

Toward Greater Clarity: Saul Bellow's Revisions in *Mosby's Memoirs and Other Stories*

Takuya Handa*

Saul Bellow's short story collection *Mosby's Memoirs and Other Stories* (1968) is worth close analysis mainly because the stories vary in theme and show us different aspect of our lives. As Peter Hyland points out, while in none of this volume's three earlier stories is the protagonist "allowed the opportunity to reassess or reshape his experience through memory," the three later stories allow the protagonist to have such an opportunity through "an act of memory" (18). In this paper I would like to discuss the themes of each story, particularly comparing the current version of the book with the version when the stories were first published in magazines. The following is the list of each story's first publication in magazines and journals.

"Leaving the Yellow House"	<i>Esquire</i> , 49 (January 1958)
"The Old System"	<i>Playboy</i> (January 1967)
"Looking for Mr. Green"	<i>Commentary</i> (March 1951)
"The Gonzaga Manuscripts"	<i>Discovery</i> , 4 (1954)
"A Father-to-Be"	<i>New Yorker</i> (5 February 1955)

* Professor, Faculty of Humanities, Fukuoka University

“Mosby’s Memoirs”

New Yorker (20 July 1968)

The following shows the number of Bellow’s revisions for each story, the first number being the total number of revisions, the second number the revisions involving a change of word(s) or phrase(s), the third number the revisions that do not involve a change of word(s), i.e. revisions related to grammatical correction, punctuation, etc.

“Leaving the Yellow House”	187	131	56
“The Old System”	105	71	34
“Looking for Mr. Green”	114	69	45
“The Gonzaga Manuscripts”	119	69	50
“A Father-to-Be”	6	0	6
“Mosby’s Memoirs”	32	1	31
Total	563	341	222

The table shows that revisions that involve word represent approximately 60% of the total, consisting of 341 word changes in *Mosby’s Memoirs and Other Stories*. Strictly speaking, however, these figures may change more or less according to the way we count each revision. Here I have counted the revisions in accordance with the reasons for their change. For example, when we have a revision of word(s) that indicates a delicate or major change in meaning and also have a revision of punctuation in the same sentence, I counted two revisions. But, I counted one revision when it appears that Bellow intended to emphasize a certain point in rewriting a few phrases in one sentence. So the reader is requested to take these figures as approximate.

When comparing the two versions, I will refer to previous works that treat Bellow's revisions whenever possible, namely Daniel Fuchs' *Saul Bellow: Vision and Revision* (1984) and Marianne M. Friedrich's *Character and Narration in the Short Fiction of Saul Bellow* (1995). The former is an extensive research into Bellow's manuscripts, mostly kept at the Department of Special Collections at the Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago. But Fuchs does not compare the different versions of the six stories after their first publication in magazines or journals; here is one significant gap that the current paper will fill. Friedrich offers a reading of "Looking for Mr. Green" mostly based on the comparison between the two versions, but the current paper will examine her assertions from a new angle.

In chronological order I will discuss the three earlier stories in section I and the three later stories in section II.

I

"Looking for Mr. Green" describes a day's experience of the protagonist George Grebe, who has found work delivering municipal relief checks to the needy. A thirty-five-year-old native Chicagoan and once an "instructor in classical languages" (95) at a college, Grebe is happy now that he has any job to do during the Great Depression. He is assigned to deliver checks in the black neighborhood in Chicago, but is eager about the job—Grebe "wanted to do well, simply for doing-well's sake, to acquit himself decently of a job" (86). But he is realizing the difficulty of the job because the clients are hard to find and neighbors "don't like to give information about anybody" (87). No one tells him the whereabouts of Tulliver Green, a check recipient. After several encoun-

ters with the neighbors in the black district, Grebe finally finds the name “Green” below a broken mailbox. He exultantly rings the bell, but is only confronted by an “entirely naked” woman who is drunk and spews obscenities (presumably) at a sexual partner she has just left upstairs. At first Grebe hesitates to hand her the check but finally gives in and has her sign without confirming that the presumptive person upstairs is Tulliver Green. “Though she might not be Mrs. Green, he was convinced that Mr. Green was upstairs. Whoever she was, the woman stood for Green.” The story ends with the sentence: “And though the self-ridicule was slow to diminish, and his face still blazed with it, he had, nevertheless, a feeling of elation, too. ‘For after all,’ he said, ‘he *could* be found!’” (109)

Many critics agree that the story deals with the protagonist’s quest for the self or reality, but critical opinions vary greatly, particularly about the implications of the ending. Irving Malin argues that “his expedition symbolizes, in effect, his quest for the real soul” (41). Keith Michael Opdahl argues that Grebe’s “search is transformed by his imagination into a quest for the final reality behind man’s temporary creations,” but that his quest is rather unsuccessful (101–03). Robert F. Kiernan also sees this story as “a quest story of familiar kind” and argues that “Grebe’s apparent finding of Mr. Green’s abode and the story terminating in a withheld vision are penultima in the mystical questing—a concluding on the threshold of illumination” (122). And Marianne M. Friedrich analyzes this story against the background of the “classic, archetypal” quest. She argues that when we view the story as a variant of the archetypal quest pattern, both parallels and differences in the character conception may be recognized, and that the denial of Grebe’s quest on the realistic plane is the result of this character conception. She maintains that although the ending con-

notes the negative outcome on the realistic plane, one would expect “a positive ending in the sense of an archetypical elevation” (48–50).

Such a variety of readings, it seems, stems largely from the author’s frequent reference to Grebe’s thoughts on “appearances and realities” or “agreement.” This idea is first introduced in the conversation between Grebe and Raynor, his supervisor. Teasing Grebe about his academic background, Raynor says, “I’ll tell you, as a man of culture, that even though nothing looks to be real, and everything stands for something else, and that thing for another thing, and that thing for a still further one—there ain’t any comparison between twenty-five and thirty-seven dollars a week, regardless of the last reality.” (Underlinings are mine throughout this paper.) Grebe responds, “Do you think my mistake was so terrible?” and Raynor answers, “Damn right it was terrible Were you brought up tenderly, with permission to go and find out what were the last things that everything else stands for while everybody else labored in the fallen world of appearances?” After meeting Winston Field, one of the recipients, who cautiously shows all the documents to verify his identity, Grebe reflects on the question of appearances and realities :

Objects once so new, so concrete that it could never have occurred to anyone they stood for other things, had crumbled. Therefore, reflected Grebe, the secret of them was out. It was that they stood for themselves by agreement, and were natural and not unnatural by agreement, and when the things themselves collapsed the agreement became visible. . . . But in Chicago, where the cycles were so fast and the familiar died out, and again rose changed, and died again in thirty years, you saw the common agreement or covenant, and you were forced to think about appearances and re-

alities. (104–05)

Grebe then cites, as an example, the EI in Chicago: “People consented to pay dimes and ride the crash-box cars, and so it was a success.” In the final scene, Grebe wanted to ask the black woman “But are you Mrs. Green?” But it was too late because she was already climbing the stairs with the check. Grebe thinks, “Whoever she was, the woman stood for Green, whom he was not to see this time” (109). Thus it seems that Grebe’s philosophical thought leads to his conviction that the presumable person upstairs must be Mr. Green. It looks as if Bellow is smiling with irony at Grebe’s judgment, although he sympathizes with the protagonist throughout the story.

Regarding the ambiguity of the final scene, Marianne Friedrich makes the following observations :

Interestingly, such a positive ending to Grebe’s at least intimated archetypal quest was indeed originally intended by Bellow, perhaps as an epiphany. This is clearly evident in the early version in *Commentary*: “[a] moment came, illuminated from the greatest height when you could not refuse to yield a check, a municipal check, and therefore his worry stung him only superficially” (*Commentary* 261). Bellow, however, dropped the passage “illuminated from the greatest height” and the obviously positive outcome in the early version in favor of a greater ambiguity in the final revision. (50)

The passage she is referring to is written in *Commentary* as follows :

But she was already climbing the stairs with the check, and it was too late, if he had made an error, if he was now in trouble, to undo the thing. However, a moment came, illuminated from the greatest height when you could not refuse to yield a check, a municipal check, and therefore his worry stung him only superficially.

