

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Revolt against Patriarchal Mores in *Daisy Miller*

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, Prithvi Narayan Campus,
in partial fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Masters of Arts in English**

By

Chandra Mani Poudel

Class Roll No. 76/061

Exam Roll No. 1057

Regd: No.6-1-291-12-96

Department of English

Prithvi Narayan Campus

Pokhara

April, 11-2011

Approval Letter

This thesis, submitted to the Department of English, Prithvi Narayan Campus, by Chandra Mani Paudel, entitled "Revolt against Patriarchal Mores in Daisy Miller" has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Coordinator
Department of English

Date: April, 11- 2011

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

This is to certify that Mr. Chandra Mani Poudel with class roll no. 76/061 has prepared this thesis entitled "*Revolt against Patriarchal Mores in Daisy Miller*" under my supervision, following the format as specified by the research committee, Department of English, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara. I, therefore, forward it to the Research committee for final evaluation

.....

Bhanu Kandel
Teaching Assistant
Department of English
Prithvi Narayan Campus
Pokhara

Date: April, 2011

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the guidance and support from my teachers and friends. I am indebted to Mr. Bhanu Kandel Lecturer at the Department of English at Prithvi Narayan Campus, and Dr. Man Bahadur K.C. Head of Department for their guidance, tremendous support and motivation.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my parents for their moral support. Without the support and well wishers of my teachers, friends and family, this thesis would not have been completed.

Date : April, 11- 2011

Chandra Mani

Poudel

Abstract

In the novella *Daisy Miller*, Daisy is created as the pinnacle of American innocence, which is socially and personally destructive but also refreshingly attractive and charming. It is her charm and spontaneity that attract Winterbourne, who is the only one that correctly judges Daisy as an innocent. But because of false starts, romantic posturing, missed opportunities, and different social backgrounds, Winterbourne and Daisy, who genuinely like one another, are never able to develop a serious relationship, a fact which contributes to the overall tragedy of the story.

Many of James' American characters portray an unsettling mix of charm and ignorance, but Daisy is the epitome of the type. She is filled with fun and spontaneity, but totally ignorant of social custom and tradition. As a result, she commits one blunder after another in European society. It is, therefore, not surprising that Daisy meets with personal tragedy, and the novella becomes a social tragedy.

But Daisy defies the patriarchal notion of how a lady of class should behave, and in the course also puzzles her admirer Winterbourne who stands as a representative of the civilized society. Her deliberate idiosyncratic behaviors are her rebellion against the patriarchal mores, morals and prescriptions.

Contents

Approval Letter	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
CHAPTER ONE: James' Concern on Innocence	1-10
James, His Times, and the Novel	1
Review of Literature	8
CHAPTER TWO: Feminism	11-27
Feminism	11
Marxist Feminism	18
CHAPTER THREE: Charm and Innocence	28-52
Charming and Innocent: Patriarchal Idea of Femininity	28
Good Woman versus Bad Woman	35
Class Concern: Capitalist Mindset	43
CHAPTER FOUR:	
Sacrifice of Innocence	53-55
Works Cited	56-57

CHAPTER ONE

James' Concern on Innocence

James, His Times, and the Novel

In the autumn of 1877, Henry James (1843–1916) heard a piece of gossip from a friend in Rome about a young American girl traveling with her wealthy but unsophisticated mother in Europe. The girl had met a handsome Italian of “vague identity” and no particular social standing and attempted to introduce him into the exclusive society of expatriate Americans in Rome. The incident had ended in a snub of some sort, a small social check of no great gravity,” the exact nature of which James promptly forgot. Nevertheless, in the margin of the notebook where he recorded the anecdote, he wrote “Dramatise, dramatise!” He never knew the young lady in question or heard mention of her again, but he proceeded to immortalize the idea of her in *Daisy Miller*.

Native of New York, James had been born into a world of ideas and letters. His father, an amateur philosopher and theologian who had inherited a considerable fortune, socialized with all the leading intellectuals of the day. Henry's older brother, William, would become a key figure in the emerging science of psychology. In 1855, when James was twelve, the family embarked on a three-year tour of Europe that included London, Paris, and Geneva. The experience was to have a profound influence on James's life and writing. In addition to European art and culture, the trip exposed him to the erudition of European society. It also put him in an ideal position to observe the contrasts between new and old world values, a conflict that was to appear repeatedly in James's fiction as the international theme.

Daisy Miller was first published in the June and July 1878 issues of the British magazine *Cornhill*. It was an instant success, transforming James into an author of

international standing. The novel's popularity almost certainly derived from the portrait at its center, of a naïve, overly self-confident, and rather vulgar American girl attempting to inhabit the rarified atmosphere of European high society.

The cursory plot summary of the novel informs the reader that at a hotel in the resort town of Vevey, Switzerland, a young American named Winterbourne meets a rich, pretty American girl named Daisy Miller, who is traveling around Europe with her mother and her younger brother, Randolph. Winterbourne, who has lived in Geneva most of his life, is both charmed and mystified by Daisy, who is less proper than the European girls he has encountered. She seems wonderfully spontaneous, if a little crass and “uncultivated.” Despite the fact that Mrs. Costello, his aunt, strongly disapproves of the Millers and flatly refuses to be introduced to Daisy, Winterbourne spends time with Daisy at Vevey and even accompanies her, unchaperoned, to Chillon Castle, a famous local tourist attraction.

The following winter, Winterbourne goes to Rome, knowing Daisy will be there, and is distressed to learn from his aunt that she has taken up with a number of well-known fortune hunters and become the talk of the town. She has one suitor in particular, a handsome Italian named Mr. Giovanelli, of uncertain background, whose conduct with Daisy mystifies Winterbourne and scandalizes the American community in Rome. Among those scandalized is Mrs. Walker, who is at the center of Rome's fashionable society.

Both Mrs. Walker and Winterbourne attempt to warn Daisy about the effect her behavior is having on her reputation, but she refuses to listen. As Daisy spends increasingly more time with Mr. Giovanelli, Winterbourne begins to have doubts about her character and how to interpret her behavior. He also becomes uncertain

about the nature of Daisy's relationship with Mr. Giovanelli. Sometimes Daisy tells him they are engaged, and other times she tells him they are not.

One night, on his way home from a dinner party, Winterbourne passes the Coliseum and decides to look at it by moonlight, braving the bad night air that is known to cause "Roman fever," which is malaria. He finds Daisy and Mr. Giovanelli there and immediately comes to the conclusion that she is too lacking in self-respect to bother about. Winterbourne is still concerned for Daisy's health, however, and he reproaches Giovanelli and urges him to get her safely home.

A few days later, Daisy becomes gravely ill, and she dies soon after. Before dying, she gives her mother a message to pass on to Winterbourne that indicates that she cared what he thought about her after all. At the time, he does not understand it, but a year later, still thinking about Daisy, he tells his aunt that he made a great mistake and has lived in Europe too long. Nevertheless, he returns to Geneva and his former life.

For Winterbourne, late 19th century Rome represents moral decline. He has contempt for Catholics, condemns the city's loose morals, and considers hygiene therein to be poor. Daisy, on the other hand, thrives in this "unhealthy moral environment." In Winterbourne's estimation, Daisy does not behave like a lady should, particularly in that she fraternizes with the working class, such as the Miller family's courier, Eugenio. Daisy also has a general desire to be around other people, as is shown when she desires to travel to Chillon by steamer and when she chooses to meet in places where "couriers, servants, foreign tourists" mill around. Daisy's open-mindedness and lack of 'daintiness' reflects democratic, pluralistic sensibilities, while Winterbourne, who likes to travel by private carriage, represents individualistic, Calvinist sensibilities. There is solidarity between the feminine, the crowd and mob, and democratic freedom. James' linking of Daisy - a woman - with the crowd and mob intuits that effective coalitions are built among

marginalized groups. Daisy is a milder version of Louisa Lander, an American woman sculptor in Rome who was reprimanded for posing nude and living out of wedlock with an Italian man.

The marginalized groups made the ruling-class 'nervous' somehow; hence, the ruling class's considerable apprehensions about how said groups behaved, both individually and toward each other. Daisy, a representative for women, flirts shamelessly, sits in corners with mysterious Italian men, dances into the evening, receives visitors late at night. However, she aligns herself with the 'good' with these behaviors, not at all with a deviant, wild, or rebellious group. She says bluntly that she is a flirt and that all nice girls are flirts. Hence, a positive spin is put on women's liberation; it is a 'good' thing, a 'nice' thing, an 'innocent' thing.

Her determined will against others is strong and weak at the same time. The weakness comes from her seeming lack of principle behind actions; her defiance is a matter of coincidence of her obliviousness. Therefore, in some critics' view, she cannot be labeled a true hero. Henry James' intention when he started the novella was to create a comedy of manners. However, by the end, he seems to side with and praise his heroine much more so than ridicule her. On the surface, it would seem Daisy is associated with simple Americans, while Winterbourne is associated with sophisticated Europeans. This is shown even in their dialogue exchanges; Winterbourne has reserved reactions, while Daisy has spontaneous, less intellectualized reactions. However, toward the middle and end of the novella, Daisy is not associated with America, but rather with nature. Henry James' choice of imagery and description displays a reverence for his heroine. She is described as "fresh," "uncultivated," and "natural." She looks at Winterbourne with "lovely remoteness" and strikes him as a "charming apparition." The name Daisy itself, as well, calls to mind natural beauty. In a scene of Daisy and Giovanelli in the Pincian

Garden overlooking the Villa Borghese, James makes Daisy quite at home in that natural environment, more so than he does in any other scene. In effect, Daisy reigns supreme over both Europeans and Americans; she is allied with the natural world and/or an otherworldly origin.

The post–Civil War industrial boom had given rise to a new class of wealthy Americans for whom “the grand tour,” an extended trip through Europe, represented the pinnacle of social and financial success. As a result, Americans were visiting Europe for the first time in record numbers. However, American manners differed greatly from European manners, and the Americans were largely ignorant of the customs of Europeans of comparable social status. Between these two groups lay a third: wealthy American expatriates whose strict observance of the Old World standards of propriety outdid even the Europeans.

This sort of affiliation of Daisy, known to many as a hero for feminism, only serves to lend greater beauty and credibility to the cause. It marks a spiritual importance and natural destiny to women's desire for emotional outlet and mental space. The needs of these women transcended what human society can understand or readily offer.

