YoRAP 2012–2013「〈"女"同士の絆〉を考える」報告
Women's Friendship and Literature
—文学の世界における女性同士の絆
Saturday, 16th, February, 2013

Coordinator
Samantha LANDAU
ICU Graduate School/Center for Gender Studies, Research Institute Assistant

Why Women's Friendship and Literature?

The first symposium on literature to be sponsored by the CGS, "Women's Friendship and Literature" was created with the goal of bringing to light new connections between women writers as well as examine the deep emotional ties between the women they wrote about. The positive influence that relationships between women have had and continue to have on/in literature is topic that remains very close to my heart; my female family members and friends have been some of my greatest allies, encouraging and inspiring my writing. Yet within scholarship, this topic seems to have been ignored time and again: in my research I have often encountered topics on men's friendship or men's bonds, yet very rarely a work on the friendship between women. Conversely, the animosity/fear/anxiety arising between women is often addressed. Thus, when my research on Emily Dickinson lead me to read the book *Open Me Carefully: Emily Dickinson's Intimate Letters to Susan Huntington Dickinson* and I discovered what a deep influence her friendship with sister-in-law Susan had on Emily's writing and life, it made a great impression on me. Furthermore, I noticed that Susan and Emily had other important relationships with intelligent women with whom they corresponded faithfully for many years. Afterwards, I started to see similar positive connections in the lives of other female writers, such as Charlotte Brontë

and Daphne du Maurier, and the lack of such associations leading to isolation and despair, as in the case of Shirley Jackson. It seemed the topic, though little addressed, certainly deserved further attention.

I broached the issue at a meeting concerning the YoRAP projects and we began discussions and planning of the event that would become the symposium, "Women's Friendship and Literature." A moderated academic forum with three presenters and time for discussion seemed most appropriate for the material. I decided to invite two professors whose work on the connection between female literary figures and on women in literature I greatly respect, Professor Hiroko Uno (Department of English, Kobe College) and Professor Barnaby Ralph (Department of Literature and Culture in English, Tokyo Women's Christian University). In addition to their lectures, I would participate by giving the third lecture myself.

A Short Summary of the Symposium

The symposium began with an introduction of the topic (as stated above) by Professor Natsumi Ikoma. She then continued with an introduction of the presenters, their academic backgrounds and fields of research, and their intent in contributing to the symposium's topic of discussion.

Professor Uno then presented her paper, "The Friendship Between Emily Dickinson and Helen Hunt Jackson" (Emily Dickinson と Helen Hunt Jackson の友情). After providing some background information on both poets, one of whom published and gain some fame during her life time (Jackson) and the other who published rarely and whose talent was only recognized posthumously (Dickinson), Professor Uno explained how their supportive relationship was inspiring and important for both women. The friendship between Dickinson and Jackson may have begun while the two of them attended school together. But textual evidence points to a later date, through the auspices of Thomas Wentworth Higginson. In any case, their

friendship continued through correspondence until Jackson's death in 1885, and is a notable example of 19th century female authors supporting each other's writing endeavors.

Next, Professor Barnaby Ralph regaled us with a lecture entitled, "A Gilded Cage: Women's Literary Associations in Seventeenth-and Eighteenth-Century France and England." He dealt with a time period directly preceding that of Dickinson and Jackson and presented aspects of literary women's friendship in Europe, which provided contrast to the American poets discussed by Professor Uno. Professor Ralph elucidated the fact that women's literary associations in France became a forum for women to discuss the work of men (instead of a place to foster their own creativity) without interacting directly with those men. In contrast, English women's literary societies were far more subversive, allowing women more freedom to spread their own theories and criticism, and even to draw men into their circles.

Finally, I presented my paper, "The Desire for Sisterhood: Shirley Jackson's Heroines and the Complexity of Female Companionship." My lecture examined existing interpretations of female companionship, comparing the pre-cursors to Jackson's novel *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*. At the same time, it questioned the lack of scholarship on the positive influences of sisters who are also friends, and offered criticism on the trend of reducing sisterly relationships to either wicked or helpful with no in between. Finally, it posited that inseparable friendships between sisters evoke an ambiguity that forces us to reexamine our own definition of sisterhood and its place in the social hierarchy of both society and family.