Bellow replaced the underlined part with the sentence “But he wasn’t going to worry about it” (109), and Friedrich points out the writer’s move toward a greater ambiguity. I think Friedrich is right because the replaced sentence suggests an epiphany for Grebe, indorsing Bellow’s intention to emphasize Grebe’s conviction. But what does this move to a greater ambiguity mean ultimately? Maybe it does not affect the implication of the ending; rather “he wasn’t going to worry about it” is a more realistic expression and therefore may possibly enhance the persuasiveness of the passage.

Friedrich also argues about the changes in the final sentence of the story, which in *Commentary* goes: “And though the self-ridicule was slow to diminish, and his face, throat and chest, arms, his whole body blazed with it, he had, nevertheless, a reason for elation, too. ‘For after all,’ he said, ‘I did get to him’ (261). In contrast, the *Mosby’s Memoirs* version reads: “And though the self-ridicule was slow to diminish, and his face still blazed with it, he had, nevertheless, a feeling of elation, too. ‘For after all,’ he said, ‘he could be found!’ (107).

Friedrich thinks that Bellow considers Grebe’s “self-ridicule” less important, since he eliminates the phrase “throat and chest, arms, his whole body,” and I think the same way. Only I would like to add that the addition of “still” in the final version might counterbalance the decreased self-ridicule. Also Friedrich, mentioning the change from “reason” to “feeling,” argues that it “shows

how important it was for Bellow to convey Grebe's ghetto experience as a 'blind shock,' a sudden intrusion of the irrational in the person of the Negress" (50). I agree with her opinion. Friedrich is also correct when she argues that the change of Grebe's last utterance from "I *did get* to him" to "he *could* be found!" contributes to a greater ambiguity of the final scene. I would like to add here that the word "find" is better suited for Grebe whose quest for Mr. Green has a philosophical aspect of searching the ultimate truth or reality.

What about the other revisions not mentioned in Friedrich's book? The following comparisons are to review the wide range of Bellow's revision, with which I hope to understand his tendency when he revises a story.

There are a few revisions related to the description of Grebe. When Mrs. Staika makes "great noise" (97), for example, Grebe in *Commentary* "pressed himself forward to get a nearer view of the woman" (256). Bellow revised it to "Grebe and Raynor worked themselves forward to get a closer view of the woman" (98). Here Raynor, too, is eager to see her more closely. However, the change of verb from "press" to "work" may be more significant because pressing sounds more feverish and less conscious than working through, while working sounds more like they are somewhat under self-control and more conscious of using strategy to approach her. We can say that Bellow intends to defend the protagonist, excluding a negative element. As to the change from "nearer" to "closer," the closer relationship between Staika and Grebe is possibly what Bellow wants to hint at. A similar example can be seen in the scene where Grebe is admitted to enter a room: "Even though he was met with smiles and good will, he felt that all the currents ran against him and that he would make no headway. Without having spoken a single word he knew that he was already outweighed and overborne" (*Commentary* 253). The corre-

sponding part of the final version is “Even though he was met with smiles and good will, he knew, before a single word was spoken, that all the currents ran against him and that he would make no headway” (91). Here Bellow seems to avoid the verb “feel” because feeling is a more intuitive and emotional way of perceiving things than thinking. Maybe Bellow in the final version wanted to describe Grebe as less self-absorbed or less likely to feel sorry for himself. More importantly, the deletion of “he was already outweighed and overborne” suggests Bellow’s avoidance of negative description of Grebe, cutting down on Grebe’s feeling sorry for himself. The other revisions of character description include the word change from negative “effrontery” to positive “courage” in the sentence “Though smaller, though slight, he was his own man, he retracted nothing about himself, and he looked back at them, gray-eyed, with amusement and also with a sort of effrontery” (*Commentary* 254). Since “effrontery” means “shameless or impudent boldness” and “courage” means “bravery,” here also Bellow seems to defend Grebe, avoiding giving him a negative character trait.

Bellow’s revision extends to Grebe’s philosophical thoughts about appearances and realities. As is already mentioned, Grebe reflects on this question after the meeting with Winston Field and cites the case of the El in Chicago for further reflection. The following is the comparison between the two versions, the revised parts underlined.

People consenting to pay dimes and ride the crash-box car, it was a success. Yet, how absurd it looked; how little real to start with. And yet Yerkes, the great financier who built it, had known that he could get people to agree to its reality. (*Commentary* 259–60)

People consented to pay dimes and ride the crash-box cars, and so it was a success. Yet how absurd it looked ; how little reality there was to start with. And yet Yerkes, the great financier who built it, had known that he could get people to agree to do it. (105)

In the revision, the first sentence becomes clearer and stronger in its meaning because the cause and effect is indicated with “so.” The “how little real to start with” might also possibly be read as “it looked how little real to start with.” But the new expression “how little reality there was to start with” can exclude this possibility, making its meaning clearer and stronger. The phrase “agree to its reality” with its abstract expression becomes concrete by altering it to “do it.” By and large these revisions help contribute to the clarification and reinforcement of the theme Grebe gives thoughts to.

Related to this scene is the one where Grebe remembers the interview with his supervisor Raynor. Bellow wrote in *Commentary*, “He remembered Raynor and he smiled ; that was a clever boy—. Once you saw that a great many things became intelligible” (259). But he rewrote it to “(He remembered Raynor and he smiled. Raynor was a clever boy.) Once you had grasped this, a great many things became intelligible” (105). The change from “that” to “Raynor” shortens the distance between Grebe and Raynor, and the change from “that” to “this” also decreases the distance between the two people.

Bellow seems to grow particularly cautious when writing the ending. The most shocking scene for Grebe, the quester, is his encounter with the drunken woman in the final scene because it reveals the realities of life to him. The two versions go as follows :

And then he saw that she was not only shoeless but naked ; she was entirely naked, blundering down and talking to herself, a heavy woman, naked and drunk. The contact of her breasts on his coat made him go back against the door with a blind, rousing shock. (*Commentary* 261)

And then he saw that she was not only shoeless but naked ; she was entirely naked, climbing down while she talked to herself, a heavy woman, naked and drunk. She blundered into him. The contact of her breasts, though they touched only his coat, made him go back against the door with a blind shock. (107)

Commentary's "blundering down and talking" is rewritten to "climbing down" plus a new sentence "She blundered into him." The new sentence, with its short punchy style, stresses the woman's action, fortifying the shock Grebe receives. The change from the phrase "on his coat" to the clause "though they touched only his coat" emphasizes the lightness of the touch. The deletion of "rousing" suggests that Bellow is downplaying the arousal or sexual side of Grebe's reaction to intensify Grebe's shock.

When Grebe says, "I've got a check for Tulliver Green," and the woman puts out her hand, he reacts in *Commentary* : "No, no, for *Mister* [*sic*] Green. He's got to sign,' he said ridiculously" (261). But Bellow rewrote it to "No, no, for *Mr.* Green. He's got to sign,' he said" (108). Bellow's deletion of the adverb "ridiculously" suggests his intention to shorten the distance between Grebe and himself. This may be one of the author's efforts to exclude negative elements from Grebe. Grebe's successive thinking in *Commentary* goes : "What should he do now? Why, he should go. He should turn and go. He could not talk to

this woman. He could not keep her standing naked in the cold. However, he could not go. He could not acknowledge that what he had found was too much for him” (261). Bellow revised this to “What should he do now? Grebe asked himself. Why, he should go. He should turn away and go. He couldn’t talk to this woman. He couldn’t keep her standing naked in the cold. But when he tried he found himself unable to turn away” (108). Here Bellow removes “was too much for him” presumably to exclude negative description of Grebe, showing the author’s fundamental movement from detachment to sympathy.

It is true that the ending of the final version is more ambiguous and open-ended than that of *Commentary*’s, but it’s not the issue of finding Mr. Green or not so much as the issue of Grebe’s overall characterization, which seems clearer and more positive in the final version. We can say, therefore, that the whole look at Bellow’s revisions reveals that he moves to more realistic description and greater clarity.