Henry James followed typical British themes, such as courtship and charged domestic conversation, but he adds an American touch by invoking evil and enigma. Weisbuch focuses on an evil conception of Winterbourne. In his worry about and search for evil in Daisy's behavior, Winterbourne himself is immoral. He is evil because he seeks reductive absolutes and certainty; he desires to "solve" Daisy. In truth, his blindness is illustrated when, while spying on Daisy, his view is blocked by her parasol covering her and Giovanelli. Winterbourne also takes great interest in Daisy's appearance, noting her "wonderfully pretty eyes;" he "had great relish for feminine beauty; he was addicted to observing and analyzing it." In effect, he categorizes Daisy as

a thing, putting emotional distance between himself and her; she is an aesthetic and a puzzle. He is the epitome of a spectator-man who objectifies, itemizes, categorizes, and fictionalizes women, thus denying them wholeness.

Daisy's rejection of Winterbourne, therefore, is not a mere rejection of etiquette and social mores which restrict her freedom to walk around, flirt, and have visitors at her will, but also of the "male chauvinist pig" who would view her as a thing rather than as a complete person. Daisy repeatedly declares Winterbourne "too stiff," which refers to his uptight social manner, but also, in some sexualized interpretations, to his spectator-lust for her.

Throughout *Daisy Miller*, Winterbourne is preoccupied with the question of whether Daisy is innocent. The word *innocent* appears repeatedly, always with a different shade of meaning. *Innocent* had three meanings in James's day. First, it could have meant "ignorant" or "uninstructed." Daisy is "innocent" of the art of conversation, for example. It could also have meant "naïve," as it does today. Mrs. Costello uses the word in this sense when she calls Winterbourne "too innocent" in Chapter 2. Finally, when Winterbourne protests, twirling his moustache in a sinister fashion, he invokes the third meaning, "not having done harm or wrong."

This third sense is the one that preoccupies Winterbourne as he tries to come to a decision about Daisy. He initially judges the Millers to be merely "very ignorant" and "very innocent," and he assesses Daisy as a "harmless" flirt. As the novel progresses, he becomes increasingly absorbed in the question of her culpability. He fears she is guilty not of any particular sex act per se but merely of a vulgar mindset, a lack of concern for modesty and decency, which would put her beyond his interest or concern. One could

If the American abroad was James's signature theme, that of the un-lived life was his almost perpetual subtext. Repeatedly in James's novels and stories, characters focus

their attention on an abstraction, an ideal or idea they feel they could figure out or achieve if only they could devote their spirit or intellectual faculties to it with sufficient understanding or patience. Again and again, they realize too late that whatever it was they sought to understand or achieve, whatever they waited for, has passed them by and that they have wasted their whole life—or, like Winterbourne, they never fully arrive at that realization. One way of looking at *Daisy Miller* is to conclude that the whole issue of Daisy's character is beside the point, a red herring that distracts Winterbourne from the business of living. In that case, the heart of the novel would be Winterbourne's character, and the fear or lack of passion that causes him to hide from life behind the ultimately unimportant conundrum of Daisy's innocence, or lack thereof.

Since the publication of James's novel in 1878, Daisy has worn several labels, among them "flirt," "innocent," and "American Girl." Daisy's representation of an American Girl of the late 19th century is evident. Her free-spiritedness and individuality reflect the social movement of the American middle-class.

The author differentiates between "genuine cosmopolitanism" and "superficial worldliness" in international and intercultural attitudes. Henry James' works place moral value on learning about cultural, social, and national differences. Daisy Miller refuses to conform to the decorum of the American expatriate community in Europe, who, despite their claim to be worldly, are very provincial in attitude. They find it shocking that Daisy so openly tries to question, learn, and be exposed to everything possible. They gawk at her, a white woman, walking around with an Italian man. Aside from that, many of the American expatriates were actually only interested in Europe, not caring as much for Chinese, African, South Asian, and Mexican cultures, for instance. They were not worldly in the true sense of the word. The author says Daisy Miller is not a feminist, but

rather an American individual who disregards social rules through sincere empathy with other individuals.

However, Daisy is a feminist in that she flirts with Giovanelli and Winterbourne, using her feminine wiles proudly, not at all trying to repress it. She criticizes Winterbourne for being too "stiff," implying that she believes men and women in social situations should be more carefree and fun-loving. She does not have old-fashioned sensibilities about female/male flirtation.

When the movement for women's rights was at its peak, it was simultaneous with the Emancipation movement / civil rights for blacks. Women's Rights and Minority Rights, thus, go hand in hand. Daisy strikes the reader as more naturally and sincerely worldly than any of the American expatriates, such as Winterbourne and Mrs. Walker. Her sympathy with and interest in non-whites and her refusal to be enclosed in a provincial, upper-class white society puts her in tune with minority plight, and by association, women's plight.

Review of Literature

As with much of James's work, critical estimation of *Daisy Miller* has fluctuated. While early discussion focused on the accuracy of James's depiction of the generic "American girl," later critics have suggested that Winterbourne is the pivotal character of the story. According to these critics, by presenting Winterbourne's disapproval of Daisy's essentially innocent activities, James subtly admonished the narrow attitudes adopted by many Americans abroad. Other early discussion of *Daisy Miller* examined the reasons for Daisy's death, and commentators debated whether Daisy deserved her fate or Winterbourne's inaction caused her downfall. *Daisy Miller's* originality, stylistic distinction, and psychologically complex characters have led many modern critics to

regard James as a subtle craftsman who skillfully reflected the late nineteenth-century concern with morality and social behavior.

Critic Karen Bernardo in his essay “Henry James’ *Daisy Miller*” writes that the novel is about the rise of common people to the status of aristocracy on the nineteenth century. To quote him:

There are certain periods in history which serve as great cultural watersheds -- eras in which the normal conventions and expectations of society are in flux, as the entire society moves from one type of culture to another. In his novella *Daisy Miller*, Henry James shows how during the late Victorian era, a newly-affluent moneyed middle class began moving into social territory formerly considered the sole province of aristocracy. [. . .] However, the incursion of "common" people into this social setting has already had an effect. It has forced the ranks of the certifiably aristocratic to tighten against the invaders, much as the American pioneers pulled their covered wagons into tight circles to make them more easily defensible against Indian attack. (Bernardo 1)

He sees the class conflict the major cause behind the tragedy of Daisy. But there are other strong arguments as well. An article titled “Henry James” in the *Wikipedia* reads the novel as a tragedy:

This story portrays the confused courtship of the title character, a free-spirited American girl, by Winterbourne, a compatriot of hers with much more sophistication. His pursuit of Daisy is hampered by her own flirtatiousness, which is frowned upon by the other expatriates they meet in Switzerland and Italy. Her lack of understanding of the social mores of

the society she so desperately wishes to enter ultimately leads to tragedy.

(14)

This thesis studies the novel as a rebellion against the restraints of imposed by the patriarchal society on the women, specially in the nineteenth century Europe. When women do not conform to the patriarchal social system they are labelled dangerous, immoral and unnatural. This ultimately casues their expulsion from scoiety and leads to their tragic demise.

CHAPTER:TWO

Feminism

In this chapter, this thesis provides an introduction to the critical conceptual tool called feminism which will be used in the next chapter for the purpose of analyzing the text. The history of feminism; its rise and origin, and its basic principles, its reading of history and literature are discussed to clarify what general direction a feminist study would take while interpreting a literary work.

Feminism

The development of feminist thought has not only been uneven, but it has also always involved deep theoretical disagreements. These partly reflect the varied needs and perception of women in different societies and situations, but also stem from feminism's mixed origins in both the liberal and the socialist traditions of 'male-stream' political thought as well as women's own experiences. Rather than talking of feminism as a unified body of thought, many modern commentators therefore identify a distinct feminist positions such as liberal, radical, Marxist, socialist feminisms. The history of feminism its rise and origin, and its basic principles, its reading of history and literature are discussed to clarify what general direction a feminist study would take while interpreting a literary work.

Feminism is social theory and a political movement primarily informed and fuelled by the experience of women. Inaugurated by such critical minds as Mary Wollstonecraft and Germaine Nicole de Sainte Beauve, this movement was later strengthened by Virginia Woolf and Simone de Beauvoir in the twentieth century. Simply put, feminism can be understood as a doctrine which advocates equal rights and dignity for women. Feminism acquired a more or less concrete set of beliefs in the nineteenth century articulating the thesis that women are inherently equal to men in every way

conceivable. As a concerted social and political movement that went global, feminism got momentum in the twentieth century. The aim of this movement can be designed as spiritual as it seeks to establish a human society based on the mutual understanding and respect between the two sexes. Encyclopedia Britannica defines feminism in two important senses:

Feminism is (a) arrange of contemporary theoretical perspectives (political, sociological, legal, psychoanalytic, literary, philosophical) in which women's experiences are examined in relation to actual or perceived differences between the power and status of men and women; (b) a social justice movement in which issues of particular importance for women are analyzed, understood, and addressed from feminist perspectives. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the term was often used in compounds such as "lesbian feminism" and "eco-feminism."

The multiplicity of definitions today of this movement makes it difficult to provide an all-inclusive definition. Even then, what Catherine Mackinnnon means by it can be taken as generalization of this movement when she writes that a "theory is feminist to the extent it is persuaded that women have been unjustly unequal to men because of the social meaning of their bodies."

Feminism questions why women have been consigned to a subservient status in relation to men, and explains the social system controlled and constructed by men, as the cause behind women's subordination. It also studies how women's lives have changed throughout history. Also, one of its central concern is, according to what about women's experience is different from that of men's, either as a result, as Michael Ryan writes, of "an essential ontological or psychological difference or as a result of historical imprinting and social construction" (101).