After each lecture, there was a short question and answer session. The audience and panelists also engaged in a lively discussion for about an hour after all three lectures were completed. During that time, the connections between the three presenters' papers became clearer. Further, it seemed that the female authors' contributions to each other's writing

had somehow given birth to a creative space in which women experienced encouragement that they had not received from society at large. That affirmation was, in turn, inscribed into the literature they wrote.

In particular, I was grateful for the presence of professors who have supported my academic efforts for almost a decade now, including Professor Ikoma and Professor Maher. I was also indebted to the contributions to the discussion made by my benefactor, who travelled several hours in order to hear my lecture, and who has been a vital supporter of my research since the beginning of my PhD. I was also thankful for all of the help and support of Yuji Kato, who organized the details of the event such as engaging a simultaneous translator, and my fellow RIAs and graduate students from GSCC.

Conclusions and Connections

I feel that it was extremely important to provide an academic forum in which others could participate in the discussion and broaden our knowledge about the connections between women's friendship, authorship and literature. The CGS event "The Bonds Between 'Women'" ("女"同士の絆) became the forum for that discussion. Inviting Professors Uno and Ralph, whose work on gender and literature fit well with the context, afforded interesting dimensions to our discussion and stimulated engaging dialogue between the participants.

By bringing together a range of research on women's friendship and its literary connections, this symposium inspired both the presenters and the audience to consider the role that women play in each other's lives, contributing positivity and support with their presence. Moreover, through my research concerning the image of sisters and the friendship between them, I discovered that the desire for a sisterly bond between female friends and a friendly bond between sisters is not only common, it seems to be essential to relieve anxiety, loneliness, and social pressure.

In terms of further research, this topic might be expanded to include cultures/countries beyond Western Europe and America, such as Asia, Eastern Europe or Africa. It might also be useful to arrange a forum in which to discuss friendship between male and female literary figures, and/or male and female characters in literature across a range of time periods.

YoRAP 2012–2013「〈"女"同士の絆〉を考える」報告
Women's Friendship and Literature
―文学の世界における女性同士の絆
Saturday, 16th, February, 2013

Emily DickinsonとHelen Hunt Jacksonの友情

鵜野ひろ子
神戸女学院大学

本シンポジウムの題名「文学の世界における女性同士の絆」から私がすぐに連想するのはEmily DickinsonとHelen Hunt Jacksonの友情である。このことは幾つかのDickinsonの伝記で取り上げられており、また朝比奈緑による二人の手紙を分析した論文もあるので、ここでは簡単に二人の友情を紹介するだけとする。[1]

Emily Dickinsonは1830年12月10日マサチューセッツ州アマストに生まれ、1886年5月15日に生まれた家で亡くなった。一方、Helen Hunt JacksonはDickinsonより二カ月早く、同年10月15日にHelen Fiskeとして同じアマストに生まれ、Dickinsonより数か月早く、1885年8月12日にサンフランシスコで亡くなった。このように二人は同時代を生きた。しかもDickinsonの祖父は宣教師養成のためアマスト大学の創立に尽力し、父親は同大学の会計理事を務めた弁護士であった。一方、Jacksonは同大学の教授の長女として生まれた。Fiske家は代々牧師を輩出していて、彼女の父親も会衆派の牧師となり、1824年にアマスト大学にラテン語とギリシャ語の教師として赴任してからもバイブル教室を開く等、宗教活動を行っていた（Phillips, 44–45）。このようにDickinsonとJacksonは同じような環境に生まれ育ったが、[2] 1840年代に入ると正反対の人生を送ることとなった。

DickinsonはAmherst Academyを卒業後、1847年から1848年にかけてMount Holyoke女学院で1年間学んだ後は、1850年代には徐々に外出を控えるようになり、1860年代半ばに二度、目の治療を受けるため数カ月ずつケンブリッジに滞在した他は、父親の家の敷地から一切出ない隠遁生活に入った。