In “The Gonzaga Manuscripts,” Bellow depicts the protagonist Clarence Feiler’s “quest” from quite a different perspective than that of “Looking for Mr. Green.” The story begins with a scene that describes the protagonist arriving in Madrid. Clarence was deeply impressed with the poems by a Spanish poet named Manuel Gonzaga in graduate school. He felt that “I was in touch with a poet who could show me how to go on, and what attitude to take toward life” (113). In California where he now lives, he heard from a Spanish republican refugee that there are many poems by Gonzaga somewhere in Madrid; the refugee showed Clarence letters to one of Gonzaga’s nephews from a man named Guzmán del Nido, Gonzaga’s friend and literary executor, that admits he once had the poems but gave them to the Countess del Camino since most of them were love poems addressed to her. So Clarence is in Madrid “to re-

cover this inspired Spaniard's poems," which is "not to perform an act of cultural piety but to do a decent and necessary thing, namely, bring the testimony of a great man before the world" (114). After many encounters and hardships, Clarence seems about to get the manuscripts, but ironically it finally turns out to be shares of "a pitchblende mine in Morocco" (140). Of course, pitchblende has uranium in it, and uranium is used in atomic bombs. The year 1954 when this story was originally published in *Discovery* was the one when the U.S.A. conducted the world's first hydrogen bomb test in Bikini Atoll, and we can see Bellow's concern at that time.

In the introductory section, Clarence is introduced to a hefty British lady named Miss Walsh, with whom he has a quarrel over the weather change due, according to her, to the atomic bomb. She says, "The weather has never been normal since the atom thing started. Nobody can tell what this radioactive stuff is doing" (117). Clarence also meets Miss Ungar, an art history student, from whom he is going to obtain pesetas in the black market. She is "young and unusually attractive," and Clarence is "greatly taken with her" (119). In the first conversation with her, Clarence extensively reveals the purpose of his visit and his view of literature. Clarence then meets Guzmán del Nido, in whom Clarence feels disappointed because he has no interest in poetry: "Guzmán del Nido was indifferent, indifferent, indifferent!" (129). But he informs Clarence that he handed Gonzaga's love poems to the Countess del Camino, that the deceased countess had a secretary named Polvo who died a few years ago, and that the old man's nephews live in Alcalá de Henares, Cervantes' birthplace. Clarence visits there and meets the two nephews of Don Francisco Polvo (and their wives and daughters), but they prove to be "a family of laughers." Don Luis Polvo, one of the nephews, is called "the Englishman" by others because

“he had lived in London for several months twenty years ago” (131). Here too, Clarence is satirized and has to endure. The climax of his humiliation is when Don Luis aims the musket and shouts, “*La bomba atómica! Puum!*” (132). To which the women “shrieked, swiveling their fans, and his brother fell on his behind in the sanded path, weeping with laughter” (133). The terrier *Duglas* gets excited and Don Luis throws a stick and cries, “Fetch, fetch, *Duglas! La bomba atómica! La bomba atómica!*” Clarence thinks frantically, “The punishment he had to take trying to salvage those poems!” (133). However, Don Luis informs Clarence that the poems “probably went to my cousin Pedro Álvarez-Polvo who lives in Segovia” and “works for the *Banco Español*.” Clarence arrives in Segovia but this Álvarez-Polvo turns out to be a ruined “chaser” (139). What he finally draws from his pocket was mining stock, and Clarence knows from him that the countess “had the poems buried with her” (141). Back in his hotel room, Clarence finds his valise has been searched by the police. He shouts to the manager, and a man rises from a chair in the lobby and says with fury, “These Englishmen!” As the train leaves the mountain, rain begins to fall, and the story ends with the sentence “He knew what to expect from that redheaded Miss Walsh at dinner” (142).

As shown above, the story satirizes the self-proclaimed scholar’s search for what he thinks to be the most valuable. This is endorsed by a letter sent by Bellow to Professor Yozo Tokunaga, Japanese translator of *Mosby’s Memoirs*, in which Bellow wrote, “I was making fun of the cultural earnestness or solemnity of American students” (Date 105). But the critics differ greatly in their reading of the story. Robert F. Kiernan, for example, argues that “The Gonzaga Manuscripts” is the story “of an American buffoon just educated enough and just rich enough to loose himself upon postwar Spain in fancied service to mankind”

(128). Kiernan also argues that “Feiler’s admiration for the poet Manuel Gonzaga makes his quest for the manuscripts almost a parody of Grebe’s quest in ‘Looking for Mr. Green’” and that “it is symptomatic of the difference between the two protagonists that the word *quest* occurs only to Feiler” (127), implying that Feiler’s quest is superficial and unrealistic. On the other hand, Robert R. Dutton argues that here Bellow depicts “the innocent, idealistic American clashing with European culture,” and that “Clarence joins a list of Bellowian [*sic*] characters who desperately try to use art to solve their own problems of relevancy or as a messianic instrument with which to instruct the world” (170–71). Dutton’s list of characters includes Herzog, Mr. Sammler, Humboldt and Charlie Citrine. John Jacob Clayton argues, from somewhat a different angle, that although Gonzaga’s work has given Clarence “new faith in life, in the common life, in communication between persons,” the scholar finds “communication is mis-communication.” He goes on to argue that the burial of Gonzaga’s poems “represents the burial of those high hopes for man that the poet, and the scholar [Clarence], and Bellow held” (13), and that it also “symbolizes the death of European culture,” for “the Spanish have no time for their past culture” and they are “more interested in atomic warfare than in poems” (14). Why are there such a wide variety of interpretations in reading the story?

The primary cause of the difference, it seems, is that Clarence is endowed with virtues by the author; he is innocent and honest, and the motive for his search for the dead poet’s poems is pure and genuine. To use Daniel Fuchs’ words, throughout the story “no one can seem to understand the simplicity, the purity, of Feiler’s motives” (292). Early in the story, Bellow writes that “he was really enthusiastic about Gonzaga” and yet “he did not realize these impulses were religious” (114). It is true that Bellow satirizes his quest, but he is also in

some ways sympathetic toward him. These ambivalent feelings are reflected even in Gonzaga's poem itself.

These few bits of calcium my teeth are,
And these few ohms my brain is,
May make you think I am nothing but puny.
Let me tell you, sir,
I am like any creature—
A creature.

No wonder there are two ways of response to this poem. For Kiernan, the poem is "ludicrous" (127). For Daniel Fuchs, "Gonzaga is feeling in its purest form" and "del Nido is the denial of the purity" (294).

Fuchs points out some of the interesting changes Bellow has made from his original manuscripts. Fuchs argues that the story is "taken essentially from discarded drafts of *Augie March*, and that Bellow transformed Augie, who assumes a serious political character, to the nonpolitical scholar Feiler. In manuscript, del Nido is a rich Falangist sympathetic to the Committee of Europe and runs counter to Augie's challenge to the times, but in the story "Feiler's frame of reference is literary." Fuchs goes on to argue that "an attack on Freud and psychology by the English spinster [Miss Walsh] is dropped," and Feiler "speaks for the most precarious of causes, individual humanity" (292–93). Bellow also changed the figure of Miss Unger. In manuscript she is "a ceramics student, less intellectual, more flirtatious, who complains about how slow life in Madrid has become without Manolete [Spanish bullfighter, 1917–47]." Fuchs argues that Miss Unger's role in the new version is to "serve as a sounding

board for Feiler's insights and admirations [for Gonzaga]" (293). Fuchs thus emphasizes that in the story Bellow gives us "a portrait of debilitated Spain" and the ultimate insult is to "symbolize America by the atomic bomb" (295). These discussions of Fuchs' are very useful in that they show us Bellow's shift from politics to literature. However, Fuchs pays no attention to the difference between the *Discovery* version and *Mosby's Memoir* version.