For a long time since the written history of humanity began, all literatures on women were given to presenting women in a demeaning vein. It was only in the seventeenth century that flickers of consciousness regarding the position of women as equal to men emerged. Before that, the position of women as equal to men in all the consequential and vital aspects of life was outright denied. Since almost all literatures were written by men, women were depicted as being inferior to men in terms of physical strength, mental capability, and spiritual quest. Women were constrained to the role of taking care of kitchen, children and church (religion). Of course, women were adored for their outward or physical beauty. That shallow adoration did not earn women any true respect from the males. Relegated to a secondary status, the aspiration and dreams of half of the world populace found no recognition in the annals of human history which was exclusively androcentric. Little literature created by women has been found. In the performance art such as dramas of those times male actors played the part of the women. This was the universal plight of the women kind throughout the world. As consequence, women everywhere were rendered mute and tolerant, subservient and secondary. For all that, women were not going to tolerate the injustice for ever. In fact, there were occasional voices against male domination of women. As Patricia Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantly in their book *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory, 1830 to 1930* (1998) contend “until the late 1700s feminist writing survived as a thin but persistent trickle of protest” (488).

As was inevitable for their liberation from the century long suppression, females finally began to raise strong and organized voice suspecting and arguing against all sorts of social constructs and myths that consigned them to a lower-than-human status. The historical movement in the seventeenth Europe called Renaissance paved the way for the Age of Reason or The Enlightenment in the eighteenth century. The philosophy of

utilitarianism and individualism, championed by minds such Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill respectively, underlined the importance each individual and their aspirations. This inspired the women to claim recognition of themselves, of their individuality. This awareness further prompted them to explore their position in the society. No sooner had they begun to explore this issue and found themselves oppressed by men, “feminist writing has become a growing tide of critical work” (Lengermann and Brantley 488). There were several women and even some men who were instrumental to introducing feminism which gained strength as a socio-political movement in time. Some of them are briefly introduced in what follows below.

The publication of Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792 is regarded as the groundbreaking event in the history of feminism. The book presents the portrayal of women in the world of literature authored by men of different times. The central contention of the book is that human mind is impressionable and that women have been forced into believing in their own inferiority and the superiority of men by the representations in literatures and the constant preaching of parents in life. Specially, the sentimental novels which were in vogue at that times become the butt of Wollstonecraft’s attack for spreading pernicious influence on the mentality of the young women. Such sentimental novels, she writes, inspired women to be domiciled, and emotionally blackmailed women to pay more attention to their physical beauty rather than to their spiritual and intellectual growth:

Everything they see or hear serves to fix impressions, calls forth emotions, and associates, ideas that give a sexual character to their mind. False notions of beauty and delicacy stop the growth of their limbs and produce a sickly soreness, rather than delicacy of organs... . This cruel association of ideas, which everything conspires to twist into all their habits of

thinking... (395-6)

Wollstonecraft was also critical of the religion that puts women under the power of men. As her writings point out, women in those times were not free at all regarding the choice of their intellectual exercise, choice of husbands and career in life. They were expected to act and live according to the fancy of the men. As a result, it was not surprising that women had no sense of public responsibility, moral height or intellectual depth:

Females, in fact, denied all political privileges, and not allowed, as married women, excepting in criminal cases, a civil existence, have their attention naturally drawn from the interest of the whole community to that of the minute parts through the private duty of any other members of society must be very imperfectly performed when not connected with the general good. The mighty business of female life is to please... (398)

Though they may seem ordinary today, Wollstonecraft's ideas were quite novel in her own times. Her writings set up the way women should concentrate for their emancipation from the domestic and traditional roles assigned them by the patriarchy.

The next important feminist was Harriet Martineau from America. She emerged as one of the earlier liberal feminists with her demand that women be given the opportunity of education the right to vote for or get elected. Her earlier publications such as *Society in America* (1836) and *How to Observe Morals and Manners* (1838) were works of sociological interest. As Lengermann and Brantley write of her:

Martineau sought to create a science of society that would be systematic, grounded on empirical observation, and accessible to general readership, enabling people to make personal and political decisions guided by a scientific understanding of the principles governing social life. (31)

Martineau advocated for the due minimum political right of the women—the right to vote. She noted in *Society in America* that the four social conditions—slavery, political non-existence of women, among others—were in direct contradiction to one of the founding principles of the American nation, that all are equal in the eyes of God and government. In the America of 1830s, all were not equal excepting the adult, white, land-owning males. Thus, her demand for voting right for women earned her the designation of a liberal feminist.

John Stuart Mill, though a male, advocated that women should be empowered for the development of a society. In his book *The Subjugation of Women* (), he emphasized the importance of education for the advancement of a society. Mill's alignment with the feminist cause was important, for it was evident that women's participation only was not sufficient for bringing about an attitudinal change in the society about women. After being elected as a member of parliament in the 1860s, Mill supported women's suffrage movement, the welfare of the peasants and workers, and the land reform in Ireland. He unequivocally announced that there should be equality of married persons in the eyes of law, for a just society can be founded only among people of equal rights and dignity. For these ideas, he is recognized as one of the forerunning liberal feminists from the male side.

According to radical feminists, ignore the nature and ubiquity of male power. Radical feminism was fully articulated in the late 1960s, and it argues that men's patriarchal power over women is the primary power relationship in human society. Radical feminism blames the exploitation of women on men. Women are seen to be exploited because they undertake free labor for men by carrying out child care and house work, and because they are denied access to position of power. Radical feminist see society as patriarchal – it is dominated and ruled by men. They tend to believe that women

have always been exploited and that only revolutionary can offer the possibility of their liberation.

Some radical feminists as Shulamith Firestone, believe women's oppression originated in their biology, particularly in the fact that they give birth; others do not see biology as so important; they see male rule as largely a product of culture. A particular radical group, female supremacists argue that women are not just equal but are actually morally superior to men they wish to see patriarchy replaced by matriarchy (male rule replaced by female rule). Most radical feminists broadly share the same aim as Marxist and Liberal feminists, they seek equality between the sexes rather than dominance by either.

Liberal feminism claims that because women are rational beings like men, they are entitled to the same legal political rights; liberal feminists have argued and campaigned over the last 300 years for women's right to education, employment, political participation and full legal equality. It concentrates on rights in the public sphere and does not analyse power relationships that may exist within the home and private life; it assumes that the justice of its cause will ensure its success and that men will have no reason to oppose it

Marxist Feminism

Marxist feminism is a sub-type of feminist theory which focuses on the dismantling of capitalism as a way to liberate women. Marxist feminism states that private property, which gives rise to economic inequality, dependence, political confusion and ultimately unhealthy social relations between men and women, is the root of women's oppression in the current social context.

According to Marxist theory, the individual is heavily influenced by the structure of society, which in all modern societies mean a class structure; that is, people's opportunities, wants and interests are seen to be shaped by the mode of production that characterizes the society they inhabit. Marxist feminists see contemporary gender inequality as determined ultimately by the capitalist mode of production. Gender oppression is class oppression and women's subordination is seen as a form of class oppression which is maintained (like racism) because it serves the interests of capital and the ruling class. Marxist feminists have extended traditional Marxist analysis by looking at domestic labour as well as wage work in order to support their position.

Radical Women, a major Marxist-feminist organization, bases its theory on Marx' and Engels' analysis that the enslavement of women was the first building block of an economic system based on private property. They contend that elimination of the capitalist profit-driven economy will remove the motivation for sexism, racism, homophobia and other forms of oppression.

Marxist feminism is a sub type of feminism which sees the oppression of women and seeks its resolution from Marxist point of view. Marxism can be used to help us understand “How economic forces have been manipulated by patriarchal law and customs to keep women economically, politically and socially oppressed as an underclass”(Tyson 93). Marxism which is used to understand the feminist issues, economic, political and

social, is marxist feminism. Thus, one of the primary task of Marxist feminism “is to create the kind of world in which wmen will experience themselves as whole persons, as integrate rather than fragmented of splintered, beings”(tong 45). Gender inequality is production of capitalism and determined by capitalistic mode of production.

In capitalistic system relationship between employer and employee is similar to the and its owner. Capitalist has everything but proletariats have nothing except their labor. This is the wedge for their emancipation. When proletariats come to know that they are exploited, they are not getting proper wage they try to find out where and how they are exploited. Then they revolt against the exploitation imposed upon them. The class consciousness inspires them to revolt against everykind of injustice. They revolt freely because they have nothing to loose but bourgeoisie have everything to loose. Then they establish classless society which is a society of every people. In such society women also get equal chances. Then hierarchy less society emerges. That is the result of class consciousness.

But capitalists, also represent patriarchy, exercise to create false consciousness to establish their empire. They try to hide all kinds of discrimination and injustice. For Marxist feminist gender oppression is class oppression and women’s subordination is seen as a form of class oppression. It believes that women’s situation in the society cannot be understood in isolation from its socio-economic context. As the Marxists see the alienation of labor from work, self, human beings and nature women are also alienated from sex, self, children and from whole surroundings. In capitalism labor is treated as a commodity which can be sold and bought. Capitalism intensifies alienation and generalizes it throughout all level of society. The end of alienation requires communism. So, in the society the end of patriarchal domination requires communism. As the class less society emerges the class discrimination and gender discrimination will

be diminished. Because when the classless society is established, all people become equal and property will be distributed equally to everybody. Then only in such society women get their proper place and equality. In this context, K. K. Ruthven writes;

Marxism identifies capitalism (and the modes of production which support it) as a material base of a class system which is source of all oppression, and holds that the specific subject of women will end necessarily in that general dismissal of oppression which is to follow the destruction of capitalism.(28)

Women are mostly confined in household activities and they are not allowed to go out and work because their strength, skill, ability are take inferior to the males in fact which not real but general assumption. Women are doing household activities without any payment. Their work plays vital role in outside work but they don't get any credit. In fact women enter the productive and important work before than the males of society because they pave the way for outward activities and make base for industry. This is why Tong says;

No women has to enter the productive workforce, for all women are already in it, even if no one recognizes the fact. Women's work is the necessary conditions for all other labor from which, in turn surplus value is extracted. By providing current (and future) workers not only with food and clothes but also with emotional and domestic comfort, women keep the cogs of capitalist machine running. (54)

Therefore, some Marxist feminists ask for the wage for their household activities. They say that from the production of capitalistic factory or from surplus value some amount of money should be given to women. State should pay for housework of women. Tong brings this concept from Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James, who, "proposed that

the state (the government and employers) not individual men (husbands, fathers and boyfriends), pay wage to housewives because capital ultimately profits from women's exploitation". (55) But there are some Marxist feminists who reject the demand of wage for housework. Housework is related to feelings and emotions for them. In her book *The Economic Emergence of Women* Barbara Bergman advocates dislikes for wage of the housework. If women demand wages for housework, "the sexual division of labor would actually ossify" (Tong 56)

Except housework women have to perform their natural works. One of them is childbearing which women's unquestionable task is. But in patriarchal society childcare is also women's essential work. They give birth and bring up the baby but male members do not take it a vital work and if any woman does only child caring in the house she is called workless. But the father or may be so called father takes away the child when he wants. This injustice is in patriarchal society. As Engels says, "women give birth, the mother of any child is always known. However, the identity of the father is never certain because a woman could have been impregnated by a man other than her husband" (Tong 49). Later this child, if male, tries to control mother.