そして家事をしながら詩を書き続けた。若い頃には出版したいという思いがあったようであるが、結局、許可なく書き換えられたものが数編、無記名で、幾つかの新聞に掲載されただけであった。1862年、文芸評論家のThomas Wentworth Higginsonに数編の詩を送って指導を仰いだが、彼も彼女の詩を理解できなかった。Higginsonから彼女への手紙が残っていないので、残存している彼女の手紙から、彼が詩の出版は急がないようにと伝えたことが推測される。それに対して彼女は、「魚が空を思っても見ないように」出版のことなど考えたこともないと答えている（L–265, 7, June 1862）。また彼が詩についてアドバイスをしたようであるが、それに対して彼女は感謝の言葉は述べても、それに従った様子はない。しかし二人は生涯、師匠と弟子と言う立場で文通を続け、詩人は彼に詩を数編ずつ送り続けた。こうして、Dickinsonは全く無名のまま亡くなったが、死後見つかった1800篇近い数の詩が少しずつ出版され、今ではアメリカを代表する詩人の一人となった。

彼女の隠遁の理由は様々あったと推測されるが、一つにはアマストで1840年代、1850年代に宗教復興運動が何度も起こり周りの人々が宗教告白し、告白を勧められたにも関わらずできなかったということがある。また1850年代後半から母親が病弱になったので、母親を介護しながら、妹と共に来客の多い家の切り盛りをする必要があった。今とは違って、当時、家事には多くの時間とエネルギーが必要で、家事や介護をこなしながら詩を書く時間を確保しようとすると、外に出かける時間はなかったのかもしれない。[3] また当時は子供の内に死亡することが多く、成人する確率は低いものであった。実際、彼女の周りでも子供の内に亡くなった人が多く、彼女自身も10代半ばで軽い結核を患ったので（Habegger, 261–263）、父親が彼女の健康を気遣って家から出したがらなかったとも言われている（93–94, 97–98）。彼女の家では兄姉妹3人とも成人できたが、それには父親の過激なまでの保護があったからと言える。そして彼女が教会へ行かなくなっても、無理強いすることなく彼女の意志を尊重したこと、また娘達に結婚を強要しなかったことは、家父長制の強い当時にあって珍しいことだった。また、同じく一生独身を通した妹が外交的な用事をこなして、彼女を外の世界から守ってくれた。このように、教会に出席しないと言うような、当時では異常と言われるような状況でも、家族に守られて詩を

書くことができたのである。さらに、父親の屋敷に彼女が丹精込めた花壇や温室があり、たとえ外に出なくても、その自然の中でのびのびと動植物に囲まれて詩を書くことができた。たとえば、次の詩がある：

> 安息日には教会に行く人がいます―
> 私は、家にいることにしています―
> 米くい鳥が聖歌隊の指揮者の代わり―
> そして果樹園が、礼拝堂のドームの代わりです―
>
> 安息日にはサープリスを身に着ける人がいます―
> 私は、ただ翼を着けます―
> そして教会のために、鐘を鳴らす代わりに、
> 私たちの墓守が―歌います。
>
> 有名な牧師さんである、神様がお説教されます―
> でもそのお説教は決して長いものではありません、
> ですからいつか天国に到達するのではなくて―
> 私はいつも、行っているのです。

このように自信を持って、独自の生き方をすることができたのには、詩人自身の意志の強さもあったであろうが、家族の支えがあったからこそではないだろうか？

一方、Helen Hunt Jacksonの場合はDickinsonとは正反対で、家庭に恵まれず、根無し草のようなものであった。彼女の母親は結核を患っていたので、幼い娘達の世話をすることも、長い間一緒に居ることもできなかった。親戚の家で療養することもあり、娘達が親戚の家や両親の友人の家に預けられることもあった。また彼女は小学校の頃から寄宿学校に入れられた（Phillips, 12–14）。[4] 母親はいずれ娘たちが孤児となって他人に頼って生きて行かなければならないだろうと予測し、辛い境遇も受け入れ明るく前向きに生きていくよう、娘たちに教え込んだ（57）。このように、Helen Fiskeは幼い頃から親戚

