions but by their judgments that one can know them. Often a man may act generously, behave unconventionally, in short be quite a good sort of an individual but, wait until you hear his opinions of others. It is then that all the latent bigotry, intolerance, narrowness and pride are discovered; all the innate and inherited tendencies that never betray themselves in the realm of action.49

Perspicacious

49. R. Miller’s transcription of this theme ends following the semi-colon in the final sentence. The last clause, “all the innate and inherited tendencies…” is inserted within the 2nd paragraph of the following theme (127).
The regular habitués of the symphony concerts soon learn to know the numbers of the audience and to feel strongly drawn to them by the bond of musical sympathy.

One of the most interesting of the regular attendants last year was a young girl rather stout, fair and with a singularly attractive face, attractive chiefly because puzzling. Her mouth was just saved from complete severity by a slight fullness of the lower lip, which seemed rather an after-thought of her Creator. Her chin did its best to counteract this apology by hard lines of determination, but in spite of its best efforts, she remained distinctly lovable.

Whenever the music touched her deeply, her eyes would crease and wrinkle with an innimitable charm. All

---

50. Stein’s rewrite of The Great Enigma. You will notice no instructor’s comments, and very few edits by Stein. Perhaps more interesting, knowing the Stein who wrote “Melanctha” and the Making of Americans, the revision of this theme eliminates the entire narrative of the first version (which is very prescient of the Steinian narrative in Three Lives and in “Melanctha” in particular) and focuses only on the character studies of the two protagonists. Essentially, nothing “happens” in this theme except a description of the antipodal natures of the two characters. It is stripped of its plot completely.

51. This idea of “musical sympathy” is an extension of Stein’s interest in George Eliot’s ideas about sympathy as explored in earlier themes such as “In the red deeps” dated October 10th.

52. Stein’s spelling. She is still having difficulty with this word despite being committed to using it.
the woman in her was expressed by that delicious crinkling about the eyes.

A young man, also a regular attendant seemed very conscious of this young girl’s charm. He would sit busily twisting his little mustache and stare at her persistently. She never seemed to notice him, and he never made any effort to know her. It was enough, he thought to listen to Beethoven and to look at her. Certainly no reasonable man could ask for more.

One night however they were introduced by a mutual friend. The acquaintance once begun, ripened rapidly. Almost nightly the young man climbed the hill to her house, rang the bell, and then sat silently peacefully the whole evening, twisting his little mustache, and occasionally bringing out a slow quiet remark.

The girl did not know what to make of this strange unsocial creature, who observed none of the ordinary laws of society and knew no small talk. At first she was only amazed, then puzzled and finally amused.

They were perfect antipodes these two. He was a com-
pletely negative character, always peaceful, and slow, both by
nature and by design for he had found slowness very useful to
him in business relations. He was very bashful, but his silence
kept people from recognizing this in him. On the contrary,
they thought him a very consciously superior young man. He
was always imperturbable, and whenever a quarrel was raging
around him he would either look up sleepily and inquire of
one of the heated disputants “Why what’s the mater?” , or else
he would make for the most comfortable chair and go peace-
fully to sleep.

He had absolutely no moral sense and was always
mildly surprised at other people’s moral flights, but neverthe-
less he was thoroughly trustworthy, He had no scruples and
was completely selfish but he abhorred cruelty with an almost
physical loathing and was good-natured and very obliging,
when it was not too much trouble. He was a thorough coward
but he acknowledged it with such complete naiveté that you
only laughed at him and never thought of despising him.53

53. There is no end comment on this theme.
There could hardly be a finer impersonation of complete yet inarticulate joy than in the first figure of the procession in Semell’s picture at the Art Club.

The figure is full of sunshine and of the sunshine and of the fresh and gladsome spring. Its feet cling closely to the earth as if loathe to leave even for a step that soft fragrant grass. Its arms wave with a deliciously sensuous movement and through its closed teeth issues a whistling breath that expresses more than the most exstatic shout. The figure is as delicate as a sunbeam, it seems light enough to ascend to the heavens and yet it is wholly a piece of earth.

appreciative

54. R. Miller transcribes this as “Gervelli” which would render the sentence either lacking a possessive or lacking an article preceding the artist. Stein generally does not have difficulty with employing articles or possessives (she often drops the apostrophe, but never the “s”). Given her patterns of error in these themes, I identify the final letter as an apostrophe s. There is also some question about Miller’s identification of the rest of the letters in this word. Based on the very rushed handwriting alone, Stein appears to have written Semell’s, but the word could also easily be Servell’s or Sewell’s. Unfortunately, none of these correspond to well-known, documented artists. Therefore, I cannot determine with certainty the artist or artwork to which Stein refers. I conclude, for now, that either Stein is referring to an obscure artist, or that neither Miller nor I have correctly identified the painter from Stein’s handwriting. Other possible artists based on Miller’s assumption that the final letter is “i”: Hans Christian Genelli (1763-1623), Giovanni Bonaventure Genelli (1798-1868) (database source: Oxford Art Online); or Gemelli. For comparisons of the orthography of the beginning letter, see these digital archives of Stein’s themes: “S” of “Siegfried” in 1079746; “G” of “God” in 1079752.

55. Stein’s spelling of “ecstatic.”
To the true lover of argument the tame process of writing firstlies, secondlies and thirdlies on paper does not seem a peculiarly valiant task. He is accustomed to win or lose his point in a drawn battle where all talk at once, each trying to outdo each other, not alone by argument but by loudness of voice, number of words and violence of manner. Thus and thus only does the true lover of debate feel himself in his glory. But his natural tendency to object can get some slight satisfaction in writing a set argument. But the question is, as he with his tendency to dispute will manage to get argument into every thesis he write for all his other courses should be not in English 22 restrain himself and indulge in the purely artistic form. On the other hand those poor benighted beings, who love not logic and who are content to betray man make any statement rather than contradict, a few feeble and ineffec-
tual efforts are almost as bad as no effort if the soul loves not

56. R. Miller transcribes this word as “brighted” or “blighted?” (129).
a drawn battle.

Now for the personal equation. Argument is to me as the air I breathe. Given any proposition I cannot help believing the other side and defending it. But I would be virtuous and would rather make a \textit{dismal} failure of a description than revel in an argument. The one I get all the time; the other in English 22.\footnote{In other words, Stein \textit{chooses} to “make a dismal failure of a description” in English 22 rather than to “revel in an argument.” This is an important revelation on her part, acknowledging her failure at producing the kind of writing that she both wants to write and that her professors want her to write. It also reveals her decision to produce writing which she knows will fail. See chapter 5 for a discussion of this intention to failure, and the stated rejection of argument in a thoroughly argumentative theme.}

\textit{Edifyingly ascetic.}
What wonderful vitality there is in those old Norse legends. In the tales of Siegfried and the Niebelungen Lied\textsuperscript{58}

No matter how often one tells those old stores the excitement is still as great. Your blood is stirred as much as when you were a little child and all the heroic deeds are relived. What a pleasure in this psychological nineteenth century to live again the simple thoughts and the down-right strokes of the race of the Volsung.

Arrives

\textsuperscript{58} Also written Nibelungenlied or “The Song of the Nibelungs” (12th or 13th century text). Epic poem in Middle High German paralleling the Norse legends of the Volsung (Völsunga saga: late 13th century). Both of these texts record oral traditions dating back to the 5th and 6th centuries. They are sources upon which Richard Wagner based his four-opera cycle, \textit{The Ring of the Nibelung}, subject of Stein’s theme dated April 5, 1895.
Once my Not many years ago, my self-analysis always ended in heroics; but now it simply turns into mild meditation, with a flavor of cynisism, and contents itself with inventing wise saws to garnish a Daily Theme.

A happy consummation

59. Stein’s spelling for “cynicism.”
In the last few books of Marius the Epicurean, I felt a decided falling away in strength and truth. In trying to analyse the cause, insofar as it concerned the delineation of the character of Marius himself, it occurred to me that Pater gave us two decidedly antagonistic elements in the process of conversion.

On the one hand he discourses on the suddenness of the change, the deep impression that here was a revelation, a something utterly different and shows us that the spirit was the same and the ritual largely that of his old faith. Soon, however, I felt that this far from leading in the direction I supposed forced me to quite a contrary conclusion, and showed a clear insight in the order of influence necessary to produce not


61. In this phrase — “it occurred to me that Pater gave us two decidedly antagonistic elements in the process of conversion” — Stein offers true literary analysis, a separation of her as critic from the text as critiqued. This is a very important stage in her writing during this semester, in which she not only recognizes the relationship between herself and her audience/reader, but between herself and the text; in others words, she fashions herself as not only a reader who describes the experience of reading, but the analysis of reading: the first is primarily offering a reading of herself, the second of the text. See chapter 4 for more on this issue of movement from subsuming within the text to separating from it. Only from this position of separateness can a reader/writer create a dialogic relationship with text, which is one mark of a writer comfortable both with audience and with the process of writing. It also allows for the writer to change her position or opinion in relation to the text. Stein does this in the second paragraph as she describes not her feeling about the reading, but her understanding of it.
a violent conversion, but the quiet slow-working change that took place in Marius.

I now found that my dissatisfaction consisted rather in the purely emotional flavor of this new belief. It seemed hardly probable that the student of philosophy would so completely throw all his systematic thought to the winds and rely on the emotional wave alone.

---

Shows acumen -
There is no joy but calm.  

Look at that old figure coming down the street. I mean that dumpy little man in the coal-skuttle hat, with the coat tucked under his arm. One corner is peacefully trailing in the mud but he does he does not notice such trifles. He is a philosopher by the grace of God. See he has stopped in the very midst of the largest mud-puddle and is beatifically speculating about the fourth concept of reality utterly oblivious of the first. He evidently had some object in coming down here. Oh he was after a Boston car. Well! it is just gone passing him, but he not one whit disturbed, moves his feet placidly in the water on the crossing and waits for another.

Be a philosopher, oh my brother, if you would know perfect peace.

Seems forced.

62. This becomes a line in Stein’s opera, *Four Saints in Three Acts*, written in 1927 and later provided with a musical score by composer, Virgil Thompson. The opera was premiered in Hartford, CT, in 1934. Stein also began working in 1927 on the essays/pieces that she assembled into *How To Write* (published 1931), which I claim in my conclusion owes its structure and concept to Barrett Wendell’s 19th century composition textbook, *English Composition*, which was used in English 22. The fact that this title from her Daily Themes appears in the libretto of her opera of 1927 reinforces my claim in the conclusion that Stein’s work in the late 1920s and 1930s was influenced and informed by the writing she produced and the education she received in English 22. She was clearly consulting and borrowing from her student writing.
On reading Bernstein’s LaSalle\textsuperscript{63} it has again been borne in upon me, how completely Meredith failed in the Tragic Comedian,\textsuperscript{64} to portray his character. He gives us only a bizarre and unnatural giant in place of the very human socialist full of strength and weakness. It may seem sacrilegious to the devoted admirers of Meredith to dare to compare him with Dickens but his method is often the same. He too seizes certain marked characteristics of his characters and then dwells on them to the utter neglect of the other traits. He usually manages to keep this tendency within bounds but in the Tragic Comedians it completely carried him away and the character of La Salle is a distorted caricature that has not even the excuse of being humorous. It resembles nothing on earth certainly

Makes a point

\textsuperscript{63} Refers to an article by Eduard Bernstein on Ferdinand LaSalle, subject of George Meredith’s novel, \textit{The Tragic Comedians} (published in 1892). Stein’s reading of this article becomes an occasion for offering a critique of Meredith’s novel. For more information, see chapter 5, section entitled “Gertrude Stein, Literary Critic: From “You” to “They” — February 26th and March 2nd.

\textsuperscript{64} Refers to \textit{The Tragic Comedians: A Study in a Well-Known Story}, novel by George Meredith, which treats the late life of Ferdinand LaSalle in his character of Alvan. Note the 19th-century-era praise of Meredith in comparison to the critique of Dickens.
Hebart’s Metaphysic.  

It is remarkable what nonsense a metaphysician can give utterance to with the most awe-inspiring gravity. His here is one explanation of reality. The real world that which we do not know is made up of “Wesen.” Wesen are a quantity of nameless nothing’s having no time, no space, no form, no relation; they can have no connection with each other. Well and good, but here is the world we know, what of that?  “Why that,” replies our metaphysician, “is an accidental appearance.” To be sure but how did it manage to appear? “Well” gravely, replies the man of wisdom, “although Wesen have no relation, no nothing, they can do one thing,

---

65. R. Miller transcribes this as “Herbarte Metaphysics” (132). Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841). Wikipedia: “was a German philosopher, psychologies, and founder of pedagogy as an academic discipline. Herbart is now remembered amongst the post-Kantian philosophers mostly as making the greatest contrast to Hegel; this in particular relation to aesthetics. That does not take into account his thought on education. (sourced: 5-21-09). Good bibliographic materials on his theories of education (J-Stor). Herbart’s Textbook in Psychology (trans. M.K. Smith) was published in 1891, and his treatise on education, The Science of Education and the Aesthetic Revelation of the World (trans. H.M and E. Felkin), was published in English in 1892. Stein likely read one of these translation as she passed out of her German courses.

66. Stein’s question marks here and below look very much like semi-colons in the manuscript. Since she is consistent with both interrogatives, I give her the benefit of doubt here and assume unconventional-looking question marks rather than punctuation error. See jpg1089756.

67. Stein’s spelling of “metaphysician.”
they can zusammen.” (together) Off there in the unattainable, something says “zusammen”. Then the Wesen zusammen whatever that may be and th you have the world of appearances.” Is not this enough to bring a new burst of Satanic laughter from Mephisto. In very truth, what fools these mortals be.

Caustic
The Birth of a Legend.

When we were Californians we used regularly to spell out spend our summers in the mountains of Napa County. In order to reach the Springs, we had to stage a distance of twenty miles, from the town of St. Helena. One summer my father suggested that my brother and myself walk instead of riding. Harry was just thirteen and I but eleven, and so we agreed to the proposition in high glee. We decided to perform our pilgrimage on a Sunday, a day that the stage did not run, so that all temptation to give up our project would be removed.

The porter woke us early in the morning and we started out bravely. We carried a shot-gun and a small bag with refreshment. It was a delicious summer morning. The air, fragrant with pine, had the that crispness and clearness that I think is peculiar to California mountains. The long cloudless
summers remove every particle of moisture from the air. At
night the stars have an unearthly brilliancy. In other lands the
heavens appear as a surface; here every star hangs down out
of the blue behind it and you for the first time realize that
each is a world apart.

We soon covered the level ground, and struck up the
heavy mountain grade. As we were passing a pond in a
cañon, we saw a bird that was new to us, resting on what
seemed a little island near the bank. My brother raised his
gun and fired. The bird fell over dead. We were heartless
youngsters then, and were so fonder of our shooting than
sympathetic with we had no sympathy for our victims. Harry
climbed down the bank to get his quarry. He stepped on the
seeming island, which was only a bit of weed and stick.
He lost his footing and went down well up to his waist. Be-
fore I could come to the rescue, he had scrambled out and
stood on the shore, a most forlorn and dripping laddie. There
was nothing for it but to let the sun dry him. (If you have ever
been in California you probably were compelled to notice the
remarkable dustiness of the roads. Even if you have not been there, please picture to yourself the result of fully three months of dry weather on a country road. (You can imagine what a picture poor Henry presented for the dust) eager to seize on the only bit of moisture that it had known for many a day, came joyously and gathered around his moist garments. However we were born Bohemians and we trudged along hopefully.

The sun was now well up in the sky and it was growing exceedingly warm. We picked some large cool madrone leaves, that grow very conveniently for the hot way-farer. They come in groups of three and four in the shape of a fan and are a delightful protection from the glare of the sun, when put just under the hat, shading the face.

The scenery soon began to grow somewhat tedious.

Point of view? (We have so little forest country unless one goes to the Sierra Nevadas, that our walks are apt to be monotonous.) Of trees except the madrone and the lordly red-wood, one finds only the low shrub-like manzanita and the deadly poison-oak. The oak is the one leaf that gives our country brilliant coloring,
but alas for those that are susceptible to its dread power, even a breath of air wafted from those brilliant red-leaves, means a week of suffering. The streams by the middle of summer are (all) dried up, and the dust has settled on all the foliage. (and nature sadly needs a refreshing sprinkle.)

Our hunting zeal had not yet entirely abated, although the heat was beginning to tell on us. As we marched along we noticed a little jack-rabbit sitting right across the road. His long ears once impudently pointed towards us, saying as plainly as ears could say, “Don’t you wish you had me little boy!” Harry immediately accepted the challenge and commenced to load his gun in order to give little Johnny rabbit a lesson. Unfortunately the cartridge (and) stuck and would not go in. It was too large for the gun. Then my brother tried to get it out, but this was unsuccessful for once half-way in, it was resolved to stay. All this time the little rabbit was watching us with the most tantalizing expression in his intelligent ears. Harry tugged with his teeth, and I hardly dared breathe, I was so afraid the rabbit would go. Finally Harry managed to cut the cartridge out with his knife and just as he was about to
put in a good one, master rabbit, with a defiant whisk of his stub of a tail and a last impudent wink with those long ears, leaped into the wood.

We plodded on. Our hunting became more successful and we had added two heavy rabbits and a woodpecker to our baggage. To make progress easier we hung all our goods and chattels on the gun, each taking an end of it, and thus we managed to get along. We were now about five miles on the road. Before this we had refused several offers of a “lift”, by sympathetic farmers, but now our weary little souls began to yearn for the repetition of offers, that we had hitherto so indignantly refused.

We had not gotten much farther on our journey when we were overtaken by a jolly farmer, who of course, urged us to have a ride. We made a feeble protest, as a sop to our pride and then, only too happy to yield to his urgency, we scrambled in. How different the whole landscape became, when we could see it change before our eyes without being distracted by a fast-increasing weariness.

As we mounted higher and higher into the hills we
could see the whole broad Napa Valley below us, with the slight haze of the summer’s heat hanging over it. The view was not particularly picturesque. There was a painful same-

ness and artificiality about those squares of vineyard dotted here and there with (cool)⁷₀ wine-cellar. However our farmer said the view was fine so we acquiesced, but soon turned our eyes with greater enjoyment to the hills above us, with their madrone and red-wood and their brilliant poison oak.