Marxist feminists argue that in class society, rights can benefit only a few middle class women; most women, like most men, will remain oppressed until the capitalist economic system is replaced by communism. Women's liberation is their entry into the paid labor market and their participation in the class struggle; it is only in communist society that the economic dependency that is the basis of women's oppression will disappear, and communal child care and house keeping free them from domestic drudgery and allow them to participate fully in productive life. Such change can not be achieved simply by demanding justice, for they are the product of a particular stage of economic development; sexual equality can not therefore be achieved at will, but only in

specific historical circumstances.

Marxist and socialist feminism do not attribute women's exploitation entirely to men. They see capitalism rather than patriarchy as being the principal source of women's oppression, and the capitalists as the main beneficiaries. They relate women's oppression to the production of wealth. Marxist feminist also place much greater stress on the exploitation of women in the paid employment. The disadvantaged position of women is held to be a consequence of the emergence of the private property and subsequently their lack of ownership of the means of production which in turn deprives them of power. They agree that women as a group are exploited, particularly since the advent of capitalism, they are more sensitive to the difference between women who belongs to the ruling class and proletarian families.

Marxist feminist share with radical feminists, a desire for revolutionary change; they seek the establishment of communist society. A society where the means of production will be commonly owned, they believe gender inequalities will disappear. There is no clear cut division between Marxist and Socialist feminists; they share much in common. Marxist feminists tend to seek more swiping changes than Socialist feminists; while socialist feminists tend to give more credence to the possibility of capitalist societies gradually moving towards female equality.

Compared to male workers, women are less likely to join unions to go on strike or take other forms of militant actions against employers. Even when women join unions, they often find themselves in male dominated organization where according to Barron and Norris, men 'often do not share the interest or outlook of their fellow female unionists'. Some Marxists also believe that women benefit capitalists and the capitalist system in their capacities as mothers and housewives by reproducing labor power at no cost to employers.

However, there has been numerous critique of Marxist feminism. Gayle Rubin, who has written on a certain range of subjects including sadomasochism, prostitution, pornography and lesbian literature as well as anthropological studies and histories of sexual subcultures, first rose to prominence through her 1975 essay "*The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex*", in which she coins the phrase "sex/gender system" and criticizes Marxism for what she claims is its incomplete analysis of sexism under capitalism, without dismissing or dismantling Marxist fundamentals in the process.

Radical feminism, which emerged in the 1970s, also took issue with Marxist feminism. Radical feminist theorists stated that modern society and its constructs (law, religion, politics, art, *etc*) are the product of males and therefore have a patriarchal character. According to those who subscribe to this view, the best solution for women's oppression would be to treat patriarchy not as a subset of capitalism but as a problem in its own right. Thus eliminating women's oppression means eliminating male domination in all its forms. Like most feminists, however, radical feminists believe in replacing such domination with a culture and policy of equality.

Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises argued against the Marxist account of the experience of women. He argued that the women's movement was an evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, step that furthered gains that capitalism had secured for women. He claimed to show that women gained along with the rise of classical liberalism. Under this analysis, the marriage contract was actually a first, albeit imperfect, step toward liberating women from the subservient position they had held since the age of violence.

Proponents of Socialist feminism have also criticized the Marxist interpretation for failing to find an inherent connection between patriarchy and classism.

Heidi Hartmann compares the situation to a marriage in which the husband represents

Marxism, the wife represents Feminism, and it is the husband who has all the power. She says: “The marriage of Marxism and feminism has been like the marriage of husband of wife and wife depicted in this common law; Marxism and feminism are the one that one is Marxism”

In terms of the Marxist theory women appears insignificant: she sits on the sidelines of the grand struggle between capital and labor. Marxism may explain capitalism, but this does not explain patriarchy. Marxism can explain why capitalists exploit workers but not why men exploit women. Michelle Barrett attacks Marxist theories which see capitalism alone benefiting from the exploitation of women. She points out that working class men can benefit from the labor of their wives as well as capitalists.

Hartmann and Barrett accept that Marxism can play an important part in explaining gender inequalities; however they believe that feminism must be fully incorporated into any adequate theory. Both these writers attempt to comment on a marriage between Marxist and Feminist theory. Following radical feminists, Hartmann argues that Patriarchy provides the key to explaining the sexual division of labor. She believes that patriarchy has a ‘material’ base which is not directly related to biological differences to men and women. Men largely deny access for working women to jobs that pay a living wage. They force women into financial dependence on husband and thereby control the labor of women in their capacities as mothers and housewives. Because of men’s dominance within the family they also control women’s bodies and sexuality; women who are married become almost their husband’s property. She ensures that capitalism and patriarchy are very closely connected, termed as ‘intertwined’ but she does not believe that the interests of men as a group and capitalist as a group are identical. For example, ruling class men may benefit from increasing numbers of women entering the labor force,

where as working class men may prefer their wives to stay at home to perform personal services for them.

Hartmann accepts that the increasing participation of women in work today has made them slightly less depended on men. There are more opportunities for women to become independent. She claims ‘women’s wages allow every few women to support themselves independently and adequately’.

In *Women’s Oppression Today*, as a Marxist, Michelle Barrett believes that it is necessary to go beyond Marxism in order to explain women’s oppression. Like Hartmann she sees the origin of women’s oppression today as lying in the 19th century, and she argues that a coalition of men and capitalist led to women being excluded from work and being forced to take on a primarily domestic role. In this process women’s oppression became lodged in what she calls the family-household system.

In 20th century, the family-household system became an entrenched part of capitalism. Although there is no inevitable reason why capitalism needs women to do the unpaid household, the capitalist class do benefit politically from this division of labor. According to Barrett, the working class is divided by the family-household system; husbands and wives, men and women, fight each other instead of uniting to fight capitalism.

Engles says, “To secure their wives marital fidelity, men supposedly seek to impose an institution of compulsory monogamy on women” (tong 49). If any woman goes to other man, she is called prostitute and socially outcaste. She should be careful while meeting other males. But in man’s case it is different. Patriarchal society does not seek such strict marital fidelity from males simply because in family males’ condition is similar to the condition of the capitalists in society. As workers are commodity in capitalistic economic system, women are commodity in family because of influence of

capitalistic social system. As Engles says, “If wives are to be emancipated from their husband, women must first become economically independent of men” (tong 49). For that dismantling of capitalistic economic system is needed where exploitation of labor is working very strongly. By this reason women are suffering from the adjective like weak, passive, emotional in patriarchal society.

Women are treated as commodity in capitalistic society. They see freedom but can not experience it. In family their voices do not get any place where her husbands, boyfriends, fathers and other male members are dictators. Their relatives, supposed nearest persons try to impose their desire upon women. Therefore, they feel alienated from nature and surroundings. Working class women are more suppressed than the higher or bourgeoisie class women because working class women are treated badly by the higher class women and working class men also try to manipulate working class women according to their will, but bourgeoisie women suffer only from the male members of their own class.

Marxist feminists find similarities between male/female in the family and bourgeoisie/proletariat in society. Husband, father or male member in the family is like bourgeoisie in the society and wife in a family is like a proletariat in society. It does not mean that women are suffering only within family but family itself is initiating point women domination. Women are being exploited in the society on the basis of patriarchal norms and values which are constructions of economic power position. Women are the victims of men’s control and “men’s control of women is rooted in the fact that he, not she, controls the property, the oppression of women will cease only with the dissolution of institution of private property” (tong 49). Women are unable to practice their freedom and desire. Their needs and feelings are condemned to be suppressed because property is in the patriarchy which believes that there is no desire of women different men’s. Therefore, women are being exploited sexually, psychologically, physically etc. The root

cause is such oppression of economic system of the society.

Before marriage and after marriage women become the victim of sexual exploitation. Marxist feminist Catharine Mackinnon compares sex to work, capitalist to man, worker to women, commodity to sex/women, capitalist accumulation to male sexual desire etc. there is no place for women's sexual desire in the society. If a husband or boyfriend wants to have sexual relation than that is desire of wife/girlfriend also. Tong brings the concept of Marx and Engles and see, "marriage as a form of prostitution, Engles implicitly accepted that the services that can be prostituted are not limited to sexual service. Childcare and emotional support are also services sold by the prostitute wife" (Tong 64). Therefore, in patriarchal society husband wife relationship is like "pimp-prostitute" relation, which is similar to the bourgeoisie-proletariat or employer-employee relationship. When women venture to walk away from home, and in their own way, they are labelled whores, dangerous to the prestige of the family. But, if they comply with the social norms, they are termed ladies, the properly behaved, loving mothers and obedient wives and useful servants. The economy of male oppression on women thus takes on Marxist and feminist insights to expose the subtlety of the oppression.

CHAPTER:THREE

Charm and Innocence

Charming and Innocent: Patriarchal Idea of Femininity

In a patriarchal world order, it is the men who are the pathfinders, the explorers into terra incognita, and the adventurers. The role of the 'actant', the subject, the doer, the achiever, is always exclusively conferred on the male of the female/male divide.

Unsurprisingly, Henry James as an author, being born and brought up in the nineteenth century puritanical America, espouses ideas that conform to the conservative mode of thinking. Or at least, reading of his novel under discussion in this paper gives that impression. Suffice it to note here, at the beginning of this section, that the novel seems to uphold what one can reasonably argue, masculist, patriarchal ideologies in its view regarding male female roles and relationship. This is inferred by the simple fact in the plot of the novel that, Daisy Miller, who dares to travel abroad and develops some sort of liaison with another young expatriate American, is led to her untimely and ignominious death.