や知人の家、寄宿舎を転々として、他人の中で生きる辛さを味わっていた。果たして1844年、彼女が13歳の時に母親は亡くなった。

1846年の夏、Helen Fiskeは自分が目指すMount Holyoke女学院の入学試験の準備を熱心にしていたが、父親が男子校のアマスト大学と同じカリキュラムを組んで知的教育を目指すMount Holyokeよりも、従来通り女性向けの教育だけを行うIpswich女学院に彼女を入学させると決めたので、彼女はMount Holyokeを諦めた（Phillips, 54–55）。もし、彼女がMount Holyokeに入学し、またDickinsonが同校への入学を1年遅らせていなければ、二人は1846年の秋、そこで同級生となっていたはずである。Dickinsonは当時アマストで度々起こる宗教復興の中で宗教告白できずに悩んでいたが、Helen Fiskeも父親からの宗教告白の圧力に悩んでいた。Helenの父親は想像力を抑制するため、教育関係や宗教関係以外の書物は読まないようにと彼女を諭し、彼女を宗教告白に導こうとした。その結果、Helenは却ってカルヴィニズムの教義に反発心を抱いたが、ついに父親の圧力に屈して宗教告白した（52–53）。それ故、もし二人がMount Holyoke出会っていたら、特に同校で宗教告白の集会が度々開かれた際、互いに良い相談相手になっていたかもしれない。後に再会して友情が芽生え、Helenが亡くなるまで手紙のやり取りが続いたのには、10代、20代で同じような精神的悩みを抱いた経験があったからかもしれない。そのことをお互いに知らなかったとしても、またその後、二人は真反対の人世を送ったが、物事を突き詰めて考え、時に懐疑心を持つという点で、似ていたからかもしれない。

1847年に父親も亡くなり、遂にHelenとAnnの姉妹は孤児となった。Helen Fiskeはその後、Ipswich女学院からニューヨーク市にあるAbbott Instituteに移り、経営者の家族と共に暮らした。同校卒業後もそこで1年半の間、教員を務めたが、John Abbottに将来作家になることを考えてみるように勧められ、少しずつ詩を書いていた（Phillips, 66–68）。まさに同じ頃、Dickinsonも父親の法律事務所にいた書生のBenjamin Newtonから、詩人になるようにと励まされていた（Habegger, 221）ことは興味深い偶然の一致である。

さて、Helen FiskeはAbbott Instituteが廃校となったので、教員の仕事を

やめざるを得ず、1851年の秋オールバニの第一会衆派教会の牧師の家に住むことになった（Phillips, 70）。そこで、その年の12月、ニューヨーク州知事の弟であるEdward Huntに出会った（74）。彼はWest Point士官学校を卒業後、数年間、教官を務めた後、陸軍工兵隊で任務についていた。彼らは1852年10月に結婚し、まもなく生まれた長男は1854年に亡くなった。そして1863年には夫が事故で亡くなり、さらにその二年後には、次男も病気で亡くなった（16, 89）。このように、彼女は家族に先立たれ、絶望の淵に立たされた。しかしどんな境遇でも前向きに生きていくようにという母親の教育のお蔭で、何とか耐えることができた。しかも、それまでの彼女の生活は家族や軍隊の社交が中心であったが、一人ぼっちとなった今や、彼女は自分自身の才能のために専心することにした。そして1865年6月、息子の死のたった二カ月後に、*New York Evening Post*紙に息子の死を悼んだ詩を掲載することに成功する。その年の10月には、旅行記が同紙に掲載された（93–94）。彼女は祖父から相当の遺産を得ていたので経済的な困難はなく、決して経済的必要性から作家になろうとしたのではない。Phillipsが "Over time, Jackson's efforts to keep cheerful and productive in the face of difficulty became an integral part of her identity"（18）と言うように、彼女は困難の中でこそ前向きに生きようとして、それまで興味を抱いていた文学活動に入っていったのではないかと思われる。

さて、Helen Huntは翌年2月、ニューポートで過ごした。そこは東部の富裕層のリゾート地として有名になりつつあり、夏には大勢の避暑客で賑わっていたが、冬には芸術家や作家の社交場となっていた。彼女はその後、六回の冬をその町のHannah Dameの下宿屋に滞在した。その下宿屋を選んだ理由の一つは、Thomas W. Higginson他、自分の力になってくれそうな文学関係者が数多く滞在していたからだと思われるが、[5] 彼女の期待通り、何人もの文学関係者と親しくなり、彼女の作家デビューが支えられた。特にHigginsonはDickinsonも生涯文通をしていた当時有名な文芸評論家であるが、彼女にとって最適の指導者となった（Phillips, 94–97）。彼はHarvard神学校を卒業し、一時はユニテリア派の牧師もしていた。1860年代には、超絶主義者として過激な奴隷制度廃止論者となり、南北戦争中には最初の自由黒人部隊の隊長を務