Our farmer was very much amused at our project of walking to the Springs. Every few miles he would ask us jocularly, whether we did not want to get out and walk, but our ardor and been so thoroughly dusted, that we were perfectly willing to let him joke while we rode, rather than be proud and walk. He finally deposited us within a mile of our destination and we gave him a squirrel that we had shot. As he drove off down the road, his jolly laughter rang in our ears.

We once more loaded our gun with our spoils and started. When we had walked about a quarter of a mile, those rabbits began to grow painfully heavy. We decided finally that rabbits were not much good anyhow, they were so com-

---

⁷₀. Here Stein appears to determine that the point of view problem noted by Moody in the red underlines is properly focused on the word “cool,” for how would the narrator and her brother know this? She underlines the word cook twice, and then puts it in parentheses to indicate she will delete in the re-write.
mon, so we dropped first one and then the other by the road side. We arrived (at last) foot-sore and weary and covered with dust a little after one o’clock. As soon as the people heard that we had started to walk without waiting for the rest, they dubbed us the infant prodigies and hurried us into dinner.

We never lost that reputation in spite of all disclaimers. Many years after when we went back to the old place, we heard the legend told, of a tiny boy and girl, who had walked twenty miles up the mountain in half a day. Thus shall we figure in the future folk-lore of California.
A pleasant quiet bit of description with a sufficient thread of narrative to hold it firmly together. The style is well adapted to the simplicity of the matter, and the technique is careful and clean. In this last regard you have here made a very appreciable advance over your former work. The point of view shifts slightly in two places.

Revise

W.V.M.
Business.

It is most curious to hear a man who knows absolutely nothing of business give directions as to the conduct of an important matter. “I tell you what you want to do,” he says with deep gravity,” you want to talk to the man”. ‘What shall you say to him?’ you ask. “Oh! I don’t know” replies the sage counsellor, “just sort of talk to him.” Very well you go and talk to him. This will probably be the result. You say to the man in question, “Oh now what do you think about this matter?” “I don’t know exactly” responds the man “Oh! I guess its about alright mmm m” and the rest is an indistinct murmur. He looks wise, you try to look wise and retire. This is the business conducted, you have a noble sense of a difficult duty accomplished and the man does as he pleases.

Paragraph your dialogue
Our ancestors parents responded heart and soul to the singing of home sweet[^71] home but the only effect it produces on the present generation is of painful weariness and it brings into our minds no sacred memories, all that we associate it with it is the drone of the grind organ. Melba[^72] apparently thought that she was suiting the audience exactly by giving us that old song but she mistook the temper of young America. The tenderly pathetic is only humorous to us.

You are severe

---

[^71]: This theme appears to have been written in quite a hurry, as Stein clearly meant “sweet” here, but the word is equally clearly spelled with one “e” and two “t’s.” She did make two edits — changing “ancestors” to “parents” in the first sentence, and crossing out “and” to begin a new sentence, but she did not correct this spelling.

[^72]: Refers to Nellie Melba, Australia opera singer (1861-1931). Stein has apparently attended a concert of hers, and assessed the encore as out-of-touch with the young audience. Melba’s choice of song had less to do with pleasing the audience, however, than with her own identity as an Australian far from home. “Home Sweet Home” was already becoming a signature piece for Melba, and would later be regarded as part of her legacy as an opera legend from the antipodes. The tune was in fact picked up by her most famous late-20th-century Australian colleague, Joan Sutherland. As much of an opera-lover as Stein apparently was (choosing not to revise her theme of March 22 in order to attend the German opera), she was obviously unaware of the significance of this tune for the singer; or, perhaps less interested in the story behind the singer than in her own ‘modern’ music appreciation experience. From Wikipedia: “Melba became associated with the song ‘Home sweet home.’ She inherited it from Adelina Patti as Prima Donna Assoluta and after many performances the piano would be wheeled out and she would accompany herself singing the song, so bittersweet for her as home was an 11,000 mile sea voyage away when in England. Joan Sutherland later continued the tradition of singing "Home sweet home" and sang it after her own farewell performance in Meyerbeer's Les Huguenots at the Sydney Opera House in 1990.”
A Railroad Incident.

They were evidently just married and their clothes were painfully new. Alas the baleful eye of a Frenchwoman, an agent for a new kind of shawl strap, was soon on them. She moved up opposite them and commenced to describe the manifold virtues of her new patent. The poor young couple were in despair. First the groom sat on the edge of the seat. He began to edge nearer and nearer to his timid young bride when suddenly the voice of the agent would suddenly sound out loud and clear as she came to some particularly impressive fact and the poor youth would shrink of the seat like some guilty thing. He went to the smoking-room and there the men guyed him, he came back and found the agent still talking. Marriage certainly was a failure as far as that train was concerned. As we neared Washington they both proceeded to

73. Definition of “guyed” in this context from the OED online, guy, v3: “2. trans. (Originally Theatrical slang.) To make an object of ridicule or derisive wit, to ridicule by innuendo; to trifle with a theatrical part. Also to guy at.” The most documented uses for this meaning in the OED online entry are from 1890-1898, so likely the meaning intended by Stein here.
change their stiff new garments for some equally new and stiff and the when we reached the city they went off arm in arm, the skirts of the young bride rustling as they walked and whispering to the passers by, “See aren’t we new?”

Your details are significant.
I felt by the movement of the train that we were beginning to climb up the mountains. I drew up the shade at the head of my berth and watched. It was a perfect moon-light night. The brightness made the deep pines look all the blacker. Far ahead I saw the rosy light of the engine now lost in the dark pines, now winding snake like up the hill drawing the dark heavy train after it. Every little while a fountain of sparks rose from the engine, fell into the dark mass on either side, lit them for a moment and then was gone. Slowly, slowly it wound up through those strange mysterious shapes that thronged on either side, weird and fantastic in the mystic light of the moon. The engine now stopped panting like an exhausted thing and then once more the brakes creaked and groaned and we the serpent-like windings began again.

Specific
It is disheartening to come back to Cambridge after a
week of the delicious, dreamy south. Baltimore, sunny Balti-
more, where no one is in a hurry and the voices of the negroes
singing as their carts go lazily by, lull you into the drowsy
waken reveries. It is a strangely silent city, even its busiest
thoroughfares seem still and the clanging car-bells only blend
with the peaceful silence and do but increase it. To lie on the
porch, to listen to the weird strains of Grieg’s spring-song,74
to hear the negro voices in the distance and to let your mind
wander idly as it listeth, that is happiness. The lotus-eaters
knew not the joys of calm more completely than a Baltimor-
ean. Let us alone for we have the essence of contentment,
quiet dreamy, slothful case in the full sensuous sunshine.

Sympathetic

74. Either Edvard Grieg’s Op. 33 No.2 Våren (Spring) or Grieg’s Lyric Pieces Op. 43 No. 6 Til Vaaren (To Spring). The first is an actual “song” for soprano and accompaniment; the second, a piano solo that might more be described by Stein listeneing in 1895 as having “weird strains.”
Sleep, the greatest blessing of our miserable race.

Nothing can be compared with it, It is the essence of all good, all peace all content. What can be equal the bliss of waking up drowsily and knowing you can turn over and sleep again? I love to dwell on that word sleep – with its somnolent sl and p. It was a word born to reveal joy to the suffering and greater happiness to him already possessing earth’s fairest fruits. To sleep, to awake and then to sleep again, such is the heaven I picture to myself and to sleep and wake and not be able to sleep — again, who can conceive a hell more damnable, a suffering more intense? Sleep, the monarch of all joys, the dearest gift to man, the state of bliss supreme would that I might be in thy embrace for eternity.

To sink to sleep to feel, that drowsiness delicious drowsiness all through your frame and then to cuddle in one and sleep, ah the picture is so fair I can not tear myself away from its contemplation.

A rhapsody
Chapter I.

In the Library

It was an ideal library for literary browsers; Out of the noise and bustle of the city and yet within easy reach. The books were all in one vast room with high ceilings and great windows that let in a flood of sunshine. The place was undisturbed save for some ten or twelve habitual readers, who each sought out their favorite nook on some leathern lounge or great arm-chair, out of sight between tall rows of books. Occasionally an unwary stranger would inadvertently enter and disturb the silence by his resounding footsteps, but soon he would withdraw awed by the stillness and emptiness of the vast room. Sometimes the strains of Chopin’s funeral march would reach the ears of the quiet readers, as a military band, accompanying some local celebrity, on his last journey, passed down the street.

One day as the last long sad notes of the march died

---

75. Stein answers Moody’s question directly in the margin beneath his comment.
on the air, a young girl who had been listening intently, threw down her book with an impatient gesture, and dropped her face on the arm of the leathern couch. She was screened from all view by the heavy book-cases in front of her, so she sat in the full-glare of the noon-day sun, her book at her side, motionless. Finally with a resigned shrug she picked up her book, once more curled herself on her sofa, and tried to catch the broken thread. It was useless, a wild impatience possessed her. She was a dark-skinned girl in the full sensuous development of budding woman-hood. Her whole passionate nature had been deeply stirred by those few melancholy strains and with the sun-light heating her blood, she could not endure to rest longer. “Books, books” she muttered, “is there no end to it? Nothing but myself to feed my own eager nature. Nothing given me but musty books.” She paused, her eyes glowing, and her fists nervously clenched. She was not an impotent child, but a strong vigorous girl, with a full nature and a fertile brain that must be occupied, or burst its bounds. At
At last she arose and left the library. As she passed out of the quiet retreat, the east wind struck her, and increased the tumult in her soul. “I will walk it down” she said aloud. “I must escape from myself.” She started up over the hills at a quick pace, but even that did not satisfy her, faster and faster she went, panting as she climbed the steep hills, but utterly oblivious of her bodily strain, anxious only to escape from self. At last she reached the top-most hill and (there she stopped). Below her lay the blue ocean; the fresh breeze blew on her. She took off her hat and stood there bathed in sunshine, drinking in deep (gulps) of ocean air, and muttering her satisfaction to herself. At last she turned and now more slowly retraced her steps down the long hills until she reached her house. - - - - -

Circumstances had forced Hortense Sänger to live much alone. For many years this had suited her completely.

With her intense and imaginative temperament, books and her own visions had been sufficient company.76 She had been

76. I address this sentence in particular in chapter 4 as a self-conscious move by Stein from the life of the “inner mind” so vehemently defended and occupied in her first theme in October to this theme in March. This sentence appears to refer directly to that theme of October 10th, in which she writes in the first person of the experience of her “vision” of Shelley’s Beatrice taking over her (Stein’s) reality, such that she had to stop writing entirely. Her character in this theme, Hortense Sänger, refers to the very intense imagination, book-obsession, and visions that characterize Stein’s first-person narrator in theme one. While the morbidity, fears, and “wild mood” remain in the narrative, in this theme of March, however, rather than reveling in them, Hortense ultimately rejects them. I read this theme as a fundamental shift in the Steinian relationship between reading and writing during this semester.
early inured to heavy responsibilities, and had handled them firmly, for, though a dreamer by nature she had a strong prac-
tical sense. She had now come to a period of her life, when she could no longer content herself with her own nature. She fairly lived in her favorite library. (for being) motherless (she was) at liberty to come and go at her own pleasure, . (but now) her old and well-beloved companions began to pall. One could not live on books, she felt that she must have some hu-
man sympathy. Her passionate yearnings made her fear for the endurance of her own reason. Vague fears began to crowd on her. Her longings and desires had become morbid. She felt that she must have an outlet. Some change must come into her life, or she would no longer be able to struggle with the wild moods that now so often possessed her.

Just at this critical time, her father died and thus the only tie that bound her to her old home was snapped. Not long after she accepted the invitation of some relatives and left her old haunts and, she hoped her old fears, to lead an entirely new life in a large family circle.
I would like to have rewritten the whole theme but the German opera threw me back in my work. 77

The theme opens attractively 78 It is a pity to throw away so good a background as the old library: it is a sheer waste of material, and inartistic into the bargain, since it throws a false emphasis on the milieu at the start. 79 The description of the girl is lacking in vividness and specific quality. We see her mood, but not her living image. The last page of the theme seems scrappy and hurried. The story should have been taken up at a later point and the present portion developed by way of reminiscence.

Revise or rewrite, as you think best. 80

W.V.M.

77. A lovely postscript by Stein to her professor, demonstrating her preference for opera over writing. There is a story of a similar note to William James on the day of her final exam, saying that she simply did not feel so much like taking an exam that day. As she tells it in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas, James gave her an “A” for the class, saying that he understood, and that sometimes he felt the same way. That story, written by Stein but not documented, seems more credible, however, given the note she writes here. If to Moody, why not to James? 78. In the Beinecke digital archive of these themes, the image of this end comment is non-sequential. The theme ranges from 1079777 to 1079780. This image of Moody’s final comment is 1064025. 79. This criticism is valid in the first draft of this theme. Stein addresses his critique by keeping the description of the library at the start in order to reject it at the close. It appears, if the rewrite indicates a “refining” of Stein’s idea, that the library itself was never the focus of description, but rather, a convenient setting for exploring her character’s rejection of books for living. 80. This final “as you think best” comes as a complete surprise after months of harsh critique. Moody takes a much less forceful approach with Stein here than in previous long end comments, openly giving her the choice that she has taken without his consent for most of the year. In addition, his many edits in the final comment strike me as equivocating more than he had early on in the year. He seems subdued, almost conciliatory, in this comment, as though he has been beaten by her resistance.
He was a melancholy looking porter but strongly built. He seemed more intelligent than most of the men in his class. One day he told us a story of negro life in the south that impressed us deeply. He had been a porter on a Southern train and it had been the custom to pay for the parlor-car chains to the porter instead of to the conductor. As usual about an hour after the start the porter went to collect his fares. A roystering, Southern gentleman seeing the negro coming down the car determined to resist such an indignity. “I don’t pay money to niggers” he said haughtily. “Sorry sir but it is the rule of the road.” “Rule be damned,” was the insolent reply, “don’t you dare to ask a Southern gentleman for money you -” The porter persisted quietly, and again demanded his money. He was assailed with more oaths and foul words and

81. Stein reused this theme in “Melanctha,” the centerpiece story of Three Lives, published in 1909. Notice in the rewrite below the following changes: Stein removes the dialogue, and shifts from first person plural to third person, adding more detail about the relationship between the porter and the character of Melanctha, who is standing in for the narrator of the theme. In particular, notice the addition of the porter’s attitude towards Melanctha, his appeal for “the way she had of listening with intelligence and sympathetic feeling.” The revised paragraph from “Melanctha” reads as follows: “There was one, big, serious, melancholy, light brown porter who often told Melanctha stories, for he liked the way she had of listening with intelligence and sympathetic feeling, when he told how the white men in the far South tried to kill him because he made one of them who was drunk and called him a damned nigger, and who refused to pay money for his chair to a nigger, get off the train between stations. And then this porter had to give up going to that part of the Southern country, for all the white men swore that if he ever came there again they would surely kill him” (Three Lives, 83).
now he seized his opponent by the collar and forcibly put him off the car. When the train came back over the road, it was rumored that a large body of men were lying in wait for the courageous porter. The conductor hid him in a dressing-room and there he heard the angry crowd hunt through the train swear vengeance on his devoted head. He escaped that time but had to leave the road and never more return to his native state.

Last part could be made more dramatic
Fischer’s impersonation of Hagen\textsuperscript{82} reminds me much more strongly of the sturdy grim hero\textsuperscript{83} of the Nibelungenlied, the embodiment of the old German “treue,”\textsuperscript{83} than of the wicked Hagen that Wagner created.

As he sits there with his spear and shield keeping watch and ward in the gathering gloom the wonderful scene in the Lied comes back to the listener. One remembers then only the brothers-in-arms keeping watch together on that fearful night, guarding the doomed heroes and filling the treacherous enemy with fear and awe as the grim warriors sit silently in the gloomy hall. “Hagen, grimmige Hagen”\textsuperscript{84} the man of wile but also of dauntless valor, unswerving constancy\textsuperscript{85} and heroic endurance.

\textit{Sympathetic}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{82} “Fischer’s impression of Hagen” refers to Emil Fischer (1838-1914), a German bass-baritone who created the Wagnerian role of Hagen from Götterdämmerung at the Metropolitan Opera in 1888. Online source: http://www.harmonieautographs-opera-ballet.com/. He was given a “jubilee” at the Met in 1907, as reported in the \textit{New York Times}: http://query.nytimes.com/. Final note: R. Miller spells “Hagen” as “Hagan” in this first instance (though correctly as “Hagen” below); this is the first of several errors in her transcription of this theme.

\textsuperscript{83} R. Miller transcribes this erroneously as “study given here” (144).

\textsuperscript{84} Translated, “faithful” meaning he portrayed a loyal warrior, rather than wicked one.

\textsuperscript{85} Translated, “Hagen, furious, Hagen.”

\textsuperscript{86} R. Miller transcribes this word as “crestan-cry [?]”, a reasonable attempt given Stein’s handwriting, though it makes no sense, as she acknowledges herself with her bracketed question mark.
\end{flushleft}
A cloudy summer night when the air is damp and moist
is even more fearful than the blackness of a wintry storm. In
that weird fitful\textsuperscript{87} half light the budding bushes assume the
shapes of strange, weird, shadowy monsters whose swaying
arms intin seem ready to suck in and strangle all humans in the
quiet\textsuperscript{88} of the night. The willows\textsuperscript{89} in the marshes groan and
creak one against the other and between their branches one
catches glimpses of seemingly endless dreary wastes. On the
dank pond in their midst the gleam of a light flickers and dies
away in ghostly fashion. All nature seems portentous and now
suddenly arising we know not whence a tremendous last
gust of
some expiring March wind comes tearing threw\textsuperscript{90} the trees.

\textit{passes and leaves us awed and affrighted at its}

\textit{Has “atmosphere”}

\textsuperscript{87} R. Miller transcribes as “pitiful” (144). This is admittedly difficult to decipher. Stein penned “fitful” quite heavily over the original word-choice making it appear as if there were two “i”s and suggesting an amalgam of “pitiful.” However, the ink in the word “fitful” is clearly an overwrite, and with effort it becomes clear that Stein’s original word was “weird,” common to her vocabulary in similar descriptions in these themes. My transcription is also supported by Stein’s use of “weird” in the very next sentence. She likely scratched the first use out to avoid repetition so closely together. See digital archive 1079786 for manuscript image.