As it is not unusual to read in text by male writers with a patriarchal mindset, the novella also stars a male flirt, if not exactly lover, Winterbourne. He takes on the role of the active observer, of connoisseur of beauty, both of nature and of Daisy. Early on, the novella gives a description of him as one who is staying in Geneva with the purpose of advancing amorous relationship with a lady senior to him in age. And the very verb used to describe his work there is "study". He thus occupies the position of a subject, he studies objects or ideas or people.

He was some seven-and-twenty years of age; when his friends spoke of him, they usually said that he was at Geneva "studying." . . . What I should say is, simply, that when certain persons spoke of him they

affirmed that the reason of his spending so much time at Geneva was that he was extremely devoted to a lady who lived there--a foreign lady--a person older than himself. (2)

In this course of staying in Geneva as an expatriate American for studying whether university course or some woman, he gets the opportunity of making an acquaintance of Daisy Miller. His reactions to her are of interest to this paper because they provide veritable grounds for a feminist critique of the text. Winterbourne's idea of femininity is in accord with the traditional mode of thought: women are to appear beautiful, shy and modest. That is why though he is attracted positively by her appearance, he finds it somewhat odd that she is so nonchalant, undisturbed even in the presence of an unacquainted youth.

Winterbourne, who has lived in Geneva most of his life, is both charmed and mystified by Daisy, who seems to him wonderfully spontaneous, if a little unrefined:

This pretty American girl, however, on hearing Winterbourne's observation, simply glanced at him; she then turned her head and looked over the parapet, at the lake and the opposite mountains. He wondered whether he had gone too far, but he decided that he must advance farther, rather than retreat. (5)

After Randolph paves way for him to make an acquaintance with Daisy by introducing his sister, Winterbourne feels sort of obliged to talk to her. But at first he thinks it may be counted as an act of impropriety to thus talk to a stranger lady, he is encouraged when he observes that she is the least disturbed or perturbed by his presence. Daisy takes or rather seems to take little attention, let alone offence, at his presence:

The young lady inspected her flounces and smoothed her ribbons again; and Winterbourne presently risked an observation upon the beauty of the

view. He was ceasing to be embarrassed, for he had begun to perceive that she was not in the least embarrassed herself. There had not been the slightest alteration in her charming complexion; she was evidently neither offended nor flattered. (6)

Winterbourne has never heard of a well-brought-up young lady carrying on in this way. Daisy chats freely about herself and her personal life and boasts about her abundance of “gentlemen friends.” He feels he has lived so long in Europe that he has lost any sense of the way Americans express themselves. He wonders if all girls from the state of New York are like this or whether Daisy is a calculating seductress, trying to lure him into an act of impropriety that might obligate him to marry her. However, she seems too unsophisticated to have designs on him. He decides she is simply a harmless American flirt and feels relieved to have hit on a way of categorizing her.

This need for being able to name, categorize and therefore understand and consequently control and handle women is at the heart of the patriarchal scheme of things. Women are to be clearly grasped and manipulated. But when the male kind cannot do that, they term women a mystery, as some erratic beings whom even God cannot understand, whose motives therefore are beyond the comprehension of mere mortals like men. This is the mode of thinking expressed in Winterbourne’s observation and understanding of Daisy, and his is a typical mode representative of the majority of men.

If she looked another way when he spoke to her, and seemed not particularly to hear him, this was simply her habit, her manner. Yet, as he talked a little more and pointed out some of the objects of interest in the view, with which she appeared quite unacquainted, she gradually gave him more of the benefit of her glance; and then he saw that this glance

was perfectly direct and unshrinking. (6)

This very observation, though done through the eyes of Winterbourne, is actually done by the narrator of the novella who again is none else than the novelist. Here, the sense is being imparted that Daisy at first seems to be modest, not looking directly at the young man, not seeing him in the eyes, and thus maintaining her modesty. But soon she is described as not so modest, she looks at him to give him the benefit of the knowledge that she is no coy girl, that she is no hesitant feminine soul. Thus, within minutes Winterbourne gets two impressions of her: one the one hand she appears an innocent American girl; on the other she seems to be a tricky coquette whose modesty and innocence is in fact an acted out or feigned one.

The contrast between the open, even rude behavior of Randolph is set in contrast with that of his sister. If Randolph represents “the ugly American,” Daisy may represent the innocent, unworldly America. Like America, she is the beneficiary of a newly created wealth that she displays with more liberality than taste. She is frank, open, uncomplicated, and hopelessly provincial. She thinks the social whirlwind of Schenectady, New York, represents high society and that Europe is “perfectly sweet” but consists entirely of hotels. Daisy has no social graces, such as tact or an ability to pick up signals. She natters on thoughtlessly about whatever is on her mind, happy to entertain a complete stranger with details of her family's personal habits and idiosyncrasies. The sum total of her character and behaviour in the short time is designed to support the patriarchal notion that women are unpredictable, that they are mysterious beings.

Female beauty, physical beauty, is meant for men to behold, so to speak. Since women are denied any intellectual, moral nobility and height, they have only their physical attraction and beauty at their disposal to impress their male counterparts. The narrator of the novel underline the same line of thought when the novel records daisy's

beauty positively impressing Winterbourne. Her is a sample of how Winterbourne appreciated her eyes etc:

They were wonderfully pretty eyes; and, indeed, Winterbourne had not seen for a long time anything prettier than his fair countrywoman's various features--her complexion, her nose, her ears, her teeth. He had a great relish for feminine beauty; he was addicted to observing and analyzing it; and as regards this young lady's face he made several observations. (6)

Winterbourne thinks that Daisy lacks a finish in her mannerism, though she is charming. This seeming lack of finish in her allows him to doubt she is a coquette.

He thought it very possible that Master Randolph's sister was a coquette; he was sure she had a spirit of her own; but in her bright, sweet, superficial little visage there was no mockery, no irony. Before long it became obvious that she was much disposed toward conversation. (6)

In the course of their conversations, she tells him that they are going to Rome for the winter. She asks him if he is a "real American"; to her he seems more like a German.

Anyway, their conversation grows intimate, with daisy informing him of their intention of passing the winter in Rome. Next day, Winterbourne takes her to visit architectural grandeurs of the city. And daisy sort of takes the word from him that he would visit her in Rome. Incidentally, his aunt too is visiting Rome, so Winterbourne is happy to agree.

So, when he visits his aunt Mrs. Costello in Rome, he asks how the Millers are doing there. In particular, Daisy's habit of catching the fancy of a young man and flirting with him openly has scandalized the society there. Mrs. Costello informs her nephew of the shocking news:

Everything that is not done here. Flirting with any man she could pick up;

sitting in corners with mysterious Italians; dancing all the evening with the same partners; receiving visits at eleven o'clock at night. Her mother goes away when visitors come. (41)

For Winterbourne, flirting in itself is not so bad as long as it is done under cover, and, with somebody of social standing and respectability. He says something tantamount to this when he confronts Daisy after knowing and seeing her affairs with a well-groomed Italian young man named Giovanelli. But Daisy answers back with the unabashed retort that, yes, she is a dreadful flirt:

"I am afraid your habits are those of a flirt," said Winterbourne gravely.

"Of course they are," she cried, giving him her little smiling stare again.

"I'm a fearful, frightful flirt! Did you ever hear of a nice girl that was not?"

But I suppose you will tell me now that I am not a nice girl."

"You're a very nice girl; but I wish you would flirt with me, and me only," said Winterbourne. (45)

The rumour of Daisy's unseemly behaviours get around the city soon. The so called sophisticated circles now exclude her from their circle for her flamboyant disrespect of respectability. The likes of Mrs. Costello and Mrs. Walker shut their door for Daisy. Winterbourne comes to know and realize the possible effect of this social ostracism, boycott, against the Millers, so he tries to caution her as best as he can, but in vain. The novel records:

They ceased to invite her; and they intimated that they desired to express to observant Europeans the great truth that, though Miss Daisy Miller was a young American lady, her behavior was not representative-- was regarded by her compatriots as abnormal. (51 -52)

Daisy has violated the idea and ideal of feminine beauty and modesty. She should have

kept within the bounds of outward respectability. When Winterbourne conveys this concern, she declares her engagement with the Italian in one breath, and denounces it in the next:

Since you have mentioned it," she said, "I AM engaged."

Winterbourne looked at her; he had stopped laughing. "You don't believe!" she added.

He was silent a moment; and then, "Yes, I believe it," he said.

"Oh, no, you don't!" she answered. "Well, then--I am not!

(54)

Thus she baffles him, tantalizes him, suspends him and finally disappoints him both by her choosing to engage with Italian and also by getting untimely death due to the Roman fever or malaria as she so carelessly visits the St Peter's cathedral late in the evening. Before she suffers from the fatal disease, Winterbourne comes to the conclusion that he had been a fool to invest so much time, energy and affection over such a cheap character as Daisy. She is hopelessly below the par, below the social status that can match his own. The night, after seeing Daisy with Giovanelli in the Coliseum, he is visited by a sort of epiphany. He realizes that a gentleman like him need not care about such a flirtatious girl:

Winterbourne stopped, with a sort of horror, and, it must be added, with a sort of relief. It was as if a sudden illumination had been flashed upon the ambiguity of Daisy's behavior, and the riddle had become easy to read.

She was a young lady whom a gentleman need no longer be at pains to respect. (55)

He feels angry with himself that he had bothered so much about the right way of regarding Miss Daisy Miller. She does not deserve that much study, care and affection.

After all, she is a social deviant, and it is right punishment for her to be neglected by gentleman like him. In these last observations, Winterbourne is actually working as a stand-in, a representative of the moral judgment of the novelist in particular and of the society in general. Daisy does not quite fit in to the society, therefore her early exit from it by death is the only proper ending of the novel. In a way, the novel thus speaks a warning against all women who dare defy social rules and values.