The comparison shows, for one thing, Bellow's efforts to render more accurate and therefore more realistic description. Here are a few cases in which the underlined parts are Bellow's later additions. Miss Walsh tells Clarence of American Congressmen whose pants were stolen: "You do have Congressmen, though. Two of those had their pants stolen while taking a nap on the Barcelona Express. They had hung their pants up because of the heat. The thieves reached into the compartment from the roof and pinched them" (116; *Discovery* 19). Later when Clarence sees a black hearse with mourners two times, Álvarez-Polvo sets his minds at rest, saying "The hearse was broken all week. It has just been repaired. A week's dead to bury" (136; *Discovery* 40). These additions help explain the situations. A typical example of Bellow's revision toward greater clarification is seen in the scene where he describes the figure of Álvarez-Polvo. The *Discovery's* sentence "However, his brown, mottled, sunlit face with kinky gray hair escaping from the beret seemed to declare that he had a soul like a drum" (40) has become "His face, brown, mottled, sunlit, was edged with kinky gray hair escaping from the beret" and "His belly was like a drum, and he seemed also to have a drumlike soul" (137). The *Discovery's* sentence is unclear mainly because of the irrelevancy of "his face" and "declare," whereas the divided sentences are clear in their meaning because each verb matches well with its subject. Bellow's clarification is also seen in the

phrasal change in the sentence “Clarence at once sensed that del Nido would make him [Clarence] look foolish if he could, with his irony and his fine Spanish manners” (125). In *Discovery*, this was “Clarence at once sensed that he would make him look foolish if he could, through the irony of his very fine complete manners” (28). The “he” in that clause was vague and “irony of his very fine complete manners” was somewhat abstract. Bellow’s clarification sometimes leads to the enhancement of irony. A case in point is the scene in which Don Luis Polvo, seized by fun-making mood, performs the manual-of-arms: “With a Napoleonic musket, full of mockery, he performed the manual-of-arms to uproarious laughter” (132). In *Discovery*, “mockery” was “self-mockery” (36), the latter sounding milder because his mockery is basically directed to Lon Luis himself. Bellow carefully chooses a new word to make his description natural. Clarence says to Álvarez-Polvo, “What do I want with pitchblende?” to which he answers, “What any businessman would want” (140). His answer in *Discovery* was “What any sensible man would want” (43). Earlier, Clarence tells Miss Ungar about the Spanish police searching his room, and the art student responds, “But what difference does it really make, as long as you don’t do anything terribly illegal?” (131; *Discovery* 34). The word “terribly” is Bellow’s new addition to make her utterance natural, for she and Clarence are going to do business illegally in the black market anyway.

More interesting, however, is Bellow’s revision of the story’s ending. Throughout the story, Clarence is irritated by the people who don’t understand the importance of his search but his anger finally explodes when he finds that his valise has been searched. Storming, he slams it shut, drags it down the stairs and into the lobby, where he shouts to the manager, “Why must the police come and turn things upside down?” (141). It seems that, in the latter half

of the story, Bellow intends this scene to be the climax when the protagonist relieves his accumulated anger by shouting. Bellow's revision shows that the author suppresses Clarence's anger until this last moment or tries to portray Clarence as being able to emotionally control himself. When Álvarez-Polvo shows the document and says, "It's a pitchblende mine in Morocco," Clarence says, "What do I want with pitchblende?" (140). In *Discovery*, this sentence was "What in the name of anything do I want with pitchblende! Clarence shouted" (43). In the successive scene, likewise, in *Discovery*, we read: "What have I to do with atom bombs? What do I care about atom bombs! To hell with atom bombs! Clarence cried out, furious" (44). In the final version, Bellow changed "cried" to flat "said" (140) without an adverb. The later version makes us easily imagine Clarence enduring the insult, not furious, quick-tempered Clarence. In the final version, the section's last paragraph reads: "Clarence walked out on him—ran, rather. Panting, enraged, he climbed from the lower town" (141). But in *Discovery*, the protagonist is more upset: "Clarence walked out on him—ran, rather than walked. He had to get out of Segovia. Quickly. Immediately. Panting, enraged, choking, he clambered from the lower town" (44). The deletion of "than walked" may simply avoid the redundancy, but the deletion of the successive sentence and adverbs and "choking" suggests Bellow's intention not to exaggerate the protagonist's short-tempered character.

After the explosion of anger, Clarence regains his composure. Here too, Bellow's revision reveals his intention to protect the protagonist. When the hotel manager says, "You must be mistaken," Clarence responds, "I am not mistaken. They [the police] searched my wastebasket" (141). The underlined sentence is the alteration from the *Discovery* version "Why must police bother foreign visitors?" (45), which, being abstract, fails to give the reader a definite

reason for his rage. The new sentence is concrete and gives the reader an evident reason for the protagonist's explosion of anger. Hearing this exchange of words, a man rise angrily from a chair and says with fury, "These Englishmen!" and Clarence endures. In this scene, Bellow altered the sentences "Clarence couldn't reply. He stared. Then he paid his bill and left" (45) to "There was nothing to say" (142). Especially, Bellow's deletion of "stared" may reveal his feeling that it is not appropriate behavior for Clarence, who has come over to Spain for his supreme purpose. In this way, Bellow seems to defend his protagonist even when he is making fun of him.

"A Father-to-Be" depicts the disturbances of the mind of a thirty-one year-old research chemist named Rogin on a snowy Sunday evening in New York City. He is financially burdened; he is putting his younger brother through college and supporting his mother, "whose annuity isn't quite enough." And Joan, his fiancée, spends his money in extravagant and superfluous ways. On his way to have supper with Joan in her apartment, he falls into "a peculiar state" of mind and thinks, "Money surrounds you as the earth does in death. Superimposition is the universal law. Who is free? No one is free. Who has no burdens? Everyone is under pressure" (145). But what shakes his mind most is the man sitting next to him in the subway, "with whom he now suddenly felt linked through all existence" (150), for he not only looks like Joan's father whom Rogin "detested," he looks like Joan herself. Rogin imagines: "Forty years hence, a son of hers . . . might be like this. A son of hers? Of such a son, he himself, Rogin, would be the father." Rogin is frightened: "We worked toward ends we thought were our own. But no! The whole thing was so unjust. To suffer, to labor, to toil . . . only to become the father of a fourth-rate man of the world like this, so flat-looking with his ordinary, clean, rosy, uninteresting,

self-satisfied, fundamentally bourgeois face. . . . He wouldn't give anyone the time of day. Would this perhaps be general forty years from now?" (151) In her apartment, Rogin is going to say, "Do you think I was born to be taken advantage of and sacrificed? Do you think I'm just a natural resource, like a coal mine, or oil well, or fishery, or the like?" (154) But when Joan begins to wash his hair, pressing "against him from behind, surrounding him, pouring the water gently over him," it seemed to him that "the water came from within him, it was the warm fluid of his own secret loving spirit," and Rogin forgets "the words he had rehearsed" (155).

Kiernan gives an overview of the criticism of this story: "Rogin is commonly seen as one of those masochistic Bellovian protagonists who allow a predacious female access to their souls as well as their wallets. Indeed, Rogin's relationship with Joan seems to some critics an early version of the Herzog-Madeleine relationship." But Kiernan adds rightly that "Such a viewpoint does not consider adequately the parodic tone of the story" (129). More concretely, John J. Clayton argues that Rogin is "like Tommy Wilhelm in his awkward bulk and like Herzog in his masochistic submission to a 'bitch.' In Joan, indeed, we have the first glimpse of Herzog's Madeline—beautiful, with a Roman nose, sociable, aristocratic, money-devouring, man-devouring" (54). Fuchs argues that "the story anticipates the painful weight of *Seize the Day*, and that the story is "one of the clearest statements about the meaning of money" (289). According to Fuchs, the future son sitting next to Rogin is a "precursor of Dr. Adler" and he "incarnates bourgeois narcissism." For Robert R. Dutton, the story "centers on a mystery that engages Bellow throughout his fiction" and that is "the pull of sex and the triumph of sex, against all reason" (171). These criticisms show that, although Bellow is making fun of the central character, he is at the same

time sympathetic to him.

There is no major revision in this story. Worth mentioning, however, is Bellow's dividing the paragraph near the end in which Rogin vents his anger by rehearsing his grievances in his mind. Thus both "that I'm a man is no reason why I should be loaded down. I have a soul in me no bigger or stronger than yours" and "I can't always be the strong one" sounds more powerful in the final version.