\textsuperscript{88} R. Miller transcribes as “quest” (144).

\textsuperscript{89} R. Miller transcribes as “villons” (144). Again, this makes no sense, but this time Miller does not question her own judgment. Her transcriptions of the April themes are particularly error-filled.

\textsuperscript{90} Stein’s spelling for “through.”
In a lonely corner of Jarvis, behind a dismal brick wall is a solitary heap of snow, the last mournful remnant of winter’s dazzling glory. Heaped together, stained and soiled, it is a melancholy grave, a sad token of the weakness of the great nature powers.

Even here the hoary tyrant has not found peace. Dancing sun-beams are coming ever nearer and nearer, threatening to dislodge him from his last stronghold and to leave but a sorry mud-puddle to witness the end of that tyrannic power, before the shaking of whose ice-bound spear, we have so long shivered.

Paragraph a bit conventional

91. An L-shaped street that in 1895 connected Massachusetts Avenue and Everett Streets on the Northwest Corner of the Harvard Campus. The “dismal brick wall” and “solitary heap of snow” Stein refers to is in the shadow of Austin Hall, the first building on this location, completed to house classes in 1883 for what Harvard’s Law School website describes as “arguably the first day in the life of the modern Law School” source: http://www.law.harvard.edu/about/nwc/legacy_history.htm. Transformed from being a “lonely corner” in March 1895, today, in 2010, the site is under construction for the Wasserstein Caspersen Clinical (WCC) Complex of the Harvard Law School. With the completion of this major project in Fall 2010, Jarvis Street will no longer be a thorough-fare, even for pedestrian traffic. Online source: http://www.law.harvard.edu/about/nwc/timetable_overview.htm. This one example presents a fascinating map of one location in Harvard’s infrastructure expansion over a century of healthy growth. Indeed, when Stein returned to Cambridge in 1934, she says that she did not recognize Radcliffe at all, such had been the changes to the campus since she left in 1898.
Bright little blue eyes is going to see a procession. She has been dreaming and longing for it for a week. Every few minutes she cries “ooh! mamma! percession!” At last the family party are in the carriage little blue eyes on the front seat, ecstatic, the eyes growing bigger and bigger. There comes the procession at last, as it draws near the band begins to play and suddenly the big base drum gives one tremendous boom.

The little eyes close suddenly, the rosy lips begin to tremble, “Ppapa,” they timidly say, “I think I would hear better on the back seat.”

Well massed
It was a jolly high-school picnic, blooming girls and awkward boys, off for a good time, one bright spring day. The most awkward of all, a shy youth of sixteen, did not enjoy it very much and soon wandered off by himself. As he was standing gazing dreamily at the brook running past/at his feet, he suddenly heard his name called.

On the opposite bank a little above him was a beautiful young girl in delicate blue. Her hat was off, the wind was playing in her fair hair, her eyes dancing and her lips parted in a charming smile. “Won’t you help me down” she said beaming on the startled youth. He looked and looked but could not move. Give me your hand, I can’t get down, “she continued enjoying his confusion. Automatically he obeyed. With his help she jumped lightly across the bubbling stream. She was beside The boy at her touch felt strangely dizzy. She was beside him, this mysterious creature who dazed his brain. Sud-
denly he dropped her hand, turned and ran into the woods.

Surprised, she looked after him and then shrugging her pretty shoulders, “what a stupid boy he is,” she said.

Ends well
His life is gentle and the elements
So mix’d in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, “this is a man.”\(^92\)

Is life worth living?\(^93\) Yes, a thousand times yes when the world still holds such spirits as Prof. James. He is truly a man among men; a scientist of force and originality embodying all that is strongest and worthiest in the scientific spirit; a metaphysician skilled in abstract thought, clear and vigorous and yet too great to worship logic as his God, and narrow himself to a belief merely in the reason of man.

A man he is who has lived sympathetically not alone all thought but all life. He stands firmly, nobly for the dignity of man. His faith is not that of a cringing coward before an all-

\(^92\). Quotation from the final scene of William Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, spoken by Antony. Stein places her encomium to James in the present tense. Notice also the different placement of commas between Stein’s quotation and the original Shakespeare:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, “This was a man!” (5.5.73-75)

\(^92\). Refers to William James’ lecture of the same title to the Young Men’s Christian Association of Harvard University and the Philadelphia Society for Ethical Culture. The lecture received such praise that it was published, first, in the *International Journal of Ethics*, October 1895 edition, and then in several subsequent printing to keep abreast of demand. Full text of the 1904 edition, published by S. Burns Weston of Philadelphia, can be read online at Google Books. Search terms, “Is Live Worth Living William James.”
powerful master, but of a strong man willing to fight, to suffer
and endure. He has not accepted faith because it is easy and
pleasing. He has thought and lived many years and at last says
with a voice of authority, if life does not mean this, I don’t
know what it means.

What can one say more? He is a strong sane noble per-
sonality reacting truly on all experience that life has given
him. He is a man take him for all in all.

Sincere tone
“A new boarder is coming,” said our landlady the other day at the table. “A new boarder we don’t want any new boarders” we the family decided in a private meeting called to get opinions on this important question. We had nothing to say, however, and the new has come.

The first night she swept in with a royal air and we were all awe-struck. She condescendingly bowed to us poor plebians and then majestically seated himself. Miss Harriet who used to do all the talking is suddenly strangely silent. At last she picked up her courage and ventured a remark. The new boarder condescended to answer her. We breathed more freely and admired Miss Harriet and wished we could do it too.

Then the new boarder begins to talk. She talks all the time now and we are crushed to earth never to rise again. Whenever we venture an opinion she rises in her majesty, tells

94. This scrawl in pencil seems an unlikely marking for Moody, with no explanatory marginal comment; however, the end comment is also in pencil as it has been for many of the April themes. I have some small doubt, though, hence a footnote to leave the possibility, however unlikely, that this is Stein’s.
us of some great man who believes as she does and has told her so and we meekly retire.

She seems to have known all the great people since the time of Adam and they have all given her their private views on all subjects. Our landlady looks at her, drinking her in with open mouth, eyes and ears. She gives her a finger-bowl at dinner too and we poor plebs look on in envy and can only hope that some day we too will know some great man.

Suggestive
Kindergarten just out.

First comes a sturdy youngster, round face, blue eyes, generally the look of a very bad boy. He has opened his coat and stuck both his hands deep into his pockets and looks defiantly at all the world as he struts along. “Hello”, no answer, he scorns me utterly. I pass on crushed.

Here comes a group of little girls, in bright blues and reds, dancing in the sun-light. One a sweet little motherly damsel stops to smile at me encouragingly. I beam back, and feel myself once more an independent mortal. A dear old grandmother is walking along with two little ones. One of them suddenly thinks of a secret. She draws grandma’s white head down and whispers in her ear then turns exulting her little sister crying “You don’t know what I said.

Last comes a little negress, (delicate with beautifully cut features) and her brother a sturdy youngster. They both
smile at me happily and make the bright day seem even brighter. I owe them both a deep debt. When I first came to Cambridge they alone of all the children, smiled at me. The youngster has confided to me his troubles. His teacher don’t like him, he says, he does not exactly know why but thinks it must be because he’s stupid. You know I can’t learn much,”⁹⁴ he adds cheerfully.

Pleasant tone

⁹⁴. Stein does not supply an open-quote to match this close-quote.
It is easy and sounds well to prate of the utilitarianism of the present day, to say that the ideal of all reform is simply the ideal of getting something to eat. It is easy to talk so but at the same time it shows small knowledge of the forces that have led the human race to its present high development.

If we are to believe our modern theories at all, can we lose sight of the fact that all our ethical and aesthetic sense has had its rise in reactions useful for the preservation of the organism, that is in reactions necessary to get it something to eat?

When we turn to history can we forget that Hampden went to prison on a question of ship-money and that the American revolution was fought on a question of taxes? The getting something to eat is incentive, and from that one developed noble spirits and heroic deeds.

---

95. John Hampden (c. 1595-1643), English politician. Stein is referring to Hampden’s opposition to a tax levied by Charles I without the consent of Parliament. Stein’s two references in this sentence serve her point that “utilitarianism,” which she reduces to “the ideal of getting something to eat” has produced great moments in history, and should not be disparaged. The slippage in her argument, the difficulty following it, stems from her equation of “getting something to eat” with justice fought on behalf of the preservation of money. She has, in a sense, too many arguments going at once here in a short theme. Despite this, the theme displays a political bent on behalf of the oppressed against powerful political forces, and shows a fairly sophisticated grasp of philosophy and English history. Being in Cambridge, and being an American, the reference to the American revolution would be a part of common knowledge and not derived from book learning.
Better would it be for the educated to-day to recognize this, and assist in modern reforms thus developing in the laborer the great qualities of prudence, endurance and self-sacrifice that co-operation induces, rather than to assume a fin de siècle tone and rail against the gross materialism round about him. 96

96. This theme is very much in the style of a forensic exercise, such as those Stein wrote in her junior year. We can see in this brief theme the force of her argumentative approach. I have included in my appendices a transcription of Stein’s Third Forensic from 1895-1896 which she preserved for posterity. You will notice that the forensic exercise is much lengthier than this short daily theme, and successfully connects-the-dots of her argument more clearly than in this theme.
As they drew near the church the crowd in the streets increased. All Baltimore seemed to have turned out to hear the new preacher. They pressed through the throng and entered the church but as soon as they got within the door they were brought to a halt. The place was packed every nook and corner was filled with its full allowance of uncomfortable humanity. (So closely were they crowded, that no one could see anything except the person directly in front of them).

After waiting awhile, the crowd gradually, with that peculiar indefinable movement there is in even the densest throng, began to loosen. The pressure on the door was slightly lessened and our party by dint of pushing, waiting, squeezing, the

97. R. Miller prints Stein’s final two themes out of order, with this penultimate submission (entitled The Temptation) matched with May 22nd, and Stein’s final submission (a continuation of this theme) matched with May 8th. In addition to reversing the sequential order of the two final themes, she mistakes one of the two pages numbered “6” for the other, resulting in the penultimate theme missing a large section of description (comprising 3 paragraphs) which were to be inserted — as instructed by Stein — following the third paragraph within this theme (see footnote 97). Miller, having confused these two page sixes, has printed that intended insertion for the penultimate theme at the end of the final theme (which she has ordered as the penultimate theme). She notes, based upon this mistaken ordering, that “unfortunately, the manuscript stops abruptly in the middle of page p. (4),” “that the following page (5) is missing, and the theme is then continued and completed on page (6)” (152). Ordered correctly, no text is missing, and the narrative makes sense. In short, this is the first time these two themes have been printed in the correct paragraph order and with full text as Stein intended.
waiting again and so managing to insert themselves between the people, succeeded in forcing their way to the steps leading up to the choir-loft. Hortense who was ahead mounted two of the steps and then turned to look at the crowd below her. N

Never had she seen a more motley assembly. Negroes and whites, working men and elegant youths all together. A beautiful girl with a graceful figure and dressed in those light-veil-like gowns that add so much to the charm of the Southern city was forced to close up to a villainous looking Italian who was trying to push past her. Page 6 to be inserted here.98

On the other side were some nuns in their long black gowns, whispering kindly to each other, frightened at finding themselves in the midst of such a thing. One delicate little woman had fainted and the crowd were forced back enough to let her husband support her out.

Other women with that rudeness peculiar to their sex, were abusing their neighbors and impatiently trying to see over their heads. An old woman barely able to totter, was try-

98. This direction was written by Stein to her professor. She had attached an additional “Page 6” to the end of this Daily Theme. This page 6 is also not to be confused with Stein’s final “p. 6” from this same theme. There are, in fact, two page sixes for this theme, one the final consecutive narrative page (digital image 1079809), and the other, this “page 6” insertion (digital image 1079810) I have inserted the correct content here, and indicate with another footnote in this theme where the original text resumes. See Appendix B digital image 1078805 for manuscript image of this page, where Stein indicates the insertion is meant to be.
ing to kneel before the central aisle, as is the custom on passing the figure of the Christ. At last she succeeded but was almost crushed by a sudden movement in the throng around her.

All those strange noises and curiously assorted types were there, that are always to be found in a Catholic church where all ranks and conditions find a common mother. The impressive ceremonies, the wealth and imagery displayed in the building, the poetic and mystic emblems, in the church particularly in the dim evening light attract alike the ignorant and the cultured. The passivity of obedience that the church teaches is an inestimable boon in this hurried struggling life of ours.  

The crowd for a moment would be still and then without any definable cause, the swaying and pushing would begin again. The heat was intense. The noises of the street and the lig came through the widely-open windows adding to the confused hum within. To avoid the heat the lights were turned low and but the moon shone in through all the making strange sha lights and shadows through the stained windows

99. End of “Page 6” insert. Stein’s original narrative resumes with the following paragraph. This 1-page insertion is Stein’s only large revision within a single draft of a theme.
and making that strange crowed look still more weird.

Far away in the end of the church hardly distinguishable in the dim light stood the young preacher in his priestly robes waiting for the people to be still. At last he raised his hand and began his prayer. None could kneel in that densely packed throng and so all swiftly bowed their heads.

This attitude of prayer observing (it and) not participating in it has always a strange fascination. The sight of all those people bowing before a power that they dimly recognize, little children, aged grandfathers and strong men all joining in that act of prayer, is peculiarly impressive. It is a solemn and a melancholy sight to the skeptic bringing disquieting reflections on the real worth of things. What does it all mean? Why this universal bending before, what, a God of wrath, a God of love which or neither? Are we really only the victims of blind force. “Into this universe and only not knowing,

Nor whence, like water willy-nilly flowing;

And out of it, as Wind along the wastes,

I know not whither, willy nilly blowing.”100

---

100. Quotation from *The Rubaiyat* by the Persian poet, mathematician, philosopher, astronomer, Omar Khaiyyam (1048-1131), as translated by Edward FitzGerald (1809-1883). FitzGerald edited four editions, and it is likely Stein was using the fourth, published in 1879, for which this quotation is in stanza 29. For a complete online resource of the FitzGerald editions of *The Rubaiyat*, see University of Texas-Austin’s “Collaborative Rubiyat”: http://scholar.hrc.utexas.edu/rubaiyat.
Why? Why? Thus Hortense, her whole soul filled with longing thought and questioning. “A longing and for what,” she muttered, “I would not be as they.” What then?101 she did not know. She struggled with her thought, she tried to throw off the weight, the intolerable burden of solving for herself the great world-questions. “After all” she continued to herself dreamily Omar Khayyam is right. “The me within thee blind”102 “While you live drink! — for, once dead, you never shall return;103 Dream-life is the only life worth living.”104

And then she continued with new fervor, she muttered looking at the preacher over that sea of bowed heads, “Go on, I’ll catch your ecstasy. I’ll bow my soul to the melody of your voice and yield myself to all the suggestions of the moment.

Let me only be at rest and cease wonder why, why, why. There is no answer, there shall no longer be a questioning.”

Her muttering ceased and with it, the prayer came to an end. The heads were raised and again a movement began among the crowd. Once such a kind of one when a very young

101. Moody inserts a close-quote here, but does not insert a balanced open-quote for it, nor does he scratch out Stein’s close-quote directly preceding.
103. Ibid., from stanza 35.
104. This final clause in Stein’s quotation appears to be a paraphrase from The Rubaiyat, but the exact wording is not in the FitzGerald edition. In fact, it seems to echo Stein’s theme dated April 25, in praise of William James’ lecture, “Is Life Worth Living?”
woman went with some women of her

More people were forced in front of Hortense and she stepped back on to a landing. Behind her there were also some people but not so tightly pressed together. The girls was forced back against one of the men standing in a corner, her friends were just below her. She had not noticed this man before, she did not look at him now, but he, taking advantage of the position, leaned toward her rather heavily. She felt his touch. At first she was only half-aware of (oblivious to) it, but soon she became conscious of his presence. The sensuous impressions had done their work only too well. The magic charm of a human touch was on her and she could not stir. She loathed herself but still she did not move.

Now she became conscious that possibly her friends would notice her proximity to this fellow. Even that did not

105. This insertion in pencil is very likely anachronistic to the original writing and revision of these themes. The style is of Stein’s experimental writing of the early 1900s when she was beginning *The Making of Americans*. It is my belief that she returned to these themes, and made this edit in pencil long after English 22 had been completed. Like many of her male peers at Harvard-Radcliffe, who used English 22 and English 12 to draft the first of their publications, Stein must have considered these themes fodder for her later writing. Why else would she have kept them? Why else overwrite them as she has done here? This one sentence is perhaps the most interesting of Stein’s edits to these themes, demonstrating convincingly, in my opinion, that she considered these themes her first acts as a writer who saw herself as a writer. And specifically demonstrating the syntactic difference between the student Stein who wrote in pen, and the non-student Stein who, I believe, wrote this unusual sentence in pencil.

106. The scrawl above is also in pencil as is the word “girl” heavily overwritten “girls” here to create subject-very agreement. These also are probably edits made much later than the original writing, as are the pencil edits on the following pages. NB: Stein also made edits in black pen, as was typical of her post-comment edits during the course. These two rounds of editing suggests definitively that they were done at separate times, and the stylistic signature of the pencil sentence above places the date quite nicely in the early 1900s rather than in 1895 for the pencil round.
stir her. Her busy brain was active in weaving excuses. She remembered her well-known tendency to absent-mindedness. “I can tell them I was unconscious and grow indignant if they accuse me.”

The voice of the preacher continued off in the distance but the words did not penetrate her brain. At last she became unconscious of the voice and of the crowd, she only felt the human touch and thought of the reasons she should give her position.

At last she noticed her aunt friend motioning to her. “Not yet,” she said to herself, “I won’t see her.” Then with a quick revulsion she continued fiercely, “Liar and coward,” will you continue this, have you no sense of shame?” and all the while her eyes were fixed on the preacher and she looked the embodiment of intelligent interest.