めた。しかし戦争中に負傷してからはニューポートで著作業に専念し、文芸評論家として名声を高めつつあった。しかも女性の新人作家も奨励する批評家としても知られていた（Lease, 139–41）。それゆえ、Helen Huntは彼の弟子となって自分の才能を磨くだけでなく、彼に文学界で自分の後ろ盾になってくれることを期待していたようである。果たして彼女は、Dickinsonと違って、Higginsonの指導に忠実に従い、大衆雑誌の読者に気に入られる作品を書く技術を習得した。そこで彼は彼女を米国の主要な女流詩人の一人だと雑誌等で褒め称えたので、彼女は*Independent*紙や、*Hearth and Home*, *Scribner's Monthly*等に多くの作品を発表することができ、一躍、流行作家の一人として活躍し始めた（Phillips, 96–100）。[6] 彼女は1873年、気管支炎の悪化に伴い、医者のアドバイスにより、当時健康に良い土地だと言われたコロラド・スプリングズに移住し、そこで出会った銀行家で鉄道建設者のWilliam Sharpless Jacksonと1875年に再婚したが（107, 113, 168–82）、作家活動は続けた。

このように、Higginsonは偶然、幼馴染であった二人の女性から別々に文学上の助言を求められ、Dickinsonにはその助言は通用しなかったが、Helen Huntには流行作家となるチャンスを与えることとなった。そして皮肉なことには、Dickinsonの方は出版を断念し、一生結婚することなく、無名のまま終わったが、死後、世界的に有名な詩人になった。一方、二度結婚し、世界中を旅し、様々な経験を積んだHelen Hunt Jacksonは生前流行作家として活躍したが、死後は*Ramona*という作品以外、忘れられてしまう。そして皮肉にも、Dickinsonの伝記の中にだけ、彼女の名前が挙げられることとなった。というのは、1860年代半ばにHigginsonを通して二人の友情が始まったからなのである。[7]

Helen Huntは1866年以降、Higginsonを通じてDickinsonの詩を読み、誰も理解できなかったその詩の価値に気が付いた。そして間もなく二人の間で文通が始まった。残念ながら、二人が交わした手紙は一部しか残っていないが、Jacksonが亡くなるまで文通は続いた。例えば、1875年彼女が再婚した折に、Dickinsonはお祝いのカードを送っている（L–444, late October 1875）。そこに書かれていた詩の主旨が理解できなかったJacksonはそのカードを送り返して、率直に説明してくれるよう求めた（*Letters*, 544）。それに対して、

Dickinsonは返事をしなかったようで、Jacksonは何度も自分の不躾さを謝罪した上で、彼女の詩を高く評価していることを強調して、「あなたは偉大な詩人です—あなたが声を出して歌わないということは、あなたの生きている時代に対して不当な仕打ちです。」（L444a, 20 March 1876）と言って、詩を出版することを勧めている。Dickinsonは正直で率直なJacksonの性格を知っていたので、その言葉がただのお世辞ではないこともわかっていたはずである。それ故、自分の詩が正当に評価されたことをきっと嬉しく思ったことであろう。

Jacksonが無名の詩人を励ましたのはDickinson だけではなかった。彼女は才能があると思った何人ものアマチュア女性作家のため推薦状を書き、また出版社を探してやるなどした。そのお蔭で、実際プロの作家になった女性もいた（Phillips, 144）。それには、彼女自身がCharlotte Cushmanという、当時欧州でもよく知られたアメリカの有名な女優によって励まされた経験があったからだと言われている。CushmanはGeorge SandやBrowning夫妻等、当時の有名作家を友としていたが、仕事が人生で最も重要だと見なし、芸術で成功するには作品のみに専心することが必要と主張していた。そして、Helen Huntに詩をどんどん書くよう励まして、彼女の詩のスクラップブックを作って、朗読会でそれらを朗読するなどしていた。またHigginsonに頼り過ぎだと警告もしていた（103–105）。このように、Jacksonは Higginson だけでなく、Cushmanという援助があったお蔭で自分の成功があることを忘れず、無名の詩人・作家を励まそうと努めていたのである。