Although Rogin finally gives in, the ending may also be interpreted as a victory of love over money, and this theme is one of the central themes that are commonly seen in the early three stories in the collection. Rogin thinks: "To think of money was to think as the world wanted you to think; then you'd never be your own master" (148). Clarence, after hearing from the refugee that rich Guzmán del Nido is "one of these people who think everything has come to an end anyway, and they might as well live comfortably," says, "Money doesn't have to do that to you" (112). And poor Grebe "wanted to do well, simply for doing-well's sake," though, we are told, "nobody expected you to push too hard at a city job" (86).

II

In *Seize the Day* (1956), published between "A Father-to-Be" (1955) and "Leaving the Yellow House" (1957), Bellow described the conflict between a father and a son, with the son protagonist's spiritual death (and possibly his rebirth) suggested. In "Leaving the Yellow House," Bellow takes up the problem of aged people, describing the life of the heroine Hattie Waggoner, born in 1885 and now aged seventy-two (37). The setting is a sparsely populated area

in the California desert called Segoe Desert Lake which is five hundred and some miles to San Francisco and two hundred to Salt Lake City. Bellow skillfully introduces the story's basic situation and atmosphere in the opening paragraph :

The neighbors—there were in all six white people who lived at Segoe Desert Lake—told one another that old Hattie could no longer make it alone. The desert life, even with a forced-air furnace in the house and butane gas brought from town in a truck, was still too difficult for her. There were women even older than Hattie in the county. Twenty miles away was Amy Walters, the gold-miner's widow. But she was a hardier old girl. Every day of the year she took a bath in the icy lake. And Amy was crazy about money and knew how to manage it, as Hattie did not. Hattie was not exactly a drunkard, but she hit the bottle pretty hard, and now she was in trouble and there was a limit to the help she could expect from even the best of neighbors. (3)

Hattie's predicament is triggered by an accident. She has had a few martinis one evening with the Rolfes, the best of her neighbors, and as she is driving home, loses control of her car and stalls it on the local railroad tracks. Hattie seeks help from Darly, an elderly cowboy employed by the Paces, her other neighbors, but the rescue involves an accident. Without doubling the tow chain, Darly begins to pull the pickup and the chain jerks up. Hattie falls and breaks her arm. Hattie has operations twice and recovers, but has an adhesion in her left arm. For Hattie to be unable to drive a car almost means death. Therefore, Hattie ponders over her own death and thinks over whom to be-

queath the yellow house which she inherited some years ago from India, her friend and employer. Since Hattie cannot find any suitable successor even after intensive deliberation, she writes her will to her lawyer: “And so I’ll tell you what, I leave this property, land, house, garden, and water rights, to Hattie Simmons Waggoner. Me!” (42)

Not that Hattie is disliked by her neighbors; “They were fond of her You couldn’t help being fond of Hattie,” Bellow writes. Feeling pain in her arm, Hattie seems to shun the idea of death, as seen in her drawing the comforter away “from contact with her skin.” It belonged to Hattie’s dead friend India, and “she didn’t want it any nearer” (11). But, as the question of how to get along with the rest of life becomes prominent, Hattie decides that “she would have herself moved into India’s bed when it was time to die” (21). Even the lake is described with the imagery of death: “Two thousand feet down in the middle, so deep no corpse could ever be recovered” (25). Hattie sees her own life as though every moment has been filmed, and her fancy is that “when she died she would see the film in the next world” (12). She recalls her young days when she was in Paris—“She knew music. . . . She could read all those notes” (34). She sees her divorced husband James John Waggoner IV who had nothing but an old Philadelphia family. She has “loved him” and “she too had been a snob about her Philadelphia connections.” Hattie recalls cohabitation with Wicks, a cowboy, and weeps for him. She also recalls her years as a hired companion to India. For Hattie who has “a house of her own at last,” leaving it somebody is a difficult decision. She says rebelliously to herself: “*I swear to God I’ll keep it. Why, I barely just got it. I haven’t had time [to enjoy it]*” (27).

Critics disagree about the hopefulness of Hattie’s life. Dutton optimistically argues that although Hattie’s life has been “one long series of mistakes and dis-

appointments,” she can “no more give up her house than she can give up on life” (167–68). Kiernan, on the other hand, pessimistically argues that Hattie is repressing her emotions so that beneath her quietude are “rumblings potentially eruptive” like volcanoes. In this context, he argues that although “Hattie’s drunken decision to will the yellow house to herself is an assertion of ego,” it is also the expression of “the self-alienation that assaults her and of the contempt and anger she dare not express.” Kiernan, therefore, interprets Hattie’s thoughts “*I was never one single thing anyway*” and “*I was only loaned to myself*” as “an alienation from her own emotions that borders schizophrenia” (115–16). But to me, Hattie seems neither so affirmative nor so sad. It is sure that she is “not one to be miserable for long” and that she has “the expression of a perennial survivor” (15), but it is also undeniable that she has not solved the problem of the difficult life she is going to have. Neither is she so sick as Kiernan asserts. Hattie’s thoughts quoted above may possibly mean Hattie is thinking that her body is loaned to her by the creator God.

Fuchs’ discussion is illuminating because it reveals Bellow’s move to intensify Hattie’s solitude, which is, I think, one of the most important theme of this story. Fuchs argues that “this story shows Bellow breaking through into the third-person, first-person narrative voice.” This means that Bellow shifted his narrative voice from the earlier straight third-person to “the shifting third-person, first-person voice of *Herzog*.” “The typical early page is heavy on dialog and light on description,” while the final version “gives us much more interiorized description in pages of solid paragraphs.” In other words, Bellow finds “a style answerable to greater inner illumination, the third person focusing on objectivity and limitation of the central intelligence, the first person winning us over with the intimacy of confession.” Thus “Cut from the final version is the

interview at the hospital, the visitors there, the renting of her house, the description of Hattie's daily routine—all to make for a more ultimate solitude" (297). Fuchs also points out that the making of the will was a casual afterthought in some early versions while it is a "climax" in the final version.

My comparison confirms Bellow's usual efforts at clarifying and his intention to intensify Hattie's solitude. After the second operation the doctor prohibits Hattie from drinking, and Helen Rolfe says to the doctor, "Life sober may not be much of a temptation to her." The word "sober" is Bellow's addition in the final version probably to make the meaning clearer. Hearing this, her husband Jerry Rolfe says, "And if Sego Lake was all whiskey she'd use her last strength to knock her old yellow house down and build a raft of it. She'd float away on whisky. So why talk temperance to her now?" (13; *Esquire* 116) The underlined sentence is also Bellow's addition in the final version probably to make the author's humor clearer. Likewise, *Esquire's* sentence "At the bar she made it appear that she observed the limit; but she had started drinking at home after lunch" (122) is altered to ". . . drinking at home. One before lunch, one during, one after lunch" (30). Presumably, Bellow makes the amount of alcohol Hattie is drinking clearer and more concrete.

In the following examples Bellow seems to try to make conversation more natural. In the conversation about insurance with Jerry Rolfe, Hattie says, "Maybe I could sell some of my valuables" and he says with laughter, "What have you got?" (*Esquire* 116) but in the final version he says, "What valuables have you got?" Hattie mentions "the beautiful, precious Persian rug that India left me" and Jerry says "Coals from the fireplace have been burning it for years, Hat!" Hattie says with a sway of her shoulders, "The rug is in perfect condition." In the final version, "perfect" is italicized (14), making the conversa-

tion natural and vivid. Bellow's efforts to render vividness sometimes enhance his irony. When Hattie says, "There are things you can't put a price tag on. Beautiful things," Jerry Rolfe says, "Oh, bull, Hattie! You don't know what they are any more than I do" (*Esquire* 116). In the final version, Jerry says, "Oh, bull, Hattie! You don't know squat about beautiful things. Any more than I do" (14). When Hattie sets the rental of the house at two hundred dollars and Jerry laughs, Hattie "turned toward him one of those proud, dulled looks she always took on when he angered her and said haughtily, 'For summer on Sego Lake?'" (*Esquire* 119). Bellow rewrote it to ". . . when he angered her. Haughtily she said, 'For summer on Sego Lake? That's reasonable'" (22). This is probably to intensify her arrogance and assertion.