She seemed to herself, to be growing apathetic. She tried to force herself to move but she could not. She upbraided herself, she grew more violent in her thoughts and yet she did not move.
At last one of her cousins forced her way to her,
touched her arm and said that her mother wanted to go home.
Hortense stepped down & together they made their way out of
the crowded church.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷. One final note about the ordering of these final two themes, and the credibility of the available transcriptions. When I first began studying these manuscripts in earnest in 2006, the loose-leaf pages were still in the order that Miller had printed them in *Gertrude Stein: Form and Intelligibility*, suggesting that scholars since 1949, when Miller published her book, were assuming the order to be correct. So not only was Miller’s print version misleading, the manuscript archive was as well, despite there being small clues such as reversed folds of the recto and verso of some pages, and the strange narrative lacunae noted by Miller. When I pointed these folds out to the Beinecke librarians, and explained the problematic narrative, they were engaged and appreciative, and we restored the pages within the manuscript archive to the correct order. They have attempted in the digitization to reflect this order in the number system. Where there are anomalies, I have indicated them in footnotes.
Very slow at the start. The trials and tribulations endured by your heroine in finding a vantage ground in the church do not seem sufficiently integral to deserve such elaborate recital. The vague thoughts and emotions aroused in the heroine’s mind by contemplation of the crowd are indicated with considerable force, though the tone is at first awkwardly impersonal. The closing reflections suggest the cold-blooded methods of laboratory analysis. The ethical and sociological elements of the problem [if it can be called to formal a name] are drained off in such a way as to leave it somewhat unmitigated.  

Revise

W.V.M.

108. Moody’s end comment, with its boilerplate attention to the rhetorical priorities of “force” “tone” and “point of view” sanitize the actual content of this theme. Even when he does address the scandalous aspects of Stein’s narrative, he does so at an emotional remove that strips any real engagement with the story Stein appears to be telling. This seems a dilemma, an educational moment, for graders of composition in any era: when to address shocking content directly, and when to approach it indirectly through rhetorical strategy?
After leaving the church they all walked on very silently for some time. A chill had crept into the air. The joy had gone out of the streets. In place of the dancing children and the careless groups of elders, there were now but the weird wavering shadows of the trees. The sky had become overcast, all nature seemed to feel the reaction of sadness and chill after the excitement of this summer evening.

The group began to separate slightly, Hortense walking ahead with her favorite cousin. There was an uneasy silence that she tried again and again to break, but could not. A strange feeling came over her as they walked on. She began to wonder whether she had really done this thing, whether she had yielded herself consciously or whether after all the position was accidental and she not a willing subject. The excuses that she had framed to herself in the height of the excitement had taken an abiding hold on her and had become not excuses

109. Though this final theme was to be a revision of the previous theme, Stein continues the narrative where she had left off, with Hortense and her friend leaving the church. This theme has no title.
but a reality.

She wondered to see the process go on within herself. She tried to shake off her apathy but could not. She was only a spectator and within herself gradually began without any effort of her own, a growing conviction that after all it had been absent-mindedness. Again she tried to struggle against this process, tried to force herself to confess the truth to her companion. It was useless, the false conviction increasing, soon took possession of her entirely, she was mentally paralyzed.

Her cousin now also attempted to break the silence. At last they began to talk in rather a strained fashion. The tension was too much for Hortense, she drew the accusation down upon herself at last by asking somewhat indignantly, what the matter was. At this her cousin began telling her how pained and ashamed they all had been at seeing her so far forget herself.

When the accusation was actually worded, all Hortense’s doubts were at an end. She became filled completely with the sense of her own guiltlessness. She grew indignant
and her anger passed directly into words. “What” she said frowning, “do you think as meanly of me as that? Can you believe that I could to a thing of that sort consciously? You all are ready enough think ill of me if you can so easily accuse me of this. Don’t you know well enough, how unconscious I am of the things about me when I get interested? You know how absent-minded I am and yet it does not seem to have occurred to you that I was unconscious of that fellow’s presence?”

Her indignation grew stronger with its expression and she now only felt that she was innocent and wronged. Her cousin only too glad to receive her justification promised to tell the rest as soon as possible. This caused Hortense another out-burst of wrath. “Tell them or not as you please, if you all have thought me guilty, you can continue to do so for aught I care.” She continued the walk home silently deeply angered, convinced now beyond question that she had been wronged. She felt that she was innocent, that her violation was only a hideous fantasy.

110. Stein has crossed out only the top part of the question mark, apparently to remove the question, and present as a declarative statement.

111. It is too bad that Stein presents this in the passive voice. It would have been helpful to know by whom she felt wronged, the “villainous Italian” or her cousin and the rest of her party.

112. With this sentence, Stein opens the possibility that this is, indeed, yet another “vision” of the type she has been writing about periodically during the semester. And yet the level of detail in this theme, and the social setting (rather than a book-inspired-one) suggests a more realistic than fantastic narrative.
The next morning, according to her wont Hortense lay out on the grass basking in the sun-shine. Doubts began to assail her. Was she innocent, was she guilty? Had she been willing or had she only had a delusive sense of volition and could she really not have avoided her position. She lay there looking into the depths of the blueness sky wondering and struggling.

Now the full conviction of her guilt would rush upon her and gritting her teeth muttering fiercely, she would struggle with the thought, then an apathetic feeling would succeed, and she would be certain that she had not been in the wrong.

Her old sense of isolation began to surge over her. Again she had become one apart. Again there was something that none knew beside herself, that no one else of those about her had been guilty of. The struggle continued at intervals all that day. She was outwardly as usual. In fact she herself seemed to take very little part in the war of doubts waged so hotly within her. She felt the struggle, she heard the reasons given again and again, but she herself seemed to be but an apathetic spectator.113

113. Gertrude Stein’s final sentence written in English 22, 1894-1895.
For the sake of balance and completeness this should have been made to form part of the preceding paper. The analysis of the girl’s reaction on the situation, though unpleasing in the extreme, is not without psychological interest. The laboratory atmosphere still pervades the lines, and spreads over the work a certain artificial hardness and nakedness which is inartistic.

Your work has shown at times considerable emotional intensity and a somewhat unusual power of abstract thought. It has frequently been lacking in organization, in fertility of resource, and in artfulness of literary method.\textsuperscript{114}

W.V.M.

\textsuperscript{114} The sexual overtones of this final comment of the semester — with its “hardness” “nakedness” and “fertility” — are quite astounding to me given Stein’s not-so-veiled content. Moody seems to have no qualms (or awareness?) about the extended double entendre he sets up, though he does choose to edit out the words “spreads over” in favor of “gives.” To conclude that this “nakedness” is “inartistic” seems to me the worst sort of mixed metaphor, a transparent admission that he is unable to directly address the content, which is quite sexually disturbing. Moody seems committed to reading Stein’s late work in the semester as if she were writing a lab report, though I do not see the “laboratory atmosphere” in this theme that he does. Rather, I read this as an internal psychological exploration of a sexual — or at least sensual — encounter; for a professor whose interest is description, however, that “emotional intensity” may well appear mis-directed internally rather than outwardly. Finally, this theme raises, as do the themes of October 10 and May 8, the related 20th and 21st century compositionist question of whether and how to address disturbing content within students themes.
Appendix B

Digital images of Gertrude Stein’s Daily Themes for English 22, 1894-1895, Radcliffe College. Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas papers, YCAL, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. Reproduced by permission from the Estate of Gertrude Stein.

Each image in this appendix is preceded by its Image ID according to the catalogue at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library.
patches of melodramatic writing which give a jarring effect of touch. Rewrite.

W. V. Moody.

English 22
Eletrable Stringed
Oct 10, 1894
Theme 1

An extraordinary composition. One is puzzled to decide whether it is a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms, or a study from our objective standpoint of a morbid psychological state. In either case it has an considerable degree of vividness and imaginative force. It is marred by awkward and undiscriminating use of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional...
In the Red Sleep.

The more a seas common-place incidents of the outer world are well enough for those (non-unfortunates) whose nature has given no inner one. As for me who have lived in any plant life all the incident hands and presumed that human nature is capable of experiencing, I shuddern to write even a passing reminiscence on such detail.

My mind from childhood was one which constantly fed on itself. I would seize every possible excuse to be alone, that I might dream, might lose myself in intense emotions by the aid of which all else faded into insignificance. Now I stood on the cold pricking air that made my flesh quiver and tingle and turn the device of coughing down behind some bush to feel the associated warmth and then once more the ice and be skilled and brush and tingle with the joy of my English Man.
I had a hunt; I would trace it till

the agony of the pain thrilled me

with an exquisite delight.

As in the physical, so in the
mental, I would plunge in the

joy of suffering. I now
contented myself with the

sufferings that Richard

and the Thackeray Society could

invent; but while dreaming over

these, I would invent other even

worse and enjoy inflicting them. Thus

I came to feel keenly every horrible

delight to be found in the suf-

ferings of others.

Shortly after this period, too,
came unconsciously a complete re-

action, and instead of envying

the pains of others, I came to share

a horror of being forced to

inflict them. With this came a

foul and haunting fear of law,

self-control, and consequent inde-

pendence in those enemies once dreamed

of with so much delight. This fear

of madness reached its climax one

night when I went to see Mansfield.
May Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. My one
side was as completely expressed and
as forcibly portrayed that I felt at
the end of the second act with the
fearful story buried into my brain.
No one can describe the turmoil I en-
trusted during the nights that fol-
lowed, how night after night found
relief by until just at dawn from
when exhaustion my brain would cease
its struggle with wild face for victory
to my sister's guilt,weeting fearful
thoughts would rend upon fearful
pleasibilities. I dark, dark, until, dis-
tacted I would try to cool my brain
head, knock it against the wall
in determination anything to silence
the dreadful iteration of horrible
thoughts. How often have I tried to
play to hear some commotions
and alas! as faith in a woman was
found no peace.
One might alone, alone tone,
reading a passage. I loved in a Ilite
the fact that often more time en-
gaged then came and slunk onto my
consequences without any being able to explain why a sudden fear of something unknown, intangible, that seemed to be around me everywhere. This might it was the spirit of Shelley, that I was reading. I went on until I came to the passage where Beatrice having just kept her father returned to her mother, and she then ran, almost madness in her face, I stopped the book before my eyes, climbing toward the wall was the sweet Beatrice in her flowing white robe. This was only the short kind of the clothes of her beautiful face. I can never lose sight of it as I saw it that night and now can paint the look with which she gazed on me, and no gazer on me was bright enough. I cannot tell you more. I fear it, I fear it still.
It would pay you to re-
view the parts of the text books which
Treat of sentences and
paragraphs.
Rewrite.

Patrick Stein
Theme 3
Nov. 7
Special
English 28.

Your theme begins very
 abrupt and runs on
in a rather rambling
fashion. Your sentences
are sometimes meander-
ing, and often awkwardly
phrased; this hampers
the reader and spoils the
effect. You are careless
of subject punctuation
and do not always ex-
press yourself clearly.

Since the quotation is
all quotation, the words
that occur within, as in
pages 3, 4, 5, please
write out; the words shal
be single - not double.

Your 
paragraphing
is uncertain, particularly
with reference to dialogue.
Only a Question of Rent.

Two girls strolled into the park one summer day and threw themselves on the grass. She fell on her back, the other raised herself on her elbow and, as if continuing a conversation said, "Yes, I finally understood your feeling towards my father. He is worthy, but in and out of prison, at home, we will recognize that but how the day before, old dad we love him anyway. Wait, I'll tell you a little of his life. It's my great that you should know it. I've been reduced to a minute and then with an effort recommenced. "He is a brother in this town as you know and perhaps you have often wondered why we never speak of him. He and my father were the only children of a peasant farmer in Newfield. Shortly after my grandfather's death, uncle left home and finally settled off here in the West. My father soon followed him to this land of promise, taking his old mother with him. He expected her as well as he could for some time unaccompanied by his brother. You don't know best to be independent and only did you facts as they stand."
At last my uncle having established a good business sent for his brother who had meantime grown into a handsome and attractive young man. He was invited to my uncle as a bachelor and made all the friends with this brother and the people of the town. Finally my uncle married and left his brother to marry a young woman.

My grandmother joined her son in their new home and to some extent she went in her own way on her feet. My grandmother was young and inexperienced and managed before long to irritate someone who had first such a temper (as she was all of us used with). We children although we loved her more could suppose of her and we still remember how we suffered under her cruel tongue when her anger was aroused.

It was only a slightusion about this at first but my uncle made it as the Test in nature. He encouraged someone in his anger until finally she left my father in the house and went to him. To make his children suffer she then calling him a rascal in great voice turned his old mother out of house.

Poor old lady, she had to enter as
from where he was shunted as if he were a slip of just as seeing his old mother at last. This continued for some time until grandmother got old and old and began gradually to fade away. She was very near her end and her thoughts in years the brother stood together by her side. She revived slightly and seeing her 'eye fixed to my uncle be becoming and so hoping, 'I am, be good to little Do. Can I now he is only a boy. Has got no one but you, my little Do.' 'Yes the wind was at an end Told the last child of earth had fallen in the mother's grave for the bottom had not gotten outside the cemetery before their hat flew into the air again. My father was interred and by his brother, firer, over the same almost followed by firer. How they were separated and once more my uncle drifted out of our lives.

Living the years that passed over much grew constantly richer, while my father only made a fairly good living. This and had ventured to use the store he was occupying for some other purpose and no one neither began to look about in new quarter. My uncle came to him and told him that he
was going to move out of his present place
with a larger home and that he would gladly
rent his old store to him. He said that he
wished to buy the old house and furnish
that they live as brothers should. My father
always ready to heck the peace with his
brother, although in all their relations a
high-stempered man, consented and took a lease
for 3 years. During this time the street rent,
premise, and rents went down very much.

At the end of his lease my father
went to his brother to get a renewal. He told
him that under the circumstances he of course
expected a reduction in the rent. My uncle asked
my father a paper and said with that slight
foreign accent which makes one feel more cruel
because more he dilly: "Yes, that is your
answer."

My father opened it and read it aloud at
his brother's house, then at the banker's and, "Is it
true you mean to this base, you have raised
my rent, and a tax of 10 years for John?"

"That's what I mean," was the answer. "If you
don't want it, you have to move it the sooner.

"But I can't do that, that would ruin me and
thoughts of my wife and children. What do you
mean?"

"Yes, the words came softly, coolly. "Yes, I
Crease, I know it, it is as I have long waited. You are I have you between my thumb and
finger so and now I crunch you. You

are in my heart as you have my heart. Silence,
bead silence and then the quiet scratching
of a pen.) Seven years after my father
met a little girl on the street who smiled at
him kindly. He was fond of children and
began talking to her as they strolled on together.

She happened to ask her name. The little
one replied, “Why don’t you know me, and
I’m little Monica.” Then the old man said
not to hold it, he instantly left the street to
a child who looked as if he were too surprised
even to cry.”
Daily doomed.
Nov. 15 1895
Yestmate, Pterid.
Special.

Ha! Lumen. Some
museum.
A sudden sound to his mother's earrows.

She was certainly a charming bit of womanhood as she sat carefully imitating rhythms with the electric kumwood. The youth gazing at her so curiously was evidently of your mind. One laugh, almost immeasurably at

his best self in the room of scientific
analysis, then the taffan flushed up

and stole a sidelong peek at the

youth's cheeks by. He said, "Noticeable winking

of the eye at every beat. A trembling of the

lips. The repetition of the rhythm.

A contraction of the neck audible distinctly

noticeable."
CLINTON STAY
Daily Theme 2
Nov. 16, 1894
Special.
English 22

Pathetic but not convincing.
Dear sir,

Count them helpful advice! What shall I submit to being all my joy in living? Can I endure having all pleasures blotted out that eternal repair would in it make a good Pity? Mercy.
Yardsale Items
No. 220
Sundries 00
Special

Point of view
not by remote.
Woman.

Mine again will I ever try to reason with a woman. She immediately gets hysterical and thinks she is calm. You acknowledge that you are right half an dozen times and then deliberately reject the statement thinking she has gotten rid of a mere point of view. It is not to delude you either in jest or fun according to your temperament and the tone convinced of her remarkable argumentative power. The legal feminine is nice to be seen but its painfully illogical.
She is a bit of New England charm but unfortunately not a complete bit. She has just a small quantity of Western prairie imagination and unconventionality in her composition but unfortunately it is not strong enough to make her attractive from that standpoint. It is enough though to make her the object of the appreciation she receives for her New England attractions which naturally are not evident to the casual tourist. Poor girl it's very hard to be another flesh and blood and sometimes to always be always wanting to be the other.
Technik Stein
Nov. 2
2.
Englisch 2
Special.
A Conference.

English Prof.: "Yes, that is a very good line. Twitting birds always remind me of spring. But let me see your description. Isn't autumn, then, more suitable for tittering in autumn than in spring?"

Mute girl student: "But excuse me amid the description of tittering in midsummer."

Professor reacted: "Midsummer, no, it's too hot. I'm sure birds always titter in midsummer."
Only a Duration of Rent.

The two gilts were still under the shadow of a painful domestic scene. They hurried along anxious to escape from themselves but none the perfect beauty of the day cultured their nerves. Their aspect was shadowed and they travelled quickly, but still in indecision. At last they turned into the shaded and now found a beautiful spot of shade, where all were concealed by dark trees. With one surprise their tension down fell on their lines. After some moments of quiet contemplation one of the kinds raised himself on his shoulders and closed his eyes. "I don't want to be a new paragraph in this."

"Well, I'll tell you a little of his life. It is only fair that you should know it." After a while, she continued. "We have a brother in this time as you know and you have heard of him. He and my father once the only children of a peasant army left in memory. Shortly after grandfather's death, much
left home and settled out here in the West.
My father soon followed him to take land
of promise, taking his older mother with
him. He supported her for some years although
nothing but a boy, uneducated by his brother.
At last our uncle having established a
good business went for his brother who had
meanwhile grown into a handsome and at-
tractive young man. He was introduced to my
uncle as a salamander. He made friends with
my uncle and made many. It made much to
my uncle a dignit. Father married and left
this employ.
My grand-mother met him after
her son's new home and of course
she went first to her friend in best
formed. My aunt mother have young and
expedience and managed before long to
initiate grace mother who had just such
a temper as all our family are noted for.
We children although we loved her never could
approve of her and we still remember her un-
satisfactory under her cruel tongue to our
longer was owned.
As I was saying at first it was only
a small misunderstanding, some question los-
Since they had not much room made it a
protest for Sabbath. He encouraged George
sitting in his anger, until finally all left
my father’s home and went to town. He
whipped his children speaking to their uncle
and called him a traitor to his signals who
had turned his old uncle over to alone.