Good Women Bad Women

The desire to see women both praised and criticized for the same qualities by sometimes counting the same trait as virtue and at other time as a vice is deeply rooted in male psyche. Winterbourne is happy that Daisy is not so modest as to be alarmed of his amorous advances; but he often cynically critical and judgemental of her for the same frankness in her. Daisy, in the very first and brief encounter tells many things related to her, her circle, family, tastes etc. One such reference is about her being acquainted with a great number of societies or intimate circles back in America. She even speaks of her gentlemen callers back home:

Last winter I had seventeen dinners given me; and three of them were by gentlemen," added Daisy Miller. "I have more friends in New York than in Schenectady-- more gentleman friends; and more young lady friends too," she resumed in a moment. She paused again for an instant; she was looking at Winterbourne with all her prettiness in her lively eyes and in her light, slightly monotonous smile. "I have always had," she said, "a great deal of gentlemen's society. (9)

Poor Winterbourne is amused, perplexed, and decidedly charmed. He had never yet heard a young girl express herself in just this fashion; never, at least, save in cases where to say such things seemed a kind of demonstrative evidence of a certain laxity of

deportment. Of her charm and beauty, he has no doubt. But her character, looseness in her character is what he doubts. Yet, this possibly loose character in her encourages him to play a flirt with her. He is no less impose himself. As is already noted, he has been staying in Geneva, in the hope of getting his admiration of a certain lady requited. He is thus double-sealing in his relations. But of this aspect the novel makes no more mention so as to raise question about his motives, about the infatuated facet of his affair.

Winterbourne is sort of confused about Daisy's behaviour; she escapes his clean categorization of innocent and corrupt character. Daisy is too lively, vivacious, and lovely to be termed a cool, calculating mischief, as a corrupted person. But neither is she so innocent and easy for him to understand.

Certainly she was very charming, but how deucedly sociable! Was she simply a pretty girl from New York State? Were they all like that, the pretty girls who had a good deal of gentlemen's society? Or was she also a designing, an audacious, an unscrupulous young person? (9)

The confusion lingers till the end of the novella, and the life of Daisy itself.

Winterbourne goes to Rome after some months. His aunt has been there several weeks earlier and sends him letters informing him about the movements of the Millers, noting that the courier is still very intimate with the family and Daisy is rather intimate with several "third-rate Italians." Mrs. Costello asks him to bring her the novel, *Paule Méré*: One of the themes of James's work, concerning the incongruity between reality and appearance, becomes apparent during the second part of the novella. The first substantial example of this incongruity results during the letter from Mrs. Costello informing her nephew of the scandalous behavior of his acquaintance, Daisy Miller. Her tone is rather sarcastic, focusing again on the intimacy of the courier with the family because she understands his intimacy as a symbol of the family's vulgarity. At the end of

the letter however, she asks Winterbourne to bring her a novel of Cherbuliez, *Paule Mère*:

Those people you were so devoted to last summer at Vevey have turned up here, courier and all," she wrote. "They seem to have made several acquaintances, but the courier continues to be the most intimate. The young lady, however, is also very intimate with some third-rate Italians, with whom she rackets about in a way that makes much talk. Bring me that pretty novel of Cherbuliez's--Paule Mère-- and don't come later than the 23rd. (29)

This novel is purposely chosen by James in order to illustrate Mrs. Costello's own ignorance of the situation concerning Daisy. In the novel, published in 1865, the heroine is innocent but has her reputation destroyed by the gossiping Genevan society. The hero loves her and tries to ignore the gossip but it finally ruins their relationship. The parallel to Daisy Miller is meaningful, and is definitely intended by James to be understood by the reader as irony. The reality of the character of Daisy was overlooked by Mrs. Costello who can comprehend the novel *Paule Mère* as being "pretty" but cannot see the reality which lay beneath the text.

Winterbourne visits her the first week of the month of January. He expects to pay a visit to Miss Daisy after their acquaintance at Vevey, but his aunt says that case is hopeless because the Millers are "hopelessly vulgar": "Whether or no being hopelessly vulgar is being 'bad' is a question for the metaphysicians. They are bad enough to dislike, at any rate; and for this short life that is quite enough" (29).

By making this observation against the fact of her interest in the novel which was actually published in Switzerland and its theme was gossip, James holds Miss Costello up to ridiculous. The same person who is so uncompromising against vulgarity and

impropriety as to refuse a meeting with Daisy now wants to read a novel based on the theme of gossip. This all is an assault on her integrity and character. In fact, by making this point, the novel only substantiates the patriarchal idea that women are dishonest, hypocrite, who say one thing and do something else.

This idea of subtext is a metaphor for the manner in which the European-American social circle in Europe misunderstands the true character of Daisy Miller. She is innocent and uncultured and incautious but the circle sees only the surface of her character and the actions that character takes. They imagine a member of their social circle, thus someone with the experience and knowledge to understand and exaggerate the mores and codes of the European culture, acting in the way that Daisy Miller does. They do not take the time to look beneath this pretense to find that she is naturally innocent, acting on impulse instead of caution and convention. She rebels not by having a great knowledge of the rules which bind the society and consciously deciding to throw them out the window, but by being limited in her scope of experience and by refusing to change her natural ways in order to please a culture to which she does not belong. She oversteps even these bounds but not in the manner for which she will be ridiculed and rejected by her compatriots.

The insensitivity of women is once again underlined in the meeting between Winterbourne, and Daisy and Mrs. Miller, at the party given by one Mrs. Walker, an acquaintance of Winterbourne from Geneva. There Winterbourne asks Mrs. Miller how she enjoyed Rome to which she replies that it had not pleased her like other cities, such as Zürich. However, she informs him, Daisy dearly enjoyed the society and had made many gentleman friends. After chatting for a while, Daisy, who had been talking to Mrs. Walker, turns to Winterbourne and reprimands him for being mean and for leaving Vevey. Winterbourne thinks to himself that Daisy should have realized the sacrifice he

made by not stopping in the intellectual centers of Florence and Bologna on his way to Rome. He came directly to see her after visiting his aunt, and now Daisy scolds him. He remembered that a cynical compatriot had once told him that the pretty American women were at once the most exacting in the world and the least endowed with a sense of indebtedness. The text records the confrontation in this way:

Why, you were awfully mean at Vevey," said Daisy. "You wouldn't do anything. You wouldn't stay there when I asked you.

"My dearest young lady," cried Winterbourne, with eloquence, "have I come all the way to Rome to encounter your reproaches?" (33)

She obviously has missed the man and is very excited to see him but he must remain properly reserved and so does not relay to Daisy the quickness with which he traveled to Rome. The text states, "...Winterbourne was rather annoyed at Miss Miller's want of appreciation of the zeal of an admirer who on his way down to Rome had stopped neither at Bologna nor at Florence..." some critics have noted that if Winterbourne had told Daisy that he had traveled to Rome in impatience and that he hoped she was anxiously awaiting him, the events which unfolded between them likely could have been very different. Yet, as Winterbourne often expresses his doubts and feelings to himself or perhaps the outside ear of his aunt, Daisy knows very little of how he feels. As a result she believes he feels very little, calling him "stiff" and "quaint." He is overly proper in her eyes and little more. Thus is really hard to please, very exacting, taxing on others. Daisy next tells Mrs. Walker than she would like to invite a friend to her party. Mrs. Walker says that any family friend is fine but Mrs. Miller corrected her, noting that she did not know the gentleman. Daisy tells them that it is Mr. Giovanelli: an Italian, an "intimate friend", and the handsomest man in the world, besides Mr. Winterbourne. To quote how excited she is about the young Italian:

He's an Italian," Daisy pursued with the prettiest serenity. "He's a great friend of mine; he's the handsomest man in the world-- except Mr. Winterbourne! He knows plenty of Italians, but he wants to know some Americans. He thinks ever so much of Americans. He's tremendously clever. He's perfectly lovely! (33)

This reference to the insensitivity to daisy is once more intended as a disparaging episode to the women race. How could daisy be so rude as to invite in the party someone whom nobody else knows beside herself? Surely, she must be an idiosyncratic creature.

As Daisy and Winterbourne speak at Mrs. Walker's party, Winterbourne attempts to designate her by type to understand why she confuses him but he misses the message which results. First Winterbourne tries to compare her to a young lady of Italy to which Daisy responds that she is happy to not have to conform to their stricter idea of convention. He then tells her she is a flirt but Daisy surprises him and agrees. She says:

I am afraid your habits are those of a flirt," said Winterbourne gravely.

"Of course they are," she cried, giving him her little smiling stare again.

"I'm a fearful, frightful flirt! Did you ever hear of a nice girl that was not?"

But I suppose you will tell me now that I am not a nice girl."

"You're a very nice girl; but I wish you would flirt with me, and me only,"

said Winterbourne. (45)

Daisy, in her way, is explaining to Winterbourne that her intentions are completely innocent and that she is living by the morals of American youth. She is quite aware of what she is doing and nothing lies beneath the surface. And yet Winterbourne cannot accept this and ventures that young unmarried women should not act in that manner in Italy. Daisy rightly compares this notion to old married women acting as flirts, twisting Winterbourne's words. This argumentative sparring does little but try to assign categories

which Daisy defies and obscure the concern for Daisy which Winterbourne really feels. He finally offends her because he does not understand that she is only flirting. By implying that she and Giovanelli are in love, Winterbourne has expanded and distorted their relationship to a point which Daisy finds uncouth but which baffles Winterbourne. He can only reply "mentally that little American flirts were the queerest creatures in the world," again employing types.

The cynicism and condescension which describe Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Costello's manner toward Daisy and her type is well typified in a comment made by Mrs. Costello. She retorts, "Of that young lady's, Miss Baker's, Miss Chandler's - what's her name? - Miss Miller's intrigue with that little barber's block." As Patricia Crick notes, Mrs. Costello most likely had no problem remembering Daisy's last name but was mocking her social origins by putting her in the category of last names which symbolize, like her own, industry and trade. Also, the act of not being able to recall Daisy's name demonstrates Daisy's lack of significance to Mrs. Costello and her circle. She is solely a type to the group, not an individual to be concerned about. Mrs. Costello's great hypocrisy, and the hypocrisy of her type, is described soon after this comment as she sits with her circle of haughty Americans abroad and gossips during the St. Peter's vespers service. At a moment which should be solemn if she were religious or respectful, she and her friends are self-involved and rude. Ironically, they gossip about Daisy's crude manners as they commit an uncivilized act of their own.

Daisy defies the male attempt to neatly put women in two categories as bad or good. If the women obey the males, abide by the patriarchal norm and values, they are praised as good, good mothers, Madonna, angels etc. but if they do not conform to the patriarchal norms, they are termed as praying mantis, evil seductress, dangerous coquettes and flirts. Winterbourne is intrigued by daisy as he cannot categorize her neatly into either of these

categories.