Jerry Rolfe seems to have become a very slightly colder person in the final version as seen from the revision from "He evaded nothing himself and tolerated very little evasion in others. Except that, as Hattie knew, he always indulged her" (120) to "He evaded nothing himself and tolerated no evasion in others. Except that, as Hattie knew, he made every possible allowance for her" (23). Here Jerry's generosity somewhat reduces, deepening Hattie's solitude. The same holds true for Pace. When Helen Rolfe wrapped a heating pad around Hattie's arm and Hattie complains, "it starts my generator and uses up the gas," Jerry says, "this is not the time to stingy." This angers Hattie but she thinks: "But the Rolfes were good to her Darly would have let her lie in the yard all night, and Pace would sell her to the bone man if he had an offer" (*Esquire* 114). This is rewritten in the final version as ". . . and Pace would sell her to the bone man. He'd give her to the knacker for a buck" (11). The deletion of the if clause and the use of a strong word "knacker," which means "one that buys worn-out domestic animals or their carcasses and disposes of the

products for other purposes than use as human food” (*Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*), suggests the colder character of Pace and the increased anger of Hattie. When Pace proposes a business deal involving Hattie’s leaving the house to him in her will, Hattie says, “But I’ll be here the day the sheriff takes your horses—you never mind” (*Esquire* 123). Bellow writes in the final version: “But I’ll be here the day the sheriff takes away your horses—you never mind! I’ll be clapping and applauding!” (31). Especially Bellow’s additional sentence makes Hattie’s anger and solitude more intense.

The comparison of the ending shows us how Bellow has deepened the theme of death in the process of revising.

“How can that be?” She studied what she had written and finally she acknowledged that she was drunk. “I’m drunk,” she said, “and don’t know what I am doing. I’ll die, and end. Like India. Dead as that lilac bush. Only tonight I can’t give the house away. I’m drunk and so I need it. But I won’t be selfish from the grave. I’ll think again tomorrow,” she promised herself. She went to sleep then. (126)

How could that happen? She studied what she had written and finally she acknowledged that she was drunk. “I’m drunk,” she said, “and don’t know what I am doing. I’ll die, and end. Like India. Dead as that lilac bush.”

Then she thought that there was a beginning, and a middle. She shrank from the last term. She began once more—a beginning. After that, there was the early middle, then middle middle, late middle middle, quite late middle. In fact the middle is all I know. The rest is just a rumor.

Only tonight I can't give the house away. I'm drunk and so I need it. And tomorrow, she promised herself, I'll think again. I'll work it out, for sure. (42)

The most conspicuous change is Bellow's addition of a new paragraph. In the final version, Hattie is more strongly resisting to her "end." The end is the word Hattie is desperately trying to avoid. The change of the final sentence is also important. "I'll work it out, for sure" sounds positive and expresses a sense of continuation more than "She went to sleep then." Finally, the deletion of "I won't be selfish from the grave" suggests Bellow's avoidance of negative description because it connotes Hattie's selfishness.

In "The Old System," Dr. Samuel Braun tries to recapture the reminiscences of his deceased cousins, mostly of Isaac and his sister Tina, in an attempt to understand what their life's strife was. On a cold December day, Dr. Braun, a specialist in the chemistry of heredity, who "has been written up in *Time*" for his research, is working with a feeling or "sentiment" mostly for his two cousins in upstate New York, the Mohawk Valley. Cousin Isaac, his senior by fifteen years, is a successful housing developer who started with rags and bottles, fire-salvaged goods and used cars, and then learned the building trades. Dr. Braun's memory mainly focuses on a persistent feud between Isaac and Tina and their final reconciliation on Tina's deathbed. Greedy and envious of the eldest brother's success, Tina accuses him of "shaking off the family when the main chance came" (63), though the fact is that the remaining two brothers and Tina retracted their once-given consent to invest a large sum of money in a real estate business. Tina's acquisitive nature and envy is so strong that Tina even takes from the dead body of Aunt Rose the ring, which is sup-

posed to go to Isaac's wife. Orthodox Isaac becomes more pious as he grows rich, and the lingering feud with Tina is too much for him. Therefore, before the Day of Atonement Isaac annually visits the old house to seek the sister's forgiveness but is rejected even at the entrance. The feud is solved when Tina demands from her deathbed twenty thousand dollars just to meet her, and Isaac brings the money to her. Feeble Tina sweeps the briefcase and in choked voice says, "No. Take it." Isaac kisses her and she tries to embrace him, both with tears in their eyes. Tina holds out the ring she has taken from Aunt Rose and says to Isaac, "Not the money. . . . You take Mama's ring." Dr. Braun, bitterly moved, tries to grasp what emotions are: "What good were they! What were they for!" Dr. Braun, too, has tears in his eyes and fervently wonders: "Oh, these Jews—these Jews! Their feelings, their hearts! . . . Why life, why death" (82–83).

Critics see Dr. Braun as a forerunner of Mr. Sammler in *Mr. Sammler's Planet* (1970). Brigitte Scheer-Schätzler, for example, argues that "The fact that in all three instances [Herzog, Braun and Mosby] the experiencing consciousness is that of someone old foreshadows Mr. Sammler" and it is "a distinct indication of a new turn toward the sublimity of the loving-yet-detached attitude" (74–75). Kiernan also argues that "Braun is in many ways an early version of Mr. Sammler" (117). But slightly different from this reading is Dutton's. Although he acknowledges that "'The Old System' looks ahead to the character of Mr. Sammler," he argues that Dr. Braun is different from Dr. Mosby who "cultivated an unhealthy self-detachment" (168), of which Dr. Braun is somewhat skeptical. I think we cannot place Dr. Braun and Dr. Mosby in the same category, because Braun says, "every civilized man today cultivated an unhealthy self-detachment. Had learned from art the art of amusing self-observa-

tion and objectivity,” but the author comments, “It made him [Braun] sad to feel that the thought, art, belief of great traditions should be so misemployed” (44).

Allan Chavkin and Nancy Feyl Chavkin’s discussion is persuasive. They contrast “the old system” with “the new system” that “can be regarded as the modern outlook that has become dominant in society.” According to them, those people in the old system “express themselves with fervor,” while those in the new system “pride themselves on their tough-mindedness and hard-boiled self-discipline” and “are inclined to classify dramatic displays of emotion as excessive and self-indulgent.” And “Dr. Samuel Braun, Bellow’s alter ego, explores these two fundamentally different outlooks” (24). Between these two outlooks, Dr. Braun vacillates through much of the story, but at the end he moves toward embracing the old system. Allen and Nancy Chavkin conclude that “‘The Old System’ reveals that the cold detachment and extreme skepticism of modernism are unsatisfactory responses to the incredible variety and profound mystery of human condition” (28). It is understandable, therefore, that Fuchs argues that the story is “a retrospective idyll, a hymn to the sanctity of primitive emotion,” and that Braun’s “secular, objective, modern perception . . . pales under the impact of deeply felt life” (298).

Comparing the story with manuscript, Fuchs points out two revisions of interest. First, Tina’s sexual encounter with seven year old Braun is described in manuscript as follows: “She was drawing him—taking him somewhere. In the dragon-car leaving humankind, to join the demons, her real kin.” But the last sentence is changed to the neutral, “She promised him nothing, told him nothing” (50). Second, that Aunt Rose’s ring is the one “Isaac had given her many years ago” and that for its possession Tina “outfaced him over the body of Aunt

Rose. She knew he would not quarrel at the deathbed” are Bellow’s later additions. Fuchs argues that “these revisions tone down the sexual aspect of Tina’s grasping character and firm up the material aspect” (337). My comparison between the *Playboy* and *Mosby’s Memoirs* versions confirms this move of Bellow’s. The following passage is an example :

The quarrel between Tina and Isaac lasted for years. She accused him of shaking off the family when the main chance came. He had refused to cut them in. He said that they had all deserted him at the zero hour. Eventually, the brothers made it up. Not Tina. She wanted nothing to do with Isaac. In the first phase of enmity she saw to it that he should know exactly what she thought of him. (63)

The verb “shaking off” in the second sentence is Bellow’s revision from *Playboy*’s “dumping” (244). The next sentence “He had refused to cut them in” is Bellow’s addition to the *Mosby’s Memoirs* version. These revisions are probably intended to clarify the situation and to strengthen Tina’s sense of being victimized. The phrase “the first phase of enmity” is the revision from *Playboy*’s “But at first.” The expression “enmity” is more concrete and helps clarify the confrontation between the two. Tina’s utterance also becomes more concrete when she speaks of Isaac to Mutt, her brother : “A multimillionaire—lets you go on drudging in a little business? He’s heartless. A heartless man” (62). In *Playboy* Tina is only repeatedly saying, “He’s heartless. Heartless. A heartless man” (242).