One old lady he had to enter a house
while the rest was allowed. As if she were a kin
give up seeing his old mother at first.
They continued for some time until
grandmother getting older and older began
gradually to fade away. She was now
more ill and on the first time in going
the father stood by her side.
She seemed slightly and closing her eyes
said to my uncle hormingly, “There good to
little Joe, you know he is not a boy. He is not
no one but you and little Joe.”
Yes,
the final word at an end, but only still the
last clod of earth had fallen in the mother’s
gaze. Before the mother had left the
cemetery, she felt the prospect to be again, My
uncle visited my father. Three would were
followed by former home and once more
my uncle dropped out of my line.
He's father made only a fairly good living while his brother grew constantly richer. The man who owned father's store wished to move it to some other place and as the dad began to look about for new quarters, my uncle came to him and told him that he was also going to move and that he would gladly sell him his old store. My father always ready to keep the peace with his brother, although in all other relations a high-tension enemy, consented and took a lease for three years.

During this time, the street lost its streetlight and orders began to loom. My father went to his brother at the end of his lease in order to get a renewal. He told him that under the circumstances, he expected a reduction of his rent. My uncle handed my father a folded paper and said with his slightly foreign accent, "Yes, here is your renewal. My father opened it, read it, looked at his brother, then at the paper and said, "Why you can't make the Stove, you have raised my rent? I don't want that. I didn't want it if you don't want it, you leave my store alone."
ishly. "But I can't do that, that would
ruin me, think of my wife and children?"

As the words came back, only,

yes, sir! I know it; it is as I have long

predicted. You see, bringing his fingers together,

I have you between my thumb and fore

finger, and now I must squeeze you. You

nips and here — you can't do that.

Nothing more was heard but the faint scratching

of a pen and the mother talked —

Seven years after my father

met a little girl by the street. He smiled

at her brightly. She was fond of children

and began Talking to her. As they talked

along together he happened to ask her

name. The little one replied, 'Why don't

you know me, uncle? I'm little Minnie.'

The poor old lad, he wanted to be kind

but he could not help it. He hated even his

brother as a little child. He hated her instantly

and she stood looking after him, too ashamed

to cry.
Proteus Stunt Special
Dec. 1884
Empire #2

"Vox clamantis
in deserto."
I have just been reading Panditara by
Mary Wilkins and of her left me with a
feeling of real richness and truth because
the intolerance of those New Englanders
is overwhelming. There is never a crime all
the lines are grand and straight. This
word symphony is not in their vocabulary.
So much sound and a subtle blend of
human life that each a symphony in alone
or two or many as this. The humanity
seen where symphony is joined and thought
the end and means join all the heart
for it. The Trump his head to the wall
and will become none of it. You cannot
anywhere except that you move more
sympathy because you sense it. It's a real
valuable understanding. All things with lines
and your home have it today all your
lines that can give your meaning. You
here feeling to be come and among giving
of extreme symphony. Symphony all - enchant
that you have to understand you own things
with yourselves. You think you do but of no
more really do we.
Patrick Keel
Special
Dec. 11, 1894
Simplistic 22.

Shows gain in
descriptive force
It had been raining all day and about nine o'clock we started out for a stroll. We came to a lot of orchard and stood there spell-bound. The trees were all covered with snow and there seemed over the place that familiar tense allene that always accompanies winter-beyond. The air was as balmy as in a spring evening in the South Land though all the trees came thrust summer in the spring song from the Valhalla. The air was full of it even to the delicate pink bough overhead and yet all was so hushed as still.
Dear Mr. Stein,

SPECIAL

Dec. 12, 1944

Simpler & 82

Your explanation
runs away with
your syntax.
An Army Girl.

There she stood, a little body with a very large head, and broad shoulders, but clothed alone with boots and was evidently very tired. Suddenly she broke with a swoon.

"I don't want to be anything," she moaned despairingly. "I am tired of standing up with my head bowed constantly. I am just trying to meet one person and don't want to know everything. I'm not happy, my surroundings that think higher education is all I am not more advanced. I have a long, dreary life in it. And then I couldn't bear to be one of the miserable ones.
German: Janein
Spanish: Inicial
Dec. 14 1844
English 2 2

Montaigne or
Confucius?
There is nothing we are more intolerant of than our own sins or if large in others.
Gentle, please Special
Dec. 15, 1894
English 22

After Aiptorp?
Ocean Symphony.

The first movement begins with a soft murmur among the distant waves. As if the sea were again molded by the murmurs of the depths and whispered in its soft embrace, they sang to each other in their love.

As the movement progresses, strange sea-foam rises out of the depths and strikes us. Mysterious creatures, just appear, and then are gone, the distant music of the Frigates' care is mingled in the harmonies and at times we hear the singing chant of the ant-swirl of their waters. Then come and slowly a thunder clap, the sea rises on its might, and all its myriad inhabitants, fearfully seek the vast quiet depths beneath.
Clute's Lines Special.
Dec. 17, 1894
Daily Times.

Interesting
In a Psychological Laboratory.

One is indeed all things to all men in a laboratory. At one moment you find yourself a bowing host, and at the furtive seller and sepulchral laugher, tasting in intelligent attitude hammer in hand and armes apelading reverently.

Before long this ceremonious indistinctness is sacrificed to make itself a perfect blank while some one practices on the iron automaton.

Yet she finds herself with a complicated apparatus staved across her heart to quell her beating, her fingers impounded in a steel machine and her arm thrust numbly into a big glass tube. She is surrounded by a group of earnest writers who carefully watch the silent record of the automatic pen on the slowly revolving drum.

Strange fancies begin to crowd upon her, she feels that the silent pen is uniting on and on forever, his word in time. She cannot conceive it and the words about her begin to assume the shape of mocking figures glowing over her imprisoned mind. Suddenly she starts, then is over.
Dr. Julius Hein
Special
Dec. 20 1944
Englisch 28.

Thomas discernment
It is a very painful fact in human experience that each of us must go over the same old ground of mental growth, struggle and development. To be sure it is a reflecting back as the well, but it is still new for I have just achieved it. The most of it is that the recognition of it as past is of no value.

I know perfectly well that I will walk some time in the future the same opinions in large measure that I have just been considering. I know perfectly well that when my present age and the world mine with it, I cannot prepare myself to meet any pain and struggle.

I know I will believe, but as I don't believe there is no help in that. Some time I sincerely and definitely declare that I won't believe in the world in the future. "Be still, you fool," then says my reasoning self. "You struggle you cannot amount to even a little of the ground in the same mill with your fellow. The path is straight before you can but choose to follow. Who will waste your strength in useless lines? As still, it is inevitable."
Now there was an age which those living in and writing about it did not characterize as an age of transition. They always announce the fact as if it were something new and peculiar to their own age-time.

The position is certainly illogical.

From the very nature of progress, all ages must be transitional. If they were not, the world would be at a stand-still and death would shortly ensue. It is one of the tenants of plot-studies, but it is always introduced with a flourish of trumpets.
A single result is compelling. The opening is oddly awkward and formal. I wish that you might overcome your disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation. Please edit the first draft and revise the next.

W. V. W.

Gundlach's Stein Special.
Theme C
Dec. 28 1894

The analysis character is, as far as the limits of your space allow, convincing and suggestive. The point of view seems strongly. We have an instinctive feeling, from the tone in which the young lady is treated, that the point of view is really hers, and that the analysis which deals with her character is the self-analysis, but ostensibly the point of view is that of the author or omniscient spectator. The
The Great Enigma.

It is to a symphonic exertion that I would conduct you weekly, but I do not expect to have your ears gratified by the perfect harmonies of a Boston orchestra for you are not in a Western city and musical culture is in its first stages. I desire to congratulate you, however, for your outraged ears by pleasant company.

Look carefully among the audience and you will see a girl rather stout and with a simularly attractive face, attractive by the reason of her skin. Her mouth is just dived from complete recovery by a slight failure of the lower lip which became rather an after thought of her creator. Her chin does its best to make up for this slip by hard lines of determination. Her nose just escapes being beautiful or at the last moment is squinted and spirited its perfect shape. Still in spite of these features she is dynamically pretty and if you will watch her carefully you will notice how her hands are marvelously contrived.
just then the music pleased her and her eye ceased and wrinkled with an int\ninsatiable chain. It expressed the essential romance within her that she was wrinkling about the eyes.

A young man who was quietly watching her also seemed to recognize the chain.
He was hardly noticing her little mantle one and had a light but not particularly
but he had. He is evidently an intelligent
music lover but... might be had ent more attractive...

...The young couple had courted although they had seen each other
frequently at concerts and each knew who the other was. After this particular concert
they had the good fortune to be introduced
by a mutual friend.

The acquaintance ripened rapidly.
Almost mightly the young man climbed the
hill and the bell and then sat filthily
in the whole evening twitching his little
and once in a great while bringing
out a slow quiet remark. The girl did not
know what to make of this strange musical
creature who turned some of the tune of god
society and knew no small talk. At first she was amazed, then puzzled and finally amused.

This was perfect, and polite, since than he was a completely negative character, always clean, and slow to the manner and by which he made a reputation. He had found

though he was useful to him in business relations. He was very helpful but most people did not recognize it in him. In the contrary they thought him a very opposite kind of man. He was unpretentious and

woman in a storm was raging around him, she would look at peacefully and inquire what the matter? as she would make for the most comfortable chair and for peace and to decl... he was the most negative of men and not to be nitpicking and he was always a mild mannered at other people's small

flights. When he was asleep he would shut off with nothing of one's in [no company] and when you tried to move him to a sense of his social duties, he would simply decline declaring that he didn't care, he was always and the other people could go home. And the strongest part of it was that no one
A short time ago, he was all
ever got angry with him. She had no principles,
and yet he was thoroughly trustworthy.
She was the contrary was firm and
impetuous. She could be cruel as only a
woman can and then would become quite
vindictive. She would be very thoughtful
one moment and would be one misstep
the next. In an over-courageous spirit
it to make it good. The grandeur of concluding
rapidly and changed them so rapidly. She
had always been accustomed to succeed.
Her family had been afraid of her and
everyone had loved before her. She had
a strong idea of economy but in the
least part of her whole aspect. She
was patient in the field of her strength
but no one could have, theoretically,
be broad or both. She was tremendous of
small minds, with great or as old. These
notions that belong to the woman have
in current place as advanced. She was
painfully self-righteous in the midst of
most violent disillusionment of self-righteous-
ness. By far the opening of the mouth and
chin had not been belied, but her eye kindled
and creased in mind that part of her nature.
was still hidden.

She had never met anything before like this man. She would grow nervous and shy and then he would look at her with mirth and amuse, remark: "Don't call me Kate." She began to think she hated him, but yet, she allowed him to take initiative with her, such as no one else had ever dared to dream.

Finally it was evident that he was very much in love and now she began to be in the same condition. This seemed to produce a reaction in the patient. She loved him and he began to doubt if he really were in love with all she could come and gaze at her merrily and then decide he wasn't, but in leaving would wish to take all the privilege of a lover. This she could not accept, made to his greatest joy, if he did not see any difference.

Finally she wrote him a letter telling him that perhaps after all he did not strongly advising her to come back.
...lies for he was the most eagle-hearted..."

In the meantime this weak girl, who had always been accustomed to be loved and never to love, would struggle manfully with herself all through the night. The next morning he would again be manageable as ever, training his calculating little mustache and always painting in demanding a lord's privileges in spite of the fact that as she seemed him, he really did not think that he could love her. She would find him the house but not the breakfast, he would come the next night it ill be that. (continued.)

The girl's nerves were completely shaken by this wearisome struggle. One night she had continued to self-punish far into the night. She had become even more violent than her...
She stung him as cruelly, cowardly, and unwarily. Finally he left and she was alone troubled between her great love for him and her contempt for his work. 

The struggle with herself all that night but she could not kill her love. She saw him as she was and yet kept herself as she might, she knew that she loved him. He was weak and unworthy, but he was more to her than all her practical ideals. At last her strength gave way and she lost consciousness and dreamed the next morning a miserable cold dream on the floor.

At last in desperation she declared that he must end his torment. Hand her it over for her to speak. She inspired him to decide and let her be at peace. He did not see how he could but finally he agreed to stay away a week and try and make up his mind.

The next night the bell rang as usual and the strange constable was completed.
Petroleo Mexico

Official

Jan 9, 1945

English 22

Proprietary
By their fruit ye shall not know them.

It is not by men's actions but by their judgments that one can know them. Often a man may act generously, behave uncuriously, in short, be quite a good sort of an individual but wait until you hear his opinions of others. It is then that all the latent bigotry, intolerance, narrowness, and pride are discovered, all the innate and inherited tendencies that never before threw their selves in the realm of action.
To Mr. Stein
Special Agent

Your funds will be remitted
Due Jan. 16, 1895.
The Great Enigma.

The regular habits of concerts soon
learn to know the members of the audience
and to feel strongly drawn to them by
the bond of musical sympathy.
One of the most interesting of the
regular attendants last year was a
young girl rather stout, fair and with
a uniquely attractive face, attractive
chiefly because puling. Her mouth was
puckered from complete remit by a
slight furrows of the brow that, which
seemed rather an after-thought of her
laughter. Her chin did its best to com-
trast this aloofness by hard lines of
determination, but in spite of its
best efforts, she remained distinctively
lovely. Her eyes would crease and minkle
with an inscrutable charm. All the
women in the room expressed by their
observing crinkles about the eyes.
A young man who was a regular attendant
would say somewhat of this young
girl's charm. He would sit beside him:


his little mustache and stare at her persistently. She never seemed to notice him, and he never made any effort to know her. It was enough, he thought, to listen to Bettenson and to look at her. Certainly no reasonable man could ask for more.

One night soon they were introduced by a mutual friend. The acquaintance grew, intensified rapidly. Almost nightly the young man climbed the hill to her house, sang the bell, and then sat silently peacefully the whole evening, staring his little mustache and once-in-a-while bringing out a slow, quiet remark.

The girl did not know what to make of this strange, untracable creature who shared none of the ordinary customs of society and knew no small talk. At first she was very amazed, then perplexed and finally amused.

They were perfect until notice there too. He was a completely vague character, aloof, peaceful, and slow to the very nature and by design for he had found it even more useful to this in business
relations. He was very talkative, but his audience kept people from recognizing this in him. On the contrary, they thought him a very conscious and learned young man. He was always courteous, and whenever a quarrel was raging around him, he would either laugh and explain and inquire of one of the heated disputants, "Why what is the matter?", or else he would make for the most comfortable chair and go peacefully to sleep.

He had absolute control over his nerve and was always mildly surprised at other people's nervousness, but nevertheless, he was through and thorough. He had more curfew and was completely selfish, but he appeared most of the time with almost physical loathing and with good-natured and very amusing style when it was not too much trouble. He was a thorough gentleman and he acknowledged it with such complete sincerity that you only looked at him and never thought of despising him.


Outmeal Steam Special
Feb 15, 1895
5 gross x 200 lbs.

appreciation
This could hardly be a finer impression of complete yet inarticulate joy than in the first glimpse of the procession in Somme at the Out Skirt.

The figure is full of sunshine and of the fresh and clean air. Its feet cling closely to the earth as if to breathe to have even for a step that soft fragrant grass. Its arms move with deliciously natural movement and through its clouded back issues a silvery breath that expresses more than the most ecstatic thought.

The figure is so delicate as a sunbeam, it seems light enough to ascend to the heavens and yet it is truly a figure of earth.
Electrode Stage Special
Feb 16 1975
Came out 23.

Shippingly ascetic.
To the true lover of argument the same process of putting forward, elements and third line on parallel lines are not a peculiarly valid task. He is accustomed to aim at a bare idea point in a drawn battle where all hate it once, each trying to scale each other put alone by argument but by bracing of voice, number of words and violence of manner. Thus and thus only does the time prove of battle feel himself in his play. But this natural tendency to object cannot some slight satisfaction in writing a set argument. But the question is, as he with this tendency dislike will manage to get argument into every strain he writes for all he then cause abroad at last in an English 22 restrain himself and indulge in the taking atticle form. On the other hand those have brought, speeches who try art logic and who are content to let any one make any statement rather than contradict, a few facts and individual efforts amount or not as an effort of the and prove not a drawn battle.

Now for the general question. Argument in terms in the air breathe form any frustration cannot help believing the other side and defending it. But I would be wiser and would rather make a failure of a demonstration than revol in an argument. The one get all the time; the other for in English 22.
But, wonderful vitality there is in Norse old Norse legends. In the tale of Siegfried and the Nibelungen blood.

We are the hour often one folk-tale draws old stories the excitement is still as great.

Your blood is stilled as much as when you were a little child and all the human nude one relived. What a panoramic in this mythological antithetic century to live again the simple thoughts and the dream night thrones of the race of the Coleroy.
O. W. H. Klein
Special
Feb. 20, 1875
Conf. 2 a.

A lofty communication.
Not many years ago, my self-analysis always ended in despondency, but now it simply turns into mild meditation, with a flint of cynicism, and content itself with inventing nice names to garnish a dry Thidic.
Gratule New York
16.26 1895

Shows a cumen.
In the last few books of Marins the Caliph
Omar felt a decided falling away in
strength and truth. In trying to analyze
the cause, more so as it concerned the delibera-
tion of the character of Marins himself, I found
it to me that Peter gave us two decidedly anti-
gnostic elements in the process of conversion.

On the one hand, the doctrine of the
and sense of the change, the chief instruction that
the hour was a revelation, a something, a truly
and above me, that the spirit was the same
and the ritual largely that of his old faith.

On the other hand, that the change was
in the direction, and that to me it quite
a contrary, confusing, and showed a clear insight
in the mind of influence necessary to produce
not a violent conversion, but the quiet slow
working change that took place in Marins.