1876年、Roberts Brothers社がNo Name seriesと称して、作家の名を伏せて、次々と小説を出版していたが、*A Masque of Poets*という無記名の詩のアンソロジーを出すこととなった。そこで、自らも詩を寄せるJacksonはDickinsonに是非とも詩を掲載させてくれるよう懇願した。しかし返事をしない詩人に業を煮やし、その年の10月には、直談判のためアマストまでやってきた。その後も手紙で、「あなたの知らない所の知らない人にも、あなたの詩を読む楽しみを与えてあげましょう」（L–476c）と説得している。こうして手紙のやり取りをした後に、遂に、"Success is counted sweetest" が載せられることとなった。今回の出版でも編集者によって詩の一部が変更されたので、

Jacksonは「あなたがあの詩集のために珠玉の詩を下さったことを悔やんでいらっしゃらなければと思います」（L573c, 8 December 1878）と、謝罪している。

Jacksonはその後もDickinsonに詩の出版を勧め、「あなたがあなたの詩に日の目を与えないということは、あなたの『時代や世代』に対して罪深いことです。ーもし私があなたより長生きするようなことがあれば、私をあなたの文学遺産の相続人兼管理人にしていただけませんでしょうか？」（L–937a, Sept 5, 1884）と書いている。残念ながらJacksonの方が先に亡くなったのでこの願いは実現しなかったが、このように有名作家によって高く評価されたことは、無名のままで終わろうとしていたDickinsonには、将来人々に認められるかもしれないという希望の光となったはずである。

一方、Jacksonは再婚してからも転々と旅をし、旅行記等を量産し続けていたが、1879年10月ボストンでアメリカ原住民の酋長に出会い、原住民が米国政府に不当に土地を奪われ、絶滅の危機に陥っている事実に衝撃を受けた。そこで彼女は現地調査をし、その結果を*A Century of Dishonor*として1881年に出版した（Phillips, 223–31）。これは数種の原住民種族の歴史を事実に忠実に描いたもので、政府の原住民に対する不当な政策や白人による原住民大虐殺も報告している。土地を奪われ、流浪の民となった原住民に対する同情や義憤が動機だと思われるが、この作品では彼女の満足できるほどの政治的成果はなかった。そこで今度は、センチメンタルと言われても大衆の心をつかむことができるストーリー・テラーとして、人々の心に直接訴えるため、小説*Ramona*の執筆に取り掛かった。まるで頭に吹き込まれたかの如く、ストーリー全体が5分以内で心に浮かんだと言っているが、彼女は猛スピードで書き続け、二、三カ月の内にほとんど修正なしで、その作品が出来上がった（252–53）。そして1884年5月から*Christian Union*誌に連載物として発表した。完結した11月には単行本として出版され、すぐにベストセラーとなった（260）。これは原住民と白人との混血の娘Ramonaの半生を描いたもので、Jacksonは読者に主人公の立場になって政府の不当に対し怒りを抱き、また同じアメリカ人として罪悪感を持ってほしいと願ったようである。ストウ夫人が黒人のために書いた*Uncle Tom's Cabin*のように、原住民の力となりたいと彼女は望んでいたが

（251, 260）、すぐには成果が出ず、これも不満足な結果に終わった。しかしDickinsonはJacksonのこの作品を高く評価し、「ああ！*Ramona*を読み終えてしまいました。/シェイクスピアを読み終わった時のように、それが出版されたばかりで、これから読み始めるところであればなあ！と思います」（L976, March 1885）と書いている。Jacksonはその手紙を受け取った時、足の骨折と胃癌の進行によって辛い闘病生活を送っていた。Dickinsonの作品に出会って、彼女を本物の詩人と尊敬していたJacksonは、自分の詩が彼女の詩の足元にも及ばないものだと自覚していたはずである。その詩人からシェイクスピアに譬えて褒められたということは、随分と慰めとなったことと思われる。その後、Jacksonの死を伝え聞いたDickinsonはWilliam Jacksonに書いたお悔みの手紙の中で、「トロイのHelenはいつか亡くなっても、コロラドのHelenは決して亡くなりません。」（L–1015, late summer 1885）と書いている。

このように、Emily DickinsonとHelen Hunt Jacksonは同じような環境に生まれ、同時代を生きた幼馴染であっても、正反対の人生を送った。しかし二人とも苦労を重ね、偶然、人生の半ばで再会し、互いの作品を理解し、評価し合うことができた。このことは互いにとって、大きな慰めであり、また励ましになったと思われる。Dickinsonにとっては、創作のピークは過ぎてからの交流であったが、亡くなるまで筆を折らなかったように、またJacksonは亡くなる直前に*Ramona*を書いたように、この友情が二人の貴重な作品を生む原動力になったのではないかと思うのである。