He asked himself whether Daisy's defiance came from the consciousness of innocence, or from her being, essentially, a young person of the reckless class. It must be admitted that holding one's self to a belief in Daisy's "innocence" came to seem to Winterbourne more and more a matter of fine-spun gallantry. As I have already had occasion to relate, he was angry at finding himself reduced to chopping logic about this young lady; he was vexed at his want of instinctive certitude as to how far her eccentricities were generic, national, and how far they were personal.

From either view of them he had somehow missed her, and now it was too late. (52)

Daisy's innocence comes to a bad end not because she knowingly disregards convention but because she steps too far beyond rules of physical safety and caution. She is reckless not only with her morals but with her health and wellbeing. There are several subtle references to Daisy's innate innocence. Meanwhile the reader is faced with Winterbourne's interior monologues debating Daisy's character and ultimately deciding that she does not deserve his respect. Mrs. Costello comments, "[Daisy] goes from day to day, from hour to hour, as they did in the Golden Age. I can imagine nothing more vulgar" (50). While Mrs. Costello refers to vulgarity, James alludes to innocence. Rousseau believed that natural man's innocence and purity was destroyed by the rigid rules of formalized civil society. By referring to the Golden Age, the reader is reminded of the philosophic notions of nature's ruin at the hands of civilization. Thus James is likely implying subtextually that Daisy's position in a sort of Golden Age is a state of innocence and goodness, not something to be insulted or ridiculed as Mrs. Costello is doing. This foreshadows the remark Giovanelli will make to Winterbourne at the end of

the chapter, declaring that Daisy was the "most innocent" (60) and ultimately proving to Winterbourne that he had mistaken the girl by adding too much of his own "civilized" judgment to her persona. Another important reference to Daisy's innocence comes in mentioning the Velazquez painting of Pope Innocent X. A likely reason that James chose this painting to have Winterbourne's friend comment upon directly before noting that he saw Daisy inside the gallery is to associate the name of the Pope with Daisy's character. Thus a male mind understands a woman in terms of the good/bad, innocent/corrupt dichotomy. But Daisy makes him a failure in understanding her that simple way.

Class Concern: Capitalist Mindset

There are certain periods in history which serve as great cultural watersheds -- eras in which the normal conventions and expectations of society are in flux, as the entire society moves from one type of culture to another. In the novella *Daisy Miller*, Henry James shows how during the late Victorian era, a newly-affluent moneyed middle class began moving into social territory formerly considered the sole province of aristocracy. But the move was by no means welcome to for the aristocracy which thought it to be the sole custodian of the values and proprieties of the traditional hierarchical societies.

As Marx propounded, the division in society is based on the difference between economic statuses which serves as the base structure. Those with little or no or less possession of the means and fruits of production are oppressed, dominated, mocked by the moneyed class. The same happens in the novella as well.

The novella opens by describing the ambiance of the European hotels frequented by American and English tourists at the turn of the century. Of course, before the rise of a middle class wealthy enough to afford such vacations, the clientele of hotels such as the one at Vevey had been exclusively aristocratic. However, the incursion of "common" people into this social setting has already had an effect.

The entrance of the common, or middle class people in the tourism industry and the hotels as clients, creates the scene of contact and often conflict between the members of the two classes: the aristocracy and the middle class. In the novella, Daisy and her family, as well as Giovaneli represent the middle class whereas Frederick Winterbourne, his aunt Mrs. Costello, and Mrs. Walker represent the aristocracy. Actually, Winterbourne's affair with Daisy did not get the opportunity of being tested whether it would come true or not because of the class distinction between the two families.

During their first short meeting, Daisy announces her desire to visit a local tourist attraction, the famous Chillon Castle, across Lake Geneva, and Winterbourne finds himself in the shocking but rather pleasant position of being expected to take her there, alone and unchaperoned. He is still more shocked when the Millers' courier, Eugenio, arrives to call the young Millers in to lunch. Daisy addresses Eugenio as an equal and informs him of her plan to go to Chillon with Winterbourne.

Eugenio responds in a tone of ironic disapproval that Winterbourne finds impertinent. He also gives Winterbourne a knowing look that seems to imply that Daisy is in the habit of picking up strange men. As a guarantee of his honorable intentions and general respectability, though more for the benefit of the courier than for Daisy, who seems to have no idea what is going on, Winterbourne promises to introduce Daisy to his aunt.

Winterbourne's aunt the aristocrat widow Mrs. Costello is too class-conscious to allow an audience to Daisy when Winterbourne seeks her permission to take her in their apartment. When asked if she knows whom he is talking about, she says, "Oh yes, I have observed them. Seen them--heard them--and kept out of their way" (13). In her view they are too low, too common in their status to be befriended, to be entertained as acquaintances:

They are very common," Mrs. Costello declared. "They are the sort of Americans that one does one's duty by not--not accepting."

"Ah, you don't accept them?" said the young man.

"I can't, my dear Frederick. I would if I could, but I can't."

"The young girl is very pretty," said Winterbourne in a moment.

"Of course she's pretty. But she is very common. (13-14)

Mrs Costello is overtly class conscious. So she tries her best to dissuade Winterbourne from advancing any emotional attachment or affair or whatever with Daisy.

Mrs. Costello does not like the way the Millers mix with the common people like their courier. In her view, such servant level people are not to be entertained the way the Millers do. In the same context she makes such remarks about Mrs. Miller and Eugenio, the courier:

Oh, the mother is just as bad! They treat the courier like a familiar friend-- like a gentleman. I shouldn't wonder if he dines with them. Very likely they have never seen a man with such good manners, such fine clothes, so like a gentleman. He probably corresponds to the young lady's idea of a count. He sits with them in the garden in the evening. I think he smokes.

(14)

In her opinion it is the sign of lack of taste and culture in the Millers that they treat their steward as a member of the family. But her classism itself is held up to ridicule when one closely examines her rudeness to simple people. If Mrs. Costello is so refined, why is it that she often falls victim of headache? She is a captive of narrow classism without having any taste of classical, noble thinking and capacity for love, beauty and compassion. Her wealth has not earned her mental and physical health. She is in deed poorer than the Millers who have a good familial bond and love, and who can even

respect the people lower than themselves in social status. Daisy truly represents the sympathetic humane spirit by treating Eugeno as a gentleman, not as a courier or servant or attendant.

This is a sort of oblique critique on the part of the novelist-narrator as a man with class-consciousness himself. In fact, by making the ladies dislike each other because of their status differences, the novelist has given expression to his own psyche:

Winterbourne meditated a moment. "They are very ignorant-- very innocent only. Depend upon it they are not bad."

"They are hopelessly vulgar," said Mrs. Costello. "Whether or no being hopelessly vulgar is being 'bad' is a question for the metaphysicians. They are bad enough to dislike, at any rate; and for this short life that is quite enough. (29)

She was accustomed to claiming that she would have made quite an impression upon the world if it had not been for her headaches. Her three sons rarely visited her in contrast to the attention shown to her by her nephew Winterbourne who felt it one's duty to respect one's aunt. She thought highly of Winterbourne. Her circles were very exclusive as she thought necessary for a wealthy woman of New York. Her tone intimated to Winterbourne that Daisy Miller was one of lower social status.

Mrs. Costello's character symbolizes old money and culture, even though she is American, and thus sets up a stark contrast to Daisy Miller, a character devoid of much ritual or formality. Mrs. Costello had lived much of her life in Europe and had kept a society so intentionally exclusive in America that she has separated herself from any of the qualities associated with the innocence and natural spontaneity of an American. Her reaction to Daisy's character then is not a surprise. She responds to Winterbourne's inquiry quickly with disgust and gives reasons which represent the affront felt by most

Europeans when in contact with the Millers. Daisy's family is one of commonality and crudeness which Mrs. Costello proves by pointing to their intimacy with Eugenio, their courier. As Mrs. Costello points to the way in which the Millers allow Eugenio to have such an intimate control over their lives, her insight provides us with another perspective on how to view the previous encounter. Eugenio is not only a contrast to Daisy but a condemnation of her.

Mrs. Costello is a woman who also sets up a contrast to Daisy and gives the reader the rigid formality of her viewpoint because of her relationship to Winterbourne. She does not come into contact with Daisy but knows her type. Since Winterbourne is willing to listen to his aunt and gives some credence to her observations, the reader can explore both the ways that Daisy may be overstepping her behavioral bounds and how Winterbourne is prejudiced against Daisy because of the rules of his society. For example, upon the mention of Mrs. Costello's granddaughters, whom Winterbourne had heard were tremendous flirts, Winterbourne immediately assumes that Daisy must be worse than they are instead of thinking that his cousins may be just as bad. Moreover, once Mrs. Costello tells Winterbourne about Eugenio's intimacy with Daisy, Winterbourne's mind has been influenced. The text reads, "Winterbourne listened with interest to these disclosures; they helped him to make up his mind about Miss Daisy. Evidently she was rather wild." Mrs. Costello also shows her disapproval and quickness to judge with the syntax employed and the language she uses. For instance, her devotion to a code of social behavior is expressed in the repetitiveness of her negative language. A good example of her negativity concerning Daisy, in addition to James's stress on category, is reflected in this statement, "They are the sort of Americans that one does one's duty by not -- not accepting."

James writes of Mrs. Costello's background that she is from New York,

paralleling to some extent Daisy' background, to further allow for comparison between the two woman. Whereas Daisy does not believe that she should act differently in Europe than in Schenectady, Mrs. Costello's behavior is always refined and reserved. Still, James hints to the reader that she is not a character to be admired when he explains that her sons never come to visit her and that she "frequently intimated that, if she were not so dreadfully liable to sick-headaches, she probably would have left a deeper impression upon her time." James's tone here is sarcastic; he implies that her headaches are often used as an excuse, foreshadowing the excuse Winterbourne will try to give Daisy for his aunt not wanting to see her. Mrs. Costello's intimation also alerts the reader to her artifice, the pretense of her character which causes her to invent reasons why she is not as important as she believes she should be.