Isaac is also retouched by Bellow, probably to render his orthodoxy more distinct. In *Playboy* Isaac’s orthodoxy is already fully described, but there are a

few changes in expression in *Mosby's Memoir*. One is where Bellow mentions Isaac's orthodoxy in relation to his occasional womanizing: "But that [orthodoxy] wouldn't altogether do, thought Dr. Braun. There was more there than piety. He recalled his cousin's white teeth and scar-twisted smile when he was joking. 'I fought on many fronts,' Cousin Isaac said, meaning women' bellies" (61). The underlined sentence is Bellow's addition in *Mosby's Memoirs* and the sentence in *Playboy* is "But that wouldn't altogether do, thought Braun, and recalled the white teeth and scar-twisted joking . . ." (242). Although Isaac is pious in both versions, it is only here and for the first time in *Mosby's Memoir* that Bellow uses the word "piety." Another example is where the author describes Isaac's "archaic" (74) character comparing it to a bird. The present version reads: "Among these recent birds, finches, thrushes, there was Cousin Isaac with more scale than feather in his wings. A more antique type" (77). The *Playboy* version is longer with some description of the archaeopteryx: "Among these recent birds, finches, thrushes, Cousin Isaac represented a remoter ancestor of primitive stock—the archaeopteryx of a cruder time. The scales, turning slowly into feathers, were heavy. Burdensome plumage for clumsy but powerful flight. Cousin Isaac with more scale than feather in his wings" (249). Bellow has deleted the elaborate explanation and instead added the sentence "A more antique type," which is more succinct and also punchy.

Dr. Braun seems to have grown a little warmer in his character by revision. In *Playboy* Dr. Braun remembers the country club called the Robbstown Club as follows: "And the Coolidge-era sedans turning in, with small curtains at the rear windows, and holders for artificial flowers. Hudsons, Auburns, Bearcats. Only machinery. Stupid machinery. Nothing to feel nostalgic about" (242). The underlined sentence is deleted in *Mosby's Memoirs* (59), probably

because Dr. Braun here sounds too critical of machinery and Bellow wants to get rid of such a negative response to modern civilization. At the end of the story, Dr. Braun is moved by the reconciliation and tries to grasp what emotions are: “And Dr. Braun, bitterly moved, tried to grasp what emotions were. What good were they! What were they for! And no one wanted them now. Perhaps the cold eye was better. On life, on death. But, again, the cold of the eye would be proportional to the degree of heat within” (82). But the underlined sentences are Bellow’s alteration from *Playboy*’s simple sentence “Some preferred the cold eye” (250). The latter sentence suggests the “heat” within that is proportional to the coldness of surface, hence warmer view of humankind. Noteworthy is that Allan and Nancy Chavkin quote here to point out the heat as human warmth and accordingly as a proof of Braun’s rejection of cold detachment (26). And the fact that the revised sentence like this is deeply related to the story’s theme means that Bellow himself is deepening his theme or that he is still searching for a more suitable phrase to accurately describe his inmost thoughts. It is natural therefore that Dr. Braun, with tears in his eyes, thinks, “Oh, these Jews—these Jews! Their feelings, their hearts!” and “often wanted nothing more than to stop all this” (82). But, again, this is Bellow’s revision from *Playboy*’s “often wanted nothing more than to break with this” (250). Probably “break” is too harsh a verb for Dr. Braun—probably he can never break with this, even though he can stop this.

The title story “Mosby’s Memoirs” deals with a dead end which a supreme intellectual Dr. Mosby experiences in his later days. Dr. Mosby, “erudite, maybe even profound,” is writing his memoirs, isolated on a mountain in Oaxaca, Mexico. But, we are told, he “had made some of the most interesting mistakes a man could make in the twentieth century” (157). He was formerly a

teacher of political theory at Princeton University, but the university arranged for his early retirement because “his mode of discourse was so upsetting to the academic community” and “the original Mosby approach brought Mosby hatred” (176). Princeton offered him a lump sum \$140,000 to retire seven years early. But he is now feeling that the time has come “to put some humor” into his memoirs because thus far there had been “Nothing very funny” in his writing (158)—and because “It was essential, at this point in his memoirs, to disclose new depths. The preceding chapters had been heavy. Many unconventional things were said about the state of political theory.” In his career he has aspired “to create a more rigorous environment for slovenly intellectuals, to force them to do their homework, to harden the categories of political thought” (175). And Lustgarten was the man whom Mosby wanted to enliven his memoirs.

Hymen Lustgarten is one of Bellow’s *schlemiels*—a “funny” comic Jewish figure who fails many times. A former Marxist from New Jersey, he has been a shoe salesman and belonged “to any numbers of heretical, fanatical, bolshevistic groups.” But he “gave up politics” and wants to be successful in business. Engaged in the black market (it was not reprehensible in postwar Europe), he intends to build a fortune, but “he was incompetent” (164). After the war he takes his savings and his mother’s savings and goes abroad but within a year has lost it all. His Cadillac episode is another instance of his failure. He is then working for the American Army, employed by the Graves Registration, but impatient with his slow progress, he decides to import a Cadillac because the French Government has not yet taken measures against imports for rapid resale. But when the car is unloaded at Le Havre, new regulations go into effect. Mosby realizes that “compassion should be felt” but he reflects: “His timing

was off” (170). Lustgarten sends the car to Barcelona, Spain, but no sooner does his associate depart, than Lustgarten receives a nice offer for the car, and he, after racing down on the night train, recovers the Cadillac and drives back. Lustgarten gets drowsy in the warmth of the Pyrenees and falls asleep at the wheel and the car goes down a mountainside. “He was a foot or two from death when he was awaked by the crash” (171). But Mosby “had no wish to see a man in tears” (171). To him “Such unmastered emotion was abhorrent.” Mosby is “by taste a Senecan” and he admires “Spanish masculinity” or “the classic hardness of honorable control” over oneself (173).

Bellow writes, “You could see at once that there was no harm in him [Lustgarten]. Despite the bold revolutionary associations, . . . Lustgarten could not even hold his own with pushy people in a *pissoir*” (164). Going to Yugoslavia was another of Lustgarten’s mistakes. He goes to Yugoslavia because he says he has been invited by the Government there. He says, “They are asking interested people to come as guests to tour the country and see how they’re building socialism” (174). He also says, “this will give Trudy time to reconsider,” hinting at their divorce. But when Mosby sees him in September, he looks “frightful.” He has lost “no less than fifty pounds,” his eyes infected. He says he has “had diarrhea all summer” (177). Five years later when Lustgarten and Mosby happen to meet again in New York, he is “filled out once more.” He says that he is successful and “happy.” He is married and has children. Lustgarten and his associate run a laundromat in Algiers. But Bellow adds, “Thereafter, of course, the Algerians threw out the French, expelled the Jews” (179).

Mosby himself experiences “an odd and complex fantasy” toward the end and this leads to the final twist of this story. This fantasy occurs when Mosby joins an afternoon tour to the Tule and some temple ruins. He goes through a

fantasy in which he is “dead.” He has died. However, he continues to live and his doom is “to live life to the end as Mosby.” In the fantasy, Mosby considers this “his purgatory.” In a car collision years ago “Mosby was killed” but “another Mosby was pulled from the car” (182). Mosby and the tourists are led below, into the tomb, and there Mosby feels “oppressed” because it is very damp and the vault is close. There his heart is “paralyzed” :

His lungs would not draw. Jesus! I cannot catch my breath! To be shut in here! To be dead here! . . . Stooping, he looked for daylight. Yes, it was there. The light was there. The grace of life still there. Or, if not grace, air. Go while you can.

“I must get out,” he told the guide. “Ladies, I find it very hard to breathe.”