I saw that the central principle was
rather in the purely mental plans of this
mother. It seemed hardly probable that the
student of philosophy would ever completely lose
all his systematic thought to the winds and
fly in the material wind alone.
Yester'd Fein Yerizal.
Feb. 28 1875
Englisch 23.

Sassa forced
There is no joy but calm.

Look at that old figure coming down the street. I mean that clumsy little man in the coal helmet hat, with the coat tucked under his arm. One corner is gracefully trailing in the mud, but he does not notice such trifles.

He is a philosopher by the grace of God. Yet he has stopped in the very midst of the largest mud-puddle and is thoughtfully speculating about the fourth concept of reality with all of its infamous fluidity.

He sees an object in coming down the street after a Boston car. Well, it is just gone passing him, but he not one whit disturbed, since his feet placidly in the water on the3 arassing and walk to another.

As a skilled plier, he and brother, if you would know perfect peace.
Stein
Special
Feb. 6th, 1882

Makes a point
On reading Browning's La Belle Dame again ten years or so ago, I was completely
amazed by the power of his imagination to
portray his character. He gives us only a
figure and emotional giant in place of the very
human socialist full of strength and weakness.
It may seem sacrilege to the devoted
admirer of Meredith to dare to compare
him with Dickens. But this method is often
the same. He too during certain masked char-
acteristics of his characters and then drags
in them to the utter neglect of the other traits.
He is usually correct. He has a raw tendency
within and, let us say, in the Tragic Sonnets, it
completely cancels their aims, and the char-
acter of La Belle is a distorted caricature that
has no even the excuse of being human. It
reminds nothing of real humanity.
Outside Stein Special
Nov. 5/845.

Carrie
Metaphysics.

It is remarkable what power a metaphysician can give to a science; with such a master's empiricism, there is no explanation of reality. The real world that which we do not know is made up of "Merea". Merea are a quality of some kind of nothing, having no thing, no space, no form, no relation; they can have no connection with each other. Well and good, but here is the world we know, what of that? Why, that, replies our metaphysician, is a coincidence of appearance. "To be sure, but how does it manage to appear?" Well, grunts the man of wisdom; although Merea have no relation, are nothing, they can do one thing, they can "make a man". If you have a man, you have a "gremann". Then the Merea go "gremann" whatever that may be and that you have the world of appearances. Is not this enough to bring a new kind of scientific insight into philosophy? In any truth, what better thing could be.
A pleasant quiet bit of description with a sufficient thread of narrative to hold it firmly together.

The style is well adapted to the simplicity of its matter, and the technique is careful and clean. In this last regard you have here made a very appreciable advance over your former work. The printing is slight, slightly in two places.

R.W. Rees.

w.v.r.
We were on the line, ground, and
attracted by the heavy mountain grade. As we
were passing a rock in a cove, we saw
a bird that was near the water or what
seemed a little island near the bank. My
brother raised his gun and fired. The
bird fell over dead. We then heartily sympa-
tized with our shooting, as we had sympa-
thetically after our victims. Mary climbed
down the bank to get his quills. She stopped
on the seeming island, which was only a bit of
mud and stuck to lost his footing and went
down well up to his waist. Before I could
come to the rescue, he had scrambled out
and stood on the shore, a most palmar and
shaggy looking. There was nothing for it but
to let the poor fellow (if you have ever
been in California you hardly were sufficiently
to notice the remarkable droughtness of the
rocks. Even if you have not been there, please
picture to yourself the result of fully three
months of dry weather in a country road. You
can imagine what a picture you have formed
for the dust-laden to arise on the only bit of
moisture that it had known in many a
day, come joyously and gathered around this
moist garments. However we must return to the
valleys and we trudged along hopefully.

The sun was now well up in the sky
and it was growing exceedingly warm. We
picked some large cool madrona leaves, that
grew very commonly for the hot season. They
were in groups of three and four in
the center of a fan and are a delightful pro-
tection from the glare of the sun, when put
just under the hat, shading the face.

The evening soon began to grow some-
what dusky (WE have a little fruit country
unless one goes to the Puget Sound, that
our
walks here are apt to be uncomfortable). Of
these in-
cept the madrona and the kindly red-wood.
We
frequent
find only the low shrub-hill manzanita and
in these
the redly poison-oak. The oak is the one
hill, that
leaf that gives our country brilliant emblazon,
the walks
as apt to
its dead power, even a breath of air will let
you monitor from these brilliant red leaves mean a smile
of admiration. The leaves in the middle of summer are
all dried up, the heat has settled out
the color and nature sadly needs a refresh-
ing sprinkle.

This hunting goal was not yet entirely
aborted although the heat was beginning to tell on us. We were marching along we noticed a little jack rabbit sitting right across the road. His long ears were pricked forward as though he knew our every move. Could say, “Don’t you wish you had a little boy!” Janie immediately accepted the challenge and commenced to load his gun in order to give the little Johnny rabbit a lesson. Unluckily, the cartridge was burnt and would not go in. It was too large for the gun. Then we further tried to get it out, but this was also unsuccessful. In one half my rifle was refused to stay. All the time the little rabbit was watching from a bush, staring at us with the most tantalizing expression in this intelligent race. Many times with his teeth and I hardly think he will ever be afraid the rabbit would be. Finally Janie managed to cut the cartridge out with his knife and just as we were about to put in a pet one, was to rabbit with a difficult which of him of a rake and a bent implement window with stone by some hidden into the wood.

We piled on. Our hunting became more successful and we had added two heavy rabbits and a wood pigeon to our baggage. To make progress easier we hung all our goods and chattels on the gun, each taking an end of
it, and thus we managed to get along. We were now about five miles on the road. Before this we had refused several offers of a lift from sympathetic farmers, but now our weary little soul began to yearn for the opportunity of offering that we had hinted to indignantly refused. We had not got much further on our journey when we were met by a golly farmer, who, of course, urged me to have a ride. We made a polite protest, as a rule, to our friend and then, only too happy to yield to his urgency, we stumbled in. How different the whole landscape became, when we could see all it change before our eyes without being distracted by a fact--inexcusable manners.

As we mounted higher and higher into the hills we could see the whole broad Alphar Valley belonging with the slight haze of the summer's heat hanging over it. The vines were not particularly picturesque. There was a flimsy arbor, and a little about some square of vineyard dotted here and there with green vines--all be. Moving on, our farmer said the vines were fine as he acquired, but now and then our eyes with greater enjoyment to the hills above us, with their matchless and red--wood and
their brilliant crimson oak.

Our farmer was very much annoyed at our project of walking to the city. Every few miles he would ask me jokingly whether we did not want to get out and walk like cowards. He had been so thoroughly educated that we were perfectly willing to let him joke while we rode rather than to be forced to walk. We finally determined we were within a mile of our destination and we gave him a signal that we had had enough. So he drove off down the road, his jolly laughter ring in our ears.

We now were loaded on our pinn with a belt and started. When we had walked about a quarter of a mile those rabbits began to grow painfully heavy. We decided finally that rabbits were not much good anyhow. They were so common, so we chopped out one and then the other by the road side. Meanwhile (to last) felt warm and many and roads were dull. A little after we arrived as soon as the people heard that we had started to walk without waiting for the rest, they chatted on the infant asteroids and hurried us into dinner.

We were but that reputation in April...
of all disclaimers. Many years after when we went back to the old place, we heard the
legend told of a tiny boy and girl who had walked twenty miles up the mountains in
half a day! Thus will we figure in the
future folk - one of California.
End of Stein
Special
Mar. 10, 186.
Paragraph your dialogue
Business.

It is necessary to hear a man who knows absolutely nothing of business for direction, as to the conduct of an important matter. "Tell you what you want to do," he says with deep gravity, "I want to talk to the man." "What shall I say to him?" you ask. "Oh!, I don't know anything about the case. Can't give you any sort of talk to him." We will go and talk to him. This will probably be the result.

You say to the man in greeting, "Oh! now what do you think about this matter?" "I don't know exactly," he answers, the man. "I have a notion about what to say, but I'm not sure about what to say."

"And the best thing is to take the case and act. This is to the business conducted, you have a waste of a difficult duty. You accomplished and the man done all the places."
Yours truly.
Oct 13, 1875.

You are welcome.
Our opponents suspended heart and soul to the singing of some sweet song, but the only effect it produces on the inward generation of painful emotions and things cut our memories, all that one associates with it is the home of the mind. Again she honestly thought that she was guiding the audience by giving us that still small voice, the teacher of young America. The teacher of his object is only unknown to me.
Pertinent cream Special
Mar. 19/893

Your details are

significant
A Railroad Incident.

They were evidently just married and their clothes were painfully new. Also the telltale eye of a syndicated agent for a new kind of fraud, the second, was contingent. She moved over opposite them and commenced to describe the manifold virtues of her new object. The poor young couple were in despair. Eventually, ten seconds past ten, one of the agents took a seat on the edge of the seat, he began to dispose of his money and, to his timid young bride, told of the price of the agent would suddenly come out loud and clear as she came to some particularly interesting fact, and the poor wife would laugh out of the seat like some guilty thing. He went to the adjoining room and then the man seemed to him, he came back and told the agent still telling. Marriage certainly was a failure so far as that train was concerned. As we passed Washington they both proceeded to change their stiff new garments for some equally rum and dirty and then one woman slid the seat that went from his arm to our seats. He was laughing as they walked and whispering to the audience as: "We aren't we now?"
I felt by the movement of the train that we were beginning to climb up the mountains. I drew up the shade at the head of my berth and watched. It was a perfect moonlight night. The firesights made the deep valleys look all the darker. For ahead I saw the very light of the engine now but in the dark space now winding snake-like up the hill showing the dark heavy train after it. Every little while a fountain of sparks rose from the engine fell into the dark space on either side, set them for a moment and then were gone. Every short time we thought those strange mountain echoes that chimed on either side, pink and fantastic in the mystic light of the moon. The engine now stopped panting like an ex-punted thorough and then once more the horses bellowed and ground and one the expelt like windings began again.
Yestute Tier

Purish

Mar 21, 1895

Sympathetic
It is disheartening to come back to Cambridge after a week of the delightful summer South. Baltimore, sunny Baltimore, where no one is in a hurry and the voices of the negro chiming as their carts go haggly by pull you into the sunny weather revivals. It is a strange silent city, even its streets that have seen still and the clanging car-bells and blend with the heartful silence and do but increase it. To lean the wall and listen to the weird strains of Isis's chimes and to hear the negro voices in the distance and to let your mind wander duly on it is bliss. The Slaves' songs are not the songs of white more completely than a Baltimorean. Let us alone for we have the pleasure of immitating quiet, dreamy, deathful ease in the full unmore sunshine.
A holocaust
Special
Moh 22/825
A shapody
Sleep, the greatest blessing of our mortal race. How is anything else to be compared with it? It is the essence of all good, all peace, all content. What can be equal the bliss of waking up calmly and leisurely you can turn over and asleep again? how to dwell on that and sleep - with its attendant el and up. It was a noble
one to recall joy to the suffering and great
calmness to them already possessing earth's
sweet fruit. To sleep, to awake and turn
to sleep again, such is the heaven I picture
unto myself, and to awake and wake and
not be able to asleep again as he can
conceive a hell more damnable, a
suffering more intense. And the
throughout all ages, the dearest gift to man: the state
of the purpose would that I might be in
the universe for eternity. To seek to asleep
to feel, that treasure delicious dreamless all
though you name and then to endure in me
and all the picture is as fair I
can not tear myself away from its
contented resting.
present form does
degrade by way of
reminiscence.
Rewriting大事, as
you think best
w.v.v.m.

Steinbeck Stein Special
Theme 11
Final shape of connected work
June 3rd 1937

The theme opens attractively.
It is a pity to throw away so good a background as the old theme
idea: it is a sheer waste of material, and
materialistic into the bargain, since it throws
a Jake and Phoebe on the "milieu at the
start."

The description of
the girl is lucid in
reason and specific
quality. We see the
mood, but not the
living image. The lost
fog of the theme
seems tingly and
full of hurry. The story should
have been taken up at
any point and the

---

2 In the Beinecke digital archive, the image of this end comment is non-sequential. The theme ranges from 1079777 to 1079780. The image of Stein’s header and Moody’s final comment is 1064025.
Chapter I.

In the Library.

It was an ideal library for literary lovers; out of the mael and bustle of the city and yet within easy reach. The books were all in one vast room with high ceilings and great windows that let in a flood of sunshine. The place was undisturbed save for some ten or twelve habitual readers, who each sought out their favorite nook or some historic lounge or great armchair, out of sight between tall rows of books. Occasionally an unseen stranger would inadvertently enter and disturb the silence by his very footsteps, but soon he would withdraw, annoyed by the stillness and serenity of the vast room. Sometimes the strains of Chopin’s funeral march would reach the ears of the quiet reader as a military band accompanying some local celebrity on his last journey passed down the street.

One day as the last long sad notes of the march died on the air, a young girl who had been listening intently, threw down her book with an4 impatient gesture and, cupped her face on the arm of the
leather couch. She was screened from all
view by the heavy bookcases in front of
her, so that she sat in the full glare
of the noon-day sun, her face at her sid,
unmoved. Finally, with a resigned sigh,
she picked off her book once more and
divided it with herself, and tried to con-
centrate her attention on the book. Her
mind wandered. It was a mild
afternoon around her. She was a dark-
skinned girl in the full conscious被打断
of budding womanhood. Her whole
innate nature had been deeply stirred by
those few melancholy strains and with
the sun
light heightening her blood, she could not con-
so there we end it. Nothing but myself
to feed any one else's nature. Nothing given
me but rotten books," she moaned.
tumult in her soul. "I will walk it down," she said aloud. "I must escape from myself." She started up over the hills at a quick pace, but even that did not satisfy her. With the same, she went, running as she climbed the steep hills, until it became a strain of her bodily strength, and she only to escape from self. At last she reached the top, and turned her back on the sea, the blue ocean, the fresh, huge Same on her. She took off her hat and stood there bathed in sunshine, thinking in deep gulps of ocean air, and muttering her satisfaction to herself. At last she turned and more and more slowly retraced her steps down the long hills until she reached the home.

circumstances had forced herself singer to live much alone. For many years this had suited her content. With her intense and imaginative temperament, she and her own visions had been suf-
ficient company. She had been early immer-
sed in heavy responsibilities, and had trained them firmly, though a dreamer by nature she had a strong practical sense.
She had now come to a period of her life when she could no longer content herself with her own society. She partly lived in her favorite library, surrounded with books and flowers, and at times she would rise and go to her own pleasure garden near her old and well-beloved companions began to fail. One could not live on books, she felt, that she must have some human sympathy. Her closest confidante and playmate, made her feel for the first time how the end of her own career. Why peace began to break in on her. Her longing, and others had become evident. She felt that she must have an outlet. Some change must come into her life, or she would no longer be able to struggle with the world's mood that now so often pressed her.

Just at this critical time her father died and thus the only tie that bound her to her old home was severed. Not long after the death of her father she received the invitation of some relatives and left her old home and the town. She lived in an old house to lead an entirely new life and large family circle.

I should like to have rewritten the whole theme, but the penman gives them me back in any work.
Ustinele Stein
Special
Nov. 3, 1916

Last part could
be made more
dramatic
He was a rectangularly looking man but strangely built. He seemed more intelligent than most of the men in his class. One day he told a story of miner life in the south that interested and excited. He had been a porter on a Southern train, and it had been the custom to pay for the porter with a glass to the porter instead of to the conductor. As usual, about an hour after the start, the porter went to collect his fare. A Southern gentleman seeing the mugs coming down the car determined to receive and refuse payment. "I don't pay money to niggers," he said harshly. "Any hell that it is the rule of the road." Realizing the violent reply, "don't you dare to ask a Southern gentleman for money you -" the porter exclaimed quietly, and again demanded his money. He was accosted with more oath and foul words and now he seized his arm by the collar and forcibly put him off the car. When the train came back over the road, it was rumored that a large body were dying in wait for the coming porter. The conductor had been in a drinking room and there he heard the angry crowd shout through the train, "see you when you see your devoted friend." He realized that there but hard to scare the road and men and return to his native state.
Dear Mr. Stein,

Special

April 6, 1895.

Sincerely,

Sympathetically
Tieck's imagination of Wagner reminds me more strongly of the study we have of the medieval child, the embodiment of the old German theme, than of the wicked ducal that Wagner created.

As the rice that stuck with his shoe
And child kept watch and ward in the gathering gloom, the wonderful scene in the void came back to the listeners. One remembers them as the brothers in arms keeping watch together on that fearful night, guarding the doomed hero and repelling the treacherous enemy with tear and curse as the grim monstrosity silently in the stone hall. "Najer sinnenge sig!" The monstrosity but also of Hamlet's path, unsparing, emotive and heroic endurance.
Exceeding his official
April 8, 1895.

on atmosphere.
A heavy summer mist when the air is damp and moist is even more palpable than the darkness of a winter storm. In that fell half light the building branches assume the shape of strange weird, aching monstrosities whose every curve seem ready to sink in and strangle all humanity in the quiet of the night. The willows in the marshes groan and creak as against the thin and taut wire between their branches. One catches glimpses of eminently9 cloaked men in the dim fathomed through the glint of a light flickering and dying away in deathly silence. All nature seems softened and paw suddenly arising one knows not whence a tremendous gust of some expiring March wind comes tearing through the trees, powers and leaves are tossed and uprooted at will.
Yehande Heen Yeal
April 10, 1895

Language a bit
conventional
In a lonely corner of Javan, behind a
broken brick wall is a small, dark room,
the last uncertain remnant of winter's slumber,
glory. Mixed together, tainted and soiled, it is
once a melancholy scene, a sad token of the
weakness of the great native powers.

Even here the dying tyrant has not found
peace. Glowing rumples are coming ever
 nearer and nearer, threatening to disturb
him from his last stronghold and to come
but a very small number to witness the
end of that tyrant forever. Beneath the
shaking of whose icebound ship we
have so long dreamed.
Bright little blue eye is going to see a procession.
She has been dreaming and longing for it for a week.
Every few minutes she cries "Mam/ma, Mamma!
At last the family parts me in the carriage little blue eye on the front seat, ecstatic, the eye growing bigger and bigger. Then come the processions on.