Mrs. Miller provides an even greater contrast to Mrs. Costello as they symbolize the maternal in terms of social custom in America and Europe. Daisy tells Winterbourne how her mother is timid and does not like to meet her gentleman friends. This is peculiar because most mothers, of propriety, would require their daughters to introduce them to any friends with whom they wished to keep company. If they were not properly introduced to any potential friends, their daughters would be kept away. Thus we observe how Mrs. Miller seems to condone her daughter's flighty behavior by not making any move to change it. When Winterbourne and Daisy do approach Mrs. Miller she is not surprised to see her daughter in the company of a strange man. She nonchalantly talks with Daisy about Randolph's refusal to go to bed. Her acquiescence to allow Randolph to refuse bed because he likes to talk with waiters is weak. She lacks the control over her child that a European mother would likely insist on having. Her treatment of Randolph parallels her behavior toward Daisy.

The reclusive and uncompromising Mrs. Costello represents the snobbish voice of

high society, and the fact that Winterbourne takes her opinions to heart casts him in an unflattering light. Mrs. Costello is a shallow, self-important woman whose own children seem to have as little to do with her as possible, though Winterbourne seems quite willing to spend much of his time with her. He takes seriously her assessment of Daisy and her family and defends Daisy only feebly, characterizing her as “completely uncultivated” but “wonderfully pretty.” He tries to prove what a “nice” girl he thinks Daisy is by telling Mrs. Costello he plans to take her to the castle at Chillon, but Mrs. Costello finds the fact that Daisy agreed to the trip so soon after meeting him very troubling. She raises the question of whether Daisy is actually as nice as Winterbourne thinks she is. At the heart of Mrs. Costello's suspicion is the extremely European idea that Daisy might be an adventuress—a sort of social hustler whose whole object is to trick Winterbourne into compromising her and therefore obligating him to marry her. Such women actually existed, and indeed, Winterbourne has encountered them in Europe before. However, Winterbourne suspects Daisy of this maneuver almost too easily, which calls his judgment into question.

Mrs. Costello objects to the Millers and mocks their pretensions for two reasons: first, since Mr. Miller made (his money rather than inheriting) it, the Millers represent “new money,” and second, they are vulgar. The Millers *are* vulgar, especially Daisy. She tells Winterbourne about having grilled the hotel chambermaid about his aunt (which is a vulgar thing to do) let alone admit to Winterbourne. Daisy's speech habits are a clue that James intends us to regard her critically. She talks endlessly and monotonously about herself, with frequent recourse to expressions such as the phrase “ever so” that undereducated Americans thought were “refined.” Daisy seems to regard every thought that runs through her mind worth expressing, which is an extraordinary kind of egotism. Daisy is also silly and vapid, and even the atmosphere of the castle at Chillon, with its

historic and literary associations, fails to distract Daisy from the business of flirting. Her focus remains trapped in the trivial and personal, her own and Winterbourne's "tastes, habits, and intentions." Daisy's almost inflexible approach to conversation seems to be a symptom of her larger inability to adapt to her surroundings. She fails to wisely evaluate her situation and society, the novel tells the reader in these terms:

She was not disappointed--not a bit. Perhaps it was because she had heard so much about it before. She had ever so many intimate friends that had been there ever so many times. And then she had had ever so many dresses and things from Paris. Whenever she put on a Paris dress she felt as if she were in Europe. (9)

Winterbourne remarks during their conversation that she, "It was a kind of a wishing cap for her to get dresses which reminded her of Europe, Daisy goes on talking about having seen and enjoyed societies:

The only thing I don't like, "she proceeded," is the society. There isn't any society; or, if there is, I don't know where it keeps itself. Do you? I suppose there is some society somewhere, but I haven't seen anything of it (I'm very fond of society, and I have always had a great deal of it. I don't mean only in Schenectady, but in New York. I used to go to New York every winter. In New York I had lots of society. (9)

Winterbourne has undoubtedly encountered people who live outside the bonds of polite society, but never anyone who deliberately chooses to rebel against it, and thus he mistakes Daisy's flouting of convention for mere social gaffes. In this way, it can also be argued that Winterbourne misunderstands himself. He thinks he is open, minded in accepting Daisy into his set; he does not understand the extent to which he represents the old guard, the dying order from which Daisy is completely apart. He also has no idea of

the extent to which he perceives Daisy only through that other's eyes. He believes that she was too light and childish, too uncultivated and unreasoning, too provincial, to have reflected upon her ostracism or even to have perceived. But his perception is in direct conflict with Daisy's perceptive realization that his aunt did not want to meet her, and why. It is all because his aunt has the false consciousness that she is from a higher class while the Millers are from a lower social stratum; they are at least upstarts, even though they are rich.

But most significantly of all, Winterbourne's contact with Daisy, which had the capacity to be a life-transforming experience for him, did not have any lasting effect on his social relations or his place in society. The end of the novella finds him back in Geneva, pursuing exactly the same lifestyle in which he was engaged before he met her. Daisy's rejection of social convention and her wholehearted embrace of life could have liberated Winterbourne, but it did not, because he never understood what it was all about. However, there were many families like the Millers at the turn of the century, just as there were many families like the Winterbournes, and as time passed the aristocracy of heritage inexorably fell before the onslaught of the aristocracy of money. The seeming lack of propriety in the Millers ultimately caused their downfall, as Daisy relentlessly went on doing queer and unpalatable things to shock the so-called civilized society.

Two factors, class and gender, came into play to cause the disaster in the life of Daisy. If she had abided by the gender roles or if she had kept the decorum demanded by her class, she would not have suffered the fate that she suffered. But by showing her undeserved suffering at the hands of fate, the novella has implicitly sided with the prevalent mode of thinking. Yet, Daisy commands the attention of honest readers, and thus by defying the patriarchal prescriptions and class-conscious mannerisms, has carved for herself a niche in world literature.

CHAPTER: FOUR

Sacrifice of Innocence

Some good works of literature are based on not so good an ending of their central characters. The tragic end of the characters before comes the very reason for the lingering effect of some works. It is true in the case of the novel *Daisy Miller* too. Very little about Daisy is charming, yet Winterbourne is charmed, partly because her chatter represents a novelty and partly because she is inordinately pretty and Winterbourne considers himself a connoisseur of feminine beauty. His inability to read and understand Daisy makes him uneasy.

Winterbourne is a man who likes being able to classify and categorize people, and he doesn't know how to classify Daisy. He spends the rest of the novel trying to figure out where to place her in the scheme of what he knows and understands.

Daisy's friendship with and her subsequent infatuation with a passionate but impoverished Italian, bring to life the great Jamesian themes of Americans abroad, innocence versus experience, the grip of fate, and feminine idiosyncrasy. This story emphasizes an upper-class expatriate's efforts to understand and deal with a charming, independent but uninformed heroine who a strong challenge to conservative manners. In the end the story's emphasis is not so much on social portraiture as on the tragic effects of class distinction. When Winterbourne learns that Daisy is after all completely innocent, he understands his serious mistake in going along with the other Americans who blackmail her.

Like the ancient Roman spectators in the Colosseum, Winterbourne has participated in a human sacrifice. While Winterbourne worries over the morality of the young American woman, it is his own behaviour that constitutes immorality. He is committing an unpardonable sin in his overly intellectualized searching out of the moral fault of

another.

In the novel James shows the readers how Daisy, a young American girl, lives outside the social guidelines of the upper class in the 1800's. Daisy travels through in Europe with her family when she meets an American man, Winterbourne. They had known each other for only four days when Daisy asks Winterbourne to come visit her in Italy, however, when he does, her friendship with a young Italian, Mr. Giovanelli, makes Winterbourne realize that she was a flirt. Her manipulation of men is one of the themes of the novel; she is punished for trying to control men, as patriarchal society would. She is punished this time undeservedly, as she catches malaria and dies in Rome.

Daisy Miller is merely a misunderstood young woman living in the wrong period and in the wrong society, and is therefore innocent. Explained why the author opted for such a tragic end for Daisy, the writer seems to be trying to teach readers that those who don't follow the rules of society come to a bad end because they don't have the capability to survive in such society. It is warning from the patriarchal viewpoint to women to abide by the social rules and conventions. But Daisy knowingly defies that all and risks her personal prestige, as well as life, and loses her life prematurely.

One understands how the central observing consciousness controls the telling of the story because the reader is privy so frequently to the subjective flow of consciousness experienced by the hero, Winterbourne. Daisy, on the other hand, expresses her feelings and thoughts readily to her acquaintances but we know little of the motivation behind anything because we hear more about her than from her. The reader, along with Winterbourne, has to decide for herself -- consistent with the tone of subjectivity and partially obstructed truth with which James likes to play -- if Daisy is innocent or designing. In the manner of the circles of analysis, where Daisy's character is explored in a circular motion from many different viewpoints, the reader observes the girl as an

injured friend in Mrs. Walker's room and then seemingly as a rebellious coquette as she moves through the cathedral with two men. But a woman's revolt against patriarchal mores and values are punished both by the society and likely also by the divine powers, because she is not made for disobedience but for obedience. Thus, by siding with this line of thought, the novel happens to espouse patriarchal values neglecting individual freedom and wants. The imposed patriarchal values don't hint any way and space for freedom and free thinking of women. Eventhough Daisy tries her best to recorrect the traditional values, shes gets no success. Finally, Daisy acts as a girl of loose character to challenges patriarchal values and norms that if nothing is amended in the patriarchal mores many Daisies will be born in America and the social situation will go beyond control.

Works Cited

- Beauvoir, Simone de. "The Second Sex." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Adams, Hazard. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc, 1992.
- Bernardo, Karen. Henry James' .Daisy Miller. <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?>
Boston, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1980.
- Matthiessen, F. O. and Kenneth Murdock Eds. *The Notebooks of Henry James*. New York: Routledge, 1981.
- Freedman, Jane. *Feminism*. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Ltd, 1999.
- Henry James. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_James#column-one#column-one.
- James, Henry. *Daisy Miller and other stories*. London: Wordsworth Classic, 1994.
- Kennedy, Meegan. "Daisy Miller: A Study". <http://litmed.med.nyu.edu/User?action=view_annotator&id=39>.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, and Niebrugge-Brantley. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory, 1830 to 1930*. London: McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1998.
- Mellen, Joan. *Women and Their Sexuality in the New Film*. London: Davis- Poynter Ltd.1975.
- Ruth, Sheila. *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*. Boston Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, 1998.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own*. London: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. 2004.
- Tolan, Fiona. "Feminisms". *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh US, Oxford University Press, 2006

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User –Friendly Guide*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1999.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. “A Vindication of the Rights of Women.” *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc, 1992.