As to the meaning or message of the story, including this ending, critics’ readings are diverse in nuances. Dutton argues that this is “the story of a man afflicted with one of the seven deadly sins—pride. In this case, intellectual pride” (172). Dutton argues that “Bellow uses Dantean thought and imagery” and that the mountain Mosby stays on is “Dante’s mountain in Purgatory” and “the ruined tomb Mosby visits provides him with a vision of Hell.” For Dutton, writing his memoirs is “Mosby’s doom, his purgatory, to relive every step of his life, wading in intellectual pride until he could stand the sin no longer.” At the end, “Mosby has had enough of this past, this intellectual quagmire, and he turns back toward the bit of daylight at the entrance of the tomb” (173). Dutton’s reading seems convincing when we consider the setting of the story, the flow of Mosby’s reflections, and especially Mosby’s heartless character. In fact,

Mosby has omitted “certain facts” in his memoirs. For instance, “Mosby was embracing Trudy in bed” when her husband Lustgarten is crossing the Rhine. Mosby has not advised her about leaving Lustgarten, but “his vision of Lustgarten as a funny man was transmitted to Trudy” (182). “Stone-hearted Mosby,” Bellow describes, “making fun of flesh and blood, of these little humanities with their short inventories of bad and good.” Mosby can abstract himself at a concert—“Shut out the piano. Continue thinking about Comte” (168–69).

Fuchs reads the story in similar way to Dutton, but with different nuances, which are worth mentioning. He argues that Mosby “has everything because he believes in nothing” and that “there is everything in Mosby’s life but feeling.” This is true; Mosby has “fine blue eyes, light-pained, direct, intelligent, disbelieving” (158). Fuchs argues that “this anaesthesia of heart can also be ‘Jewish’ we see clearly in *Seize the Day*, where the anal retentive respectability of the moneyed Dr. Adler is above being soiled by the floundering agony of his son” (299–300). In other words, “In ‘Mosby’ Bellow comes back to what is a central theme, the indifference to human suffering.” Or “Mosby is an updated version of the sort of intellect the Romantics in their vitalistic naturalism railed against” (301). Fuchs argues, therefore, that Lustgarten is “a mocking counterpoint to a life of *unlust*” and Bellow’s joke is not on Lustgarten but on Mosby for denying Lustgarten “as merely funny” (302–03). Therefore, Fuchs argues, “Bellow exacts a sort of Chaplinescque revenge on the nearly classical sense of comedy” (303).

Kiernan sees Mosby’s purgatorial experience but he is critical of the readings that “deduce that Bellow censures Mosby for the sin of intellectual pride.” He argues that although Mosby is perhaps “a monster of egotism,” he is “faithful to his own standards of mind, scornful of imposed formulas of contrition,

and superior to the morality of sentimental humanism.” Kiernan concludes, therefore, that “Bellow’s purpose in this final story of the *Mosby’s Memoirs* sequence is to tease the conventions of moral understanding” (135). But is it really so? I do not think so. For one thing, how can we support Dr. Mosby who “stated absolutely that however deplorable the concentration camps had been, they showed at least the rationality of German political ideas. The Americans had no such ideas” (160). On the contrary, Bellow seems to prepare for the ending from the early stage of his narrative, one proof of which is that already at the onset “Mosby did not feel well” (158). Another proof is his characterization. Bellow writes: “Mosby the thinker, like other busy men, never had time for music. Poetry was not his cup of tea. Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, Organization Men, Pentagon planners, Party leaders, Presidents had no such interests” (161–62). But toward the end, this same Mosby, disgusted with the tour guide’s talk about “The Water Table, the Caverns, the Triassic Period,” cries, “Inform me no further! Vex not my soul with more detail. I cannot use what I have!” (181) Here the word “soul” is important because it means for Bellow the inmost part in one’s heart, which means that Mosby still somehow maintains his inmost heart unaffected with knowledge and rationality, suggesting his possible capacity for a change in his emotional life. Near the end, Bellow writes: “Having disposed of all things human, he should have encountered God. Would this occur? But having so disposed, what God was there to encounter?” (184) These comments seem Bellow’s denial of Mosby’s humanity, hence also his need to rescue him. It seems to me that Bellow sees Mosby with one third of sympathy and two thirds of reproach.

I would like to support, therefore, Peter Hyland’s reading that “Mosby’s story actually ends with his struggling for breath, struggling to ascend from a

tomb, breathing and ascending nevertheless, available for one more attempt to be human” (21).

As for the comparison with the *New Yorker* version, only one revision may be worth mentioning. It is the change of a verb from *New Yorker*’s “noting” (40) to “writing” in the sentence “Mosby, writing these reflections in a blue-green color of ink which might have been extracted from the landscape” (167). Here these reflections mean Mosby’s reflections on Napoleon and his anachronism and war, etc. The verb “write” sounds more vivid, suggesting Mosby’s straight and swift way of writing memoirs.

As is shown above, thematically, the six stories in *Mosby’s Memoirs and Other Stories* depict various aspects and stages of human life ; namely, work, business, money, love, marriage, financial burden, family, old age, death, intellect vs. feeling, etc., all of which are inevitable phases that human beings must face, and Bellow’s approaches to these fundamental issues are diverse and enlightening. And, especially, problems related to “money” are seen in all of the six stories, forming one of the central themes in this collection. When we look at the present-day Japan as well as other countries in the world, we cannot help perceiving how great an influence money has on the hearts of people, not to mention the recent disaster at the Fukushima No. 1 nuclear power plant. Carl Marx emphasized the negative influence that money has upon human nature, but Bellow believes that the human mind or soul can be pure and intact, even in the midst of the chaotic conditions in which we live.

As for Bellow’s revisions in this volume, we can say that the following points are his tendencies : Sometimes he subdues extreme expressions in favor of greater ambiguity, but it is not for the sake of ambiguity itself but to ren-

der descriptions more real and convincing ; sometimes he seems to grow more sympathetic to his protagonist as he subdues or omits negative descriptions of him ; sometimes he revises to make themes clearer. Bellow thus overall moves toward greater clarity.

WORKS CITED

- Bellow, Saul. "A Father-to-Be." *New Yorker* (5 February 1955) : 26 – 30.
- . "The Gonzaga Manuscripts." *Discovery* 4 (1954) : 14 – 45.
- . "Leaving the Yellow House." *Esquire* 49 (January 1958) : 112, 114, 116, 119 – 126.
- . "Looking for Mr. Green." *Commentary* 11 (March 1951) : 251 – 261.
- . "Mosby's Memoirs." *New Yorker* (20 July 1968) : 36 – 42, 44 – 49.
- . *Mosby's Memoirs and Other Stories*. New York : Viking Press, 1968.
- . "The Old System." *Playboy* (January 1967) : 140, 142, 144, 240, 242, 244 – 47, 249 – 50.
- Chavkin, Allan and Nancy Feyl Chavkin. "Skepticism and the Depth of Life in Saul Bellow's 'The Old System.'" *Saul Bellow Journal* 19–1 (Winter 2003) : 23 – 29.
- Clayton, John J. *Saul Bellow : In Defense of Man*. Bloomington, London : Indiana University Press, 1979.
- Date, Masahiko. "Bellow's Self-Mockery : With Special Reference to 'The Gonzaga Manuscripts.'" *Shlemiel* 10 (March 2011) : 102 – 113.
- Dutton, Robert R. *Saul Bellow*. New York : Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Friedrich, Marianne M. *Character and Narration in the Short Fiction of Saul*

Bellow. New York : Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1995.

Fuchs, Daniel. *Saul Bellow : Vision and Revision*. Durham, North Caroline : Duke University Press, 1984.

Hyland, Peter. "Making It All Add Up : Bellow's Memoirs and and 'Mosby's Memoirs.'" *Saul Bellow Journal* 15-1 (Winter, 1997) : 15-23.

Kiernan, Robert F. *Saul Bellow*. New York : The Continuum Publishing Company, 1989.

Malin, Irving. *Saul Bellow's Fiction*. Carbondale and Edwardsville : Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.

Opdahl, Keith Michael. *The Novels of Saul Bellow : An Introduction*. University Park : The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1970.

Scheer-Schäzler, Brigitte. *Saul Bellow*. New York : Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1972.