First, as it draws near the band begins to play and
suddenly the big bass drum gives one tremendous boom.

The little eye close suddenly, the boy's face begin to furnish "Dad."
"But timidly say, "I think I could hear better on the back seat."
It was a jelly high-school picnic, blooming girls,
and afterward boys, off in a good time, one bright
spring day. The worst remembered of all a day such
of weather, and not enjoying it very much and
so wandered off by himself. As he was
standing gazing dreamily at the book, which
lay on his feet, he suddenly heard his name
called.

On the horizon, not a little above king,
was a beautiful young girl in delicate Tone.

She sat one off, the wind was playing on
her fair hair, her blue dancing caused her
to print in a charming smile. "Hollo, you
buckle me down," she said, leaning on the started
girth. He looked and looked, but could not more.
How one you heard, and can it put down. "she continued
enjoying his companions. Automatically he reeled:
her hat, she took to it. And the voice of the
breezy breath, the sun at her touch felt strangely
biggy. She was beside him, this unexpected creature who
stayed his train. Suddenly she dropped her hand, turned
and ran into the woods. Inquired she looked at her
arm and then slung her pretty shoulders.

"What a stupid boy he is," she said.
Yutande Stein Special
April 25, 1995

Sincere love
His life is gentle and the elements
so mild in him, that Nature might stand up
and say to all the world, This is a man.

Of life another thing? Yes, a thousand times
after when the world shall hold such spirits
as Paul Jones. He is truly a man above men.
He stands firmly not for the dignity of man.
His faith is not
that of a singing bird before an all-powerful
master, but of a strong man willing to fight for
and endure. He has not accepted faith because
it is easy and pleasing, he has thought and
lived many years and at last come with a voice
of authority, if life does not mean this, then

What can one say more? He is a strong man
with firm faith reaching truly small experience
that life has given him. He is a man to all men.
Intended Steam Special
April 26.

Suggestion
A new leader is coming, and one Lady
the other day at the table. A new leader we don't
want any new leaders we the family decided in a
private meeting called to get opinions on this
important question. We had nothing to say, however,
and the matter was come.

The first night she met us with
a royal air and we were all awestruck. The
unwaveringly bowed to us, spoke softly and then mag-
ificently seated herself. Miss Harriet you used to
say, she is by far the strangest of a silent. At last
she picked up her courage and ventured a word.
The new leader endeavored to answer her by seated
more freely and retired. Miss Harriet and we could
do it too.

Then the new leader began to tell the family
all the time we come in all our pockets.

Then the new leader began to tell the family
all the time we come in all our pockets.

When we went on to join
the rest in our majesty with me of some great
man who believes in the love and has told in re-
and we wish to.
The new leader is here all the great people in
the town of Eden and they have all seen him. Their
private views on all subjects. Our Lady lades do not at the thinking
him with a mouth, eye, and ear. We have a huge. And
at dinner too and one poor folk look on me and can
only hope that some day we too will know some great man.
Patent Heir Special
April 27, 1893

Pleasant tone
Kinding a tew just out.

First come a study goomster, small face
because generally the back is a very bad way.
He has opened his coat and pulled back his
hands deep into his pockets and moves de-
fiantly at all the world be he sits down.

"Hello, no answer, he comes me utterly.

I see a crowd of little girls in bright blue
and red, dancing in the same light. One
a sweet little nothing dances at the tone
in me. I recongizing. I hear book,
and feel myself once more an independent
mental. A young old grandmother is walking along with
two little ones. One of them is clearly1 thinking of his re-
cord. She then periods a while head down and
whispers in her ear then thumps excitedly to the little
writting. "You don't seem perfect, Dear."

Then come a little more little girls with handfuls
of potatoes and her brother a study goomster. They both
smile at me happily and make the bright warm room brighter.

"One them both a dark cloth. When first come to Canada they
alone. I all the children smiled at me. The come to her
confined to me. Her Trouble. His teacher don't
like him, she says, he does not exactly study but must
it must be because he is stupid. You know I can't
learn much, she adds cheerfully.
Yutka Fein Official
April 29, 1893
Thoughtful
History and makes well to part of the utilitarianism of the present day, to say that the ideal of all reform is simply the ideal of getting something to eat. It is easy to talk so, but at the same time it shows small knowledge of the race that have led the human race to its present high civilization.

If we are to believe our modern theories at all, can we have sight of the fact that all our ethical and aesthetic sense has had its rise in reactions useful for the preservation of the organism, that is in reactions necessary to get it something to eat.

When we turn to history, can we forget that Hampden went to prison in a question of ship-money and that the American revolution was fought on a question of taxes? The getting something to eat is the incentive and force that have developed noble spirits and heroic deeds.

Bitter would it be for the educated to deny to recognize this, and assist in modern refusals to teaching in the belief that the great qualities of modern endurance and self-sacrifice that are operation indicate rather than to assume a fin de siècle tone and rail against the gone materialism round about him.
The ethical and sociological elements of the problem [if it can be called by so formal a name] are drained off in such a way as to leave it somewhat unmitigated.

Revised

Very slow at the start.

The trials and tribulations endured by your heroine in finding a vantage ground in the church do not seem sufficiently integral to deserve such elaborate recital. The vague thoughts and somber aches in the heroine’s mind by contemplation of the crowd are indicated with considerable force, though the tone is at first awkwardly impersonal. The closing reflections suggest the cold-blooded method of labor long analysis.
The templeman.

As they drew near the church the crowd in the streets increased. Old Baltimore seemed to turn out to see the new church. They pressed through the throng and entered the church but as soon as they got within the door they were brought to a halt. The place was packed from wall to wall and corner to corner, filled with the full allowance of every comfortable humanity. So closely were they crowded that no one could see anything except the persons directly in front of them.

The silence, and the crowd gradually with that peculiar indefinable movement, there is in men, the moment things began to move. The interior of the door was heavy, and as they stepped the air deeply seemed and the doors closed.

As pushing, waiting, squeezing, waiting again, and so managing to work themselves into the crowd succeeded in forcing their way to the steps leading up to the main entrance, two of the steps were crowded up and then turned to look at the crowd below them.

Never had she seen a more motley assembly. The poor and the rich, the stained and the elegant gathered all together, a beautiful
Note Stein’s comment at the end of the first paragraph: “Page 6 to be inserted here.” This additional “page 6” follows, in this appendix, the original final page 6 of this theme in sequence by image number. There are, indeed, two page sixes for this theme.
This attitude of prayer is one of reading and not participation, has always a strange fascination. The sight of all these people bowing before a frame that they daily recognize, little children, aged grandfathers and aged men all joining in that act of prayer is at peculiarly poignant. It is a column and a melancholy sight to the cheek, the knees of the man (to him) disemboweling reflections on the real worth of things as it all were. What does it all mean? Why this universal bending? Here, why at end of worth, a God of love which a mother? Are we really only the victims of kind force into this numbness, and why not knowing, nor whence does this willfully willy willy rhyme.

And out of it, as wind along the water, I know not whether willy willy shining.

What, why? They燼re tortuus, they are so and filled with longing, thought and questions, as longing and for what, she muttered, "I could not be as they, What then, she did not know. She struggled with her thought, she tried to throw off the weight, the intractable burden of asking for herself the great mould questions.
"Well," she continued to herself, "and Mr. Reagan is right. The one within the heart." While you live think: for once dead, you never shall return; Dream-life is the only life worth living." And thus the continued with great fervor, she muttered looking at the preacher over the sea of heads, "Yes, sir, I'll catch your saying. I'll bow my soul to the melody of your voice and yield myself to all the suggestions of the moment. Let me only be at rest and cease from doing why. There is no answer, there shall no longer be a questioning, there nothing ceased and with it the prayer came to an end. The drake were raised and again a movement began among the crowd. Once such a kind of case where a very very woman went up in the air, and people were spread out in front of my frame and she turned back to sit at a landing. Behind her there were also some that fell not so tightly pressed together. The girl was pressed back against one of the men standing in a corner her friends were just below her. She had not noticed..."
this man before, she did not look at him now, but he, taking advantage of the position, leaned toward her rather
heavily. She felt his touch. At first she
only half aware of it, but soon she became
conscious of his presence. The sensation
impressed her with the need to
move. The sense of a human
touch was not hers, and she decided not
to act. She turned herself but still she
did not move.

Now she became conscious that
likely her friends would notice
her proximity to this fellow. Even
that did not stir him. Her eager
mind was active in weary excelsis. She
remembered her well-known tendency
for absent-mindedness. “I can tell them
those moments, and you vindicate
if they accuse me.”

The voice of the preacher continued
in the distance, but the noise did
not penetrate her brain. At last she become
conscious of the voice and of the crowd.
The only felt the human touch and sense
of the reason she should give for her
existence.
At last she noticed her hand meeting
to her. "Not yet," she said to herself, "I
won't see her." Then with a quick re-

"Pax," she continued, "Dear and comely,
will you continue this? Have you no
sense of shame?" and all the while
her eyes were fixed on the freckled
and she looked the embodiment of
intelligent interest.

She seemed to herself to be

the growing of the tree. She tried to face
herself to move but she could not. She
shrank back. She grew more violent
in her thoughts and yet she did not
move.

At last one of her cousins forced her
way to her, touched her arm, and said,
that her mother wanted to go home. Her-
turn stretched down so together they
made their way out of the compound.
She then turned some same on their long backs, some whispering timidly to each other, frightened at finding themselves in the midst of such a thing. One delicate little woman had fainted and the crowd were forced back enough to let her husband up front her out.

The women with that indescribable touch to their sex, were sharing their neighborhood and gradually trying to see over their heads. An old woman barely able to totter, was trying to bend before the central arch, as is the custom in passing the figure of the saint. At last she succeeded but some almost rushed by a sudden movement in the water around her. All that she

All these strange and curious abortions were born to be served in a Catholic church where all

The imposing ceremonies, the wealth and

imagery displayed in the building, the statues and symbolic emblems in the church. Practically in the dim evening light, attract all the

pious and the cultured. The presence of beauty that the church list is unmistakable born in this humble struggling life of ours.
This is the blank verso of “insertion” page 6.
and a somewhat unusual form of abstract thought. It has frequently been lacking in organization, in fertility of resource, and in artfulness of literary method.

W. V. III.

Westwood Park Special
Triangle 13.
June 22, 1875.

For the sake of balance and completeness this should have been made to form part of the preceding paper. The analysis of the girl reaction on the situation, though unpleasant, in the extreme, is not without psychological interest.

The laboratory atmosphere still pervades the girls, and the work a certain artificial hardness and nakedness which is artistic.

Your work has shown at times considerable emotional intensity.
After leaving the church they all walked
on very silently for some time. A chill had
crept into the air. The sun had gone out of
the sky. In place of the dancing children
and the carefree groups of clover, there
were now but the solemn moving shadow
of the trees. The day had become un-
earthly, all nature seemed to feel the reaction
of sadness and chill after the excitement of
this summer evening.

The group began to separate slightly,
Durfee walking ahead with her favorite
comrades. There was an uneasy silence.
She tried again and again to speak, but
could not. A strange feeling came over her
as they walked on. She began to wonder
whether she had really done this thing,
whether she had wished herself conscious
in what she had done. It was not an
accident and she was a willing subject. She
feared that she had framed it herself in the
height of the excitement and that all was
ruined.

She wondered if she could go on with
her self. She tried to shake off her apathy but
could not. The morning
and within herself gradually began to find

any effort of her own gaining conviction that after all it had been absurd. When she tried to struggle against.

This process tried to force herself to con-

fess the truth to her companion. It was

useless; the false conviction increasing con-

tributory process of her entirely. She was

mentally paralyzed.

At last nor else attempted to

break the silence. At least they began

to talk in rather a strained fashion.

The train was too much for patience,

she knew the accusation thrown upon her

self at last by asking somewhat indig-

nantly, what the matter was. At this her

companion began telling her how she had once

achieved they all had been at seeing her

so far forget herself.

When the accusation was actually

wounded, all patience was spent. She

became filled completely with the sense

of her own guiltlessness. She grew indig-

nantly and her anger flared threats into

words. What she tried to say in words.

"Do you think as members of me are that? Can anyone

that should do a thing of that sort.
consciously. You all are ready enough to think
all of me if you can so easily excuse me
of this. I do not know well enough how
unprecedented I am of the thing about me
when I get interested? You know how about
minded I am and yet it does not seem
to have occurred to me that I was un-
concealed of that fellow so present."

his indignation grew stronger with
its expression and she now only felt
that she was immured and wronged. Her cousin
only too glad to receive her justification,
insisted on telling the rest as soon as possible.
This lasted but once and then the heart
of youth "Tell them a not as you please
if you all have taught me gently you
cannot continue to do so for ought I care.
She continued the walk home with all cheerly
..."
sense of rotation and could she really not have avoided her position. The last time looking onto the Outside of the Alcove by wondering and struggling.

Now the full conviction of her guilt would make upon her and getting her truth excited fiercely she would struggle with the thought then an alpatictic feeling would overcome, and she would be certain that she had not been in the wrong.

An old sense of rotation began to range over her. Again she had become one heart. Again there was something that some inner voice bent that no one else felt about her had been guilty of. The struggle continued at intervals all that day. She was outwardly as usual. In fact she herself seemed to take very little part in the war of doubts waged as both within her. She felt the struggle she heard the voices given again and again, but she herself seemed to be but an alpatictic spectator.

---

6 Stein’s final written page in English 22, Daily Themes, 1895-95, at Radcliffe College.
### Appendix C
Catalogue of English 22 Daily Themes by date and theme number, as marked by Gertrude Stein on the themes. Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas papers, YCAL, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. (Brazier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Commenter/Description</th>
<th>End Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 1894</td>
<td>Daily Theme I</td>
<td>In the Red Deeps.</td>
<td>W.V. Moody [reddish-pink ink: weird “e”, “In”, “T/t”; marginal and end comments.]</td>
<td>An extraordinary composition. One is puzzled to decide whether it is a personal experience, related in exaggerated terms, or a study from an objective stand point of a morbid psychologic state. In either case it possesses no inconsiderable degree of vividness and imaginative force. It is marred by awkward and unidiomatic uses of language; by wretched sentence structure; and by occasional patches of melodramatic writing which give a jarring effect of bathos. Rewrite. W.V.Moody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Daily Theme 2?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7 [1894]</td>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>Only a Question of Rent.</td>
<td>F.E.F. [red ink: marginal and end comments]</td>
<td>Your theme begins very abruptly and runs on in a rather rambling fashion. Your sentences are sometimes incoherent, and often awkwardly phrased; this hampers the reader and spoils the effect. You are careless, too about punctuation and do not always express yourself clearly. Since the narrative is all quotation, the quotation marks that occur within, as on pages 3, 4, &amp; 5 (please number your pages) should be single-not double.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Theme/Work</td>
<td>Comment/Action</td>
<td>Notes/Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15, 1894</td>
<td>Daily Theme 1</td>
<td>A modern sonnet to his mistress’ eyebrows.</td>
<td>Comment not attributed [brown ink] Has humor. Some misuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 16, 1894</td>
<td>Daily Theme 2</td>
<td>cna [brown ink; no marginal]</td>
<td>Pathetic but not convincing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 20, 1894</td>
<td>Woman.</td>
<td>cna [brown ink; no marginal]</td>
<td>Point of view nobly remote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 22, 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil; no marginal]</td>
<td>Last sentence queer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 27, 1894</td>
<td>A Conference</td>
<td>cna [red ink: end comment only a ?]</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 28/94</td>
<td>Theme 3, Rewritten</td>
<td>Only a Question of Rent.</td>
<td>No comments, end or marginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11, 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [faded dark red ink: weird “e” coming off of a “w” as well as the “v”; more likely F.E.F; no marginal]</td>
<td>Shows gain in descriptive power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 12, 1894</td>
<td>An Annex Girl.</td>
<td>cna [dark reddish-brown ink: same as 15; a few marginal underlines]</td>
<td>Your vehemence runs away with your syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 14, 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [red-brown ink: no marginal]</td>
<td>Montaigne or Confucius?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15, 1894</td>
<td>Ocean Symphony.</td>
<td>cna [brown ink: same as 12, no marginal]</td>
<td>After Apthorp?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 19, 1894</td>
<td>In a Psychological Laboratory.</td>
<td>cna [brown ink: most likely WVM: see “In”; no marginal]</td>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 20, 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [red ink: most likely WVM: see “T/t”; no marginal]</td>
<td>Shows discernment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [red ink: most likely WVM; no marginal]</td>
<td>Hegelian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 29, 1894</td>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>The Great Enigma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.V.M. [red ink: weird “e” following both “v” and “w”; marginal and end comments]</td>
<td>The analysis of character is, as far as the limits of your space have allowed, convincing and suggestive. The point of view wavers strangely. We have an instinctive feeling, from the tone in which the young lady is treated, that the point of view is really hers, and that the analysis which deals with her character is self-analysis, but ostensibly the point of view is that of the author as omniscient spectator. The result is a trifle confusing. The opening is oddly awkward and formal. I wish that you might overcome your disdain for the more necessary marks of punctuation. Rewrite the first page and revise the rest. W.V.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 9, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [red ink: most likely WVM; no marginal]</td>
<td>Perspicacious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 16, 1895</td>
<td>Theme 6, Rewritten</td>
<td>The Great Enigma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments, end or marginal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 15, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: weird “e”; mostly likely WVM; no marginal]</td>
<td>appreciative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 16,</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: Two words, different]</td>
<td>Edifyingly ascetic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Handwritings?</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: weird “e”; most likely WVM; no marginal]</td>
<td>most likely WVM; no marginal</td>
<td>Arrives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 20, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: weird “A”; high/straight “t”; most like WVM; no marginal]</td>
<td>A happy consummation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 26, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: most likely WMV; no marginal]</td>
<td>Shows acumen -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28, 1895</td>
<td>There is no joy but calm.</td>
<td>cna [pencil: definitely WVM; see “force” in Oct. 10, 1894; no marginal]</td>
<td>Seems forced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: definitely WVM; see “point” in Oct. 10 and Dec. 29, 1894; no marginal]</td>
<td>Makes a point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 5, 1895</td>
<td>Herbarté Metaphysic.</td>
<td>cna [pencil: weird “C”; most likely Moody see Oct 10, marginal comments; no marginal]</td>
<td>Caustic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 6, 1895</td>
<td>Theme 10 The birth of a legend.</td>
<td>W.V.M. [red ink; marginal and end comment]</td>
<td>A pleasant quiet bit of description with a sufficient thread of narrative to hold it firmly together. The style is well adapted to the simplicity of the matter, and the technique is careful and clean. In this last regard you have here made a very appreciative advance over your former work. The point of view shifts slightly in two places. Revise W.V.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 11, 1895</td>
<td>Business.</td>
<td>cna [pencil: no marginal]</td>
<td>Paragraph your dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 13, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11; no marginal]</td>
<td>You are severe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 19, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13; no marginal]</td>
<td>Your details are significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 20, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19; no marginal]</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 21, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, 20; no marginal]</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 22, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19,21; no marginal: initial A is Moody-like]</td>
<td>A rhapsody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 22, 1895</td>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Chapter I. In the Library.</td>
<td>The theme opens attractively. It is a pity to throw away so good a background as the old library; it is a sheer waste of material, and inartistic into the bargain, since a false emphasis has been thrown in the milieu at the start. The description of the girl is lacking in vividness and specific quality. We see her mood, but not her living image. The last page of the theme seems scrappy and hurried. The story should perhaps have been taken up at a later point and the present portion developed by way of reminiscence. Revise or rewrite, as you think best W.V.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 23, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc; one marginal comment]</td>
<td>Last part could be made more dramatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; no marginal]</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 1895</td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; no marginal]</td>
<td>Has “atmosphere”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; one marginal comment (a ? by an underline)]</td>
<td>Paragraph a bit conventional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; punctuation/caps correction]</td>
<td>Well massed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; no marginal]</td>
<td>Ends well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: weird “e”; definitely W.V.M.; one clause penciled out]</td>
<td>Suggestive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; no marginal]</td>
<td>Pleasant tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>cna [pencil: likely same as Mar 11, 13, 19, etc.; no marginal]</td>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 1895</td>
<td>Theme 14</td>
<td>The temptation. W.V.M. [red ink: marginal and end comments]</td>
<td>Very slow at the start. The trials and tribulations endured by your heroine in finding a vantage ground in the church do not seem sufficiently integral to deserve such elaborate recital. The vague thoughts and emotions aroused in the heroine’s mind by contemplation of the crowd are indicated with considerable force, though the tone is at first awkwardly impersonal. The closing reflections suggest the cold-blooded methods of laboratory analysis. The ethical and sociological elements of the problem (if it can be called by so formal a name) are drained off in such a way as to leave it somewhat unmitigated. Revise W.V.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 1895</td>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td>W.V.M. [purplish-brown ink: no]</td>
<td>For the sake of balance and completeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the girl’s reaction on the situation, though unpleasant in the extreme, is not without psychological interest. The laboratory atmosphere still pervades the lines, and gives the work a certain artificial hardness and nakedness which is inartistic. Your work has shown at times considerable emotional intensity and a somewhat unusual power of abstract thought. It has frequently been lacking in organization, in fertility of resource, and in artfulness of literary method. W.V.M.
Appendix D

1. Course grades for English 22, Daily Themes, 1894-95, Radcliffe College; includes Gertrude Stein’s grade of “C.” Reproduced by permission from Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.
Appendix D

2. Course grades for Forensics, 1895-1896, Radcliffe college; includes Gertrude Stein’s grade of “A-.” Reproduced by permission from Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alden</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claffin</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkles</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whitman</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mid-year marks:

- Alden, Maple: B+
- Oppenheimer, B

F. C. Peabody
Appendix E
Timeline of 19th and 20th century events at Harvard-Radcliffe relevant to this dissertation.

1824 Judge Story proposes Special Student Statute
1825 Board of Overseers adopts Special Student Statute
1846 Founding of Lawrence Scientific School: primary population Special Students
1869 Inaugural year of President Charles W. Eliot (1869-1909)
1870s Rapid growth of elective system, expansion of elective courses
1872 Special Students in Divinity School Annual Report
1874 Women from other institutions offered Harvard Exams and Certificate for passing; Gertrude Stein born in Allegheny, PA
1876 Harvard College admits Special Students over the age of 21
1877 Special Students in Law School Annual Report
1879 Women offered courses with Harvard Faculty: “Private Collegiate Instruction for Women by Professors and Other Instructors of Harvard College.” The “Great Experiment” in women’s education begins.
1880 Harvard College admits all Special Students (drops age restriction under 21)
1882 Founding of the “Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women” known as the “Harvard Annex”
1884 Barrett Wendell teaches first English 12 course at Harvard College
1885 Special Student Statute reaffirms 1825 Statute (in force from 1825-1847) for University; Special Student Advising implemented at Harvard College
1893 Fall: Gertrude Stein begins her freshman year as a Special Student at the Society; December: Commonwealth of Massachusetts charters Radcliffe College
1894 May and June: Harvard Board of Governors/Overseers President and Fellows of Harvard College found Radcliffe College
1898  Gertrude Stein receives her A.B. degree with M.C.L.(magna cum laude) honors.

1905  Gertrude Stein writes *Three Lives*

1909  Inaugural year of President Abbott Lawrence Lowell;
      Gertrude Stein publishes *Three Lives*

1910  Founding of Harvard University Extension; announced as an “experiment” in
      “popular education.” Provides educational pathways and courses for those
      previously called Special Students and handled through the Colleges and Schools.

1920  Founding of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard
Appendix F

Table from *Harvard Annual Report*, 1883-84 (p. 170, sequence 1104) titled “Students Not Candidates for a Degree, 1884-1828.” This table in the appendixes of the Report shows the enrollments of “Special Students” and other students from nontraditional enrollment pathways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1844-53</th>
<th>1854-55</th>
<th>1856-58</th>
<th>1859-61</th>
<th>1862-63</th>
<th>1864-66</th>
<th>1867-68</th>
<th>1869-70</th>
<th>1871-72</th>
<th>1873-74</th>
<th>1875-76</th>
<th>1877-78</th>
<th>1879-80</th>
<th>1881-82</th>
<th>1883-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>3961</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>4331</td>
<td>4524</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>4876</td>
<td>5048</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>5416</td>
<td>5620</td>
<td>5812</td>
<td>6012</td>
<td>6222</td>
<td>6422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident A.B. (not candidates for degree)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident B.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident M.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Law Students</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Medical Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Veterinary Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Astronomical Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Summer Courses</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Students in Chemistry and Mathematics</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Astronomical Students for degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G
Chart showing the growth of the student body of women in Cambridge from 1879-1895.
Appendix H
Table describing English Department courses at the Harvard Annex/Radcliffe College from 1879-1898, including course description, student enrollment by course, and teachers of record. Also includes total number of students in competitive departments as available. Drawn from the annual reports of Private Collegiate Instruction, Society, and Radcliffe College. (Brazier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>DESCR.</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879-1880</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Lectures on English Literature</td>
<td>Mr. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A.S. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature of the XVIIIth and XIXth Centuries</td>
<td>One hour a week.</td>
<td>Mr. A.S. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ticknor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1881</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>4 students</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>5 students</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Not subscribed</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures on English Lit</td>
<td>Not subscribed</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>Not subscribed</td>
<td>Ticknor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1882</td>
<td>History of English Literature</td>
<td>20 students</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prof. Briggs¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of English Literature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ticknor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One course (not named)</td>
<td>Not subscribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1883</td>
<td>3 classes, 15 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-1884</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wendell²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 classes, 38 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature of 19th century</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ LeBaron Russell Briggs, according to Kitzhaber, was “one of Wendell’s best friends” (67). Also according to Kitzhaber, Briggs was part of the origin story of Wendell’s English Composition: “In the 1880s, after Briggs had been teaching freshman composition [at Harvard] for several years and Wendell had been working with a class in advanced composition, the two men decided to trade courses for a while. Wendell, as a result, had to prepare a new set of lectures. In November and December of 1890 he gave the lectures at the Lowell Institute in Boston as well. In 1891 they were published in book form under the title English Composition” (Kitzhaber 68). You will notice in this table . Briggs became president of Radcliffe upon Agassiz’s departure in 1903, and served until 1925.

² Barrett Wendell’s first courses to the ladies of the Annex: the precursor to English B, sophomore themes, and Forensics, the course which would become English C, junior year. Notice in 1883 that Hill is still teaching “English Composition.” The following year, Briggs has assumed that course now called “Hill’s Rhetoric” which was to become English A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884-1885</td>
<td>Literature of 18th century</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 classes, 59 students</td>
<td>Hill’s Rhetoric</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng: Highest enrollment</td>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1886</td>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 classes, Literature of 19th century</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 students, Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest #</td>
<td>Advanced work in English Composition</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Themes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Forensics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Forensics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1887</td>
<td>Rhetoric and English Composition</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 classes</td>
<td>English Literature of the 18th century</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 students</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin most #</td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No descreps</td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1888</td>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 classes</td>
<td>Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>Mr. Cummings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 students</td>
<td>Junior Forensics</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English most</td>
<td>Senior Forensics</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature (exclusive of Milton) Shakspere to Dryden</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-1889</td>
<td>Lectures based on AS Hill’s Principles of Rhetoric</td>
<td>Briggs and Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th century</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Clymer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton and Dryden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Forensics</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Forensics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1890</td>
<td>Lectures based on AS Hill’s</td>
<td>Mr. Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 classes</td>
<td>Lectures based on AS Hill’s Principles of Rhetoric</td>
<td>Briggs and Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 “The usual instruction in Themes and Forensics, demanded by the regular course, was given to large classes by Mr. Wendell” (1885, p. 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890-1891</td>
<td>Principles of Rhetoric</td>
<td>10 classes</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shakspere</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Drama (exclusive of Shakspere) from The Miracle Plays to the closing of the Theatres.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature of the Elizabethan period exclusive of the Drama and of Bacon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th century</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Clymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History and Principles of English Versification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Forensics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kittredge and Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Forensics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kittredge and Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1892</td>
<td>Rhetoric and English Composition - AS Hill’s Rhetoric</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mr. Lathrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shakespere</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Drama (exclusive of Shakspere) from The Miracle Plays to the closing of the Theatres.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature of the 18th century</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th century</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History and Principles of English Versification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prof. Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1892</td>
<td>Rhetoric and English Composition - AS Hill’s Rhetoric</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mr. Lathrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Messrs Hight and Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Lathrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacon. Milton.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature of the 18th century</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. Lathrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th century</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poets of the 19th century</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere (UG and G)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Criticism in English from the 16th to the 19th century</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early English (G)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature of the Elizabethan period exclusive of the Drama and of Bacon</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1893 Rhetoric and English Composition – AS Hill’s “The Elements of Rhetoric”</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 classes Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer UG&amp;G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere UG&amp;G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Works of Shakspere UG&amp;G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature of the 18th century UG&amp;G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poets of the 19th century UG&amp;G</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th Century UG&amp;G</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Criticism in England from the 16th to the 19th century UG&amp;G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition: “Asst. Professor Wendell’s English Composition was used as a textbook” (23). UG&amp;G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drama (exclusive of Shakspere) from the Miracle Plays to the closing of the theatres. G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature of the Elizabethan period exclusive of the Drama and of Bacon G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature in the 17th century</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1894 Rhetoric and English Composition</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 classes Twelve Sophomore Themes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd: 129 German(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere UG&amp;G</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Works of Shakspere UG&amp;G</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prof. Wendell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon. Milton. UG&amp;G</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Writers of the 19th century u&amp;g</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Criticism in English since the 16th century u&amp;g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition u&amp;g</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. Brewster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First offering!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition (advanced course) UG&amp;G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drama (exclusive of Shakspere) from the Miracle Plays to the closing of the Theatres....</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Lit of the Elizabethan period exclusive of the Drama and of Bacon.G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric and English Composition</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve Sophomore themes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. Hurlbut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Messrs. Baker and Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 german</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Messrs. Gates, Farley, and Moody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERTRUDE STEIN’S COURSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer U&amp;G</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakspere u&amp;g</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literatures of the 18th C u&amp;g</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Criticism in English since the 16th century u&amp;g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition (advanced course) u&amp;g</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr. Lamont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative Composition u&amp;g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Principles of English Versification (Graduates)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Poetry – Beowulf G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drama (exclusive of Shakspere) from the Miracle Plays to the closing of the Theatres (g)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research “In this course an attempt was made to assign to Middleton and Rowley their respective contributions to the Middleton-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Instructor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1896</td>
<td>English A: (1st time officially offered): Rhetoric and English Composition.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Messrs. Hurlbut, Hart, and Flandrau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>554 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English B: English Composition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr. Copeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twelve Themes (Sophomore Themes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English C: Forensics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Asst. Prof Baker and Mr. Prescott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191 German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166 french</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 3: Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr. Boynton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 22: English Composition</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mr. Gates and Mr. Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 2: Shaksperere</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Prof Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 111: English Literature, Bacon u&amp;g</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prof Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 112: English Literature, Milton u&amp;g</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 8: English Literature. Poets of the 19th century u&amp;g</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 9: English literature. Prose writers of the 19th century u&amp;g</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mr. Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 12: English Composition (Wendell’s Composition used as textbook) u&amp;g</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 4: Early English G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 17: English lit of the 15th and 16th centuryes in its relation to Italian and Spanish literature of 15th and 16th G.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 14. The development of Drama in the 19th century G.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prof Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 20: special study of Middle English Metrical Romances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prof. Kittredge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: English Composition</td>
<td>28: 23 ug, 5 ss</td>
<td>Mr. Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions removed from course listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: English Composition. Forensics</td>
<td>52: 43 ug, 9 ss</td>
<td>Asst Prof Baker and Mr. Prescott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harvard’s course listings

Specials and Undergraduates listed Separately.

22: English Composition.
   Description: “3 hours a week.”
   60: 30 ug, 29 ss, 1 grad
   Messrs. Copeland, Abbott, and Cotton

It also now resembles late 20th century curriculum:
first time descrp includes dates

10: Elocution
   14: 5ug, 8ss, 1g
   Mr. Hayes

3: Anglo-Saxon
   6: 1ug, 2ss, 3g
   Dr. Robinson

1: English Literature – Chaucer u&g
   31: 10ug, 15ss, 6g
   Prof Kittredge

2: English Literature – Shakspere
   u&g
   42: 13ug, 24ss, 5g
   Prof Kittredge

11: English Literature – Bacon
   (1sem)
   8: 4ug, 3ss, 1g
   Dr. Robinson

11: English Literature – Bacon
   (2sem)
   19: 7ug, 8ss, 4g
   Dr. Robinson

32: English Lit of Elizabethan
   Period (1557-1599)
   20: 8ug, 11ss, 1g
   Mr. Gardiner

32. English Liter from death of
   Spenser to closing of theaters
   (1599-1642)
   30: 9ug, 16ss, 5g
   Asst Prof Baker

7: English Lit of Period of Queen
   Anne (1700-1744)
   23: 10ug, 11ss, 2g
   Mr. Hulrbut

8: [from the publication of Lyrical
   Ballands to the Death of Scott
   (1798-1832)
   61: 25ug, 31ss, 5g
   Asst Prof Gates

12: English Composition
   24: 11ug, 9ss, 4grad
   Mr. Gardiner

3: Anglo-Saxon graduates
   10: 4ug, 3ss, 3g
   Dr. Robinson

23: English Lit: Works of Shakspere
   9: 3ug, 2ss, 4grad
   Asst Prof Baker

5: English Composition (advanced
   course)
   13: 5ug, 7ss, 1g
   Asst Prof Gates

1897-1898

A. Rhetoric and English
   Composition. AS Hill’s Princeiples
   of Rhetoric
   65: 49ug, 16ss
   Messrs Hulrbut, Hart and La Rose

637 students;
21 courses

B. English Composition. Twelve
   Themes
   24: 2ug, 3ss
   Messrs. Copeland and Sheffield

218: german
C. English Composition, Forensics
   53: 45ug, 8ss
   Asst Prof
| 188:phil  |
| 186: history |
| 185: French |
| **22. English Composition** | 82:46ug,34ss,2g | Asst Prof Gates, Messrs Abbott, Alden and Camberlin |

| 10. Elocution | 18:12ug,5ss,1g | Mr. Hayes |
| 31. Anglo-Saxon | 10:2ug,7ss,1g | Dr. Schofield |
| 1. English Literature. Chaucer | 15:7ug,6ss,2g | Prof Kittredge |
| 2. English Literature. Shakspere | 58:21ug,26ss,1g | Prof Kittredge |
| 111: English Literature. Bacon | 14:6ug,6ss,2g | Dr. Robinson |
| 112: English Literature. Milton | 35:20ug,13ss,2g | Dr. Robinson |
| 321: English Lit of Elizabethan Period, etc. (1557-1599) | 22:8ug,13ss,1g | Mr. Gardiner |
| 152: English Lit. From closing of Theatres to Death of Dryden (1642-1700) | 30:12ug,16ss,2g | Mr. CL Young |
| 71: English Lit of Period of Queen Anne From death of Dryden to Death of Swift (1700-1745). | 13:7ug,6ss | Mr. Hurlbut, asst by Mr. LaRose |
| 72: English Literature from Death of Swift to Lyrical Ballads (1744-1798) | 30:18ug,12ss | Mr. Copeland asst by Mr. Alden |
| 8: English Lit From the Death of Scott to the Death of Tennyson (1832-1892). | 107:54ug,48ss,5g | Asst Prof Gates, asst by Mr. Mason |
| **12: English Composition** | 16:9ug,3ss,4g | Mr. CL young |
| 32: Anglo-Saxon. Graduates | 9:3ug,6ss,1g | Dr. Robinson |
| 4: Early English. English lit 1200-1450 | 4:3ug,1g | Drs. Robinson and Schofield |
| 13. Literary Criticism in English since 16th c | 16:5ug,6ss,5g | Asst Prof Gates |
| 14. English Literature. The Drama from the Miracle Plays to the Closing of Theatres. | 15:4ug,4ss,7g | Asst Prof Baker |
| 20. Special Comparative Study of Middle English Literature | 1grad (research course) | Prof Kittredge |
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