Footnotes

[1] Dickinsonの伝記について個別に出典明記していない部分は、Sewall、Johnson、及びHabeggerの伝記を参照。二人の交流については、Whitakerも触れている（57–58, 59–60）。

[2] Phillipsは、Helen FiskがAmherstに住んでいた幼少時代、Fiske家とDickinson家が友好関係にあったので、子供である二人も幼馴染であったはずだと言う。1854年、Huntと結婚してワシントンに住んでいた時、当時国会議員であったDickinsonの父親Edwardと妹Laviniaを家に招待したが、Laviniaについてよく思わなかったようである。翌年、EmilyがLaviniaと共にワシントンを訪ねた折には家に招待していない（144）。

[3] 当時のDickinson家の家事労働については、Aife MurrayのMaid as Museを参考。

[4] Whitakerによれば、Helen FiskeはAmherst Academyに一時在籍していたが、11歳以降、幾つもの寄宿学校を転々としたようである（56）。

[5] SewallはHelen HuntとHigginsonがその下宿屋で出会ったのは偶然のものとしている（578）。

[6] Whitaker は Higginson が Helen Hunt を "one of the most gifted poetesses in America" と呼び、Emersonが新聞に掲載された彼女の詩の切り抜きを持って歩き友人達に読み聞かせたと指摘している（57）。

[7] なお、二人はHigginsonを通して互いに文学を志していることを知る以前に、偶然1860年にアマストで再会していた。その年の8月、Hunt夫妻はアマストに滞在し、礼拝の後Dickinson家でのレセプションに参加した。1870年にHigginsonがDickinsonを訪ねた折、Hunt夫妻の話となり、彼女がHunt少佐は最も印象的な人だったと話したと記録されている（L–342b）（Phillips, 144–45）。

Works Cited:

Asahina, Midori. (2007, February). 'Pursuing you in your transitions': Reading the Epistolary Exchanges between Emily Dickinson and Helen Hunt Jackson. *The Journal of the American Literature Society of Japan* 5, 1–20.

Franklin, R. W. (Ed.). (1998). *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Variorum Edition. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP.

Habegger, Alfred. (2001). *My Wars Are Laid Away in Books: the Life of Emily Dickinson*. NY: Random House.

Johnson, Thomas H. (1955). *Emily Dickinson: An Interpretive Biography*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.

- - - , (Ed.). (1958). *The Letters of Emily Dickinson*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP.

Lease, Benjamin. (1998). Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. *An Emily Dickinson Encyclopedia*. Jane Donahue Eberwein. (Ed.) Westport: Greenwood Press. 139–41.

Murray, Aife. (2009). *Maid as Muse*. Durham, NH: Univ. of New Hampshire Press.

Phillips, Kate. (2003). *Helen Hunt Jackson: A Literary Life*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Sewall, Richard B. (1974). *The Life of Emily Dickinson*. 2 vols. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Whitetaker, Rosemary. (1986, Spring). Legacy Profile: Helen Hunt Jackson (1830–1855). *Legacy* 3.1, 56–61.

YoRAP 2012–2013「〈"女"同士の絆〉を考える」報告
Women's Friendship and Literature
―文学の世界における女性同士の絆
Saturday, 16th, February, 2013

A Gilded Cage: Women's Literary Associations in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century France and England

Barnaby Ralph
Tokyo Women's Christian University

As scholars of literature and the broader humanities, we often find ourselves asked (or wondering ourselves) what it is all for. What does our study achieve? Does the world really need endless books, papers and articles interpreting and reinterpreting Ezra Pound, Emily Dickenson or W. Somerset Maugham?

When I am asked about this, I ask people to consider the following scenario. Imagine a country in which half of the population is deprived of their rights by the other half. They cannot vote, there are almost no jobs open to them, and movement is severely restricted. This is, of course, the pre-feminist-movement world. I consider here one of the ways in which the roots of the movement go back to 17th-century France, and rest upon the foundations of women's friendship and an intellectual climate created by the study of the humanities.

The interesting thing about this intellectual climate is that it was tolerated-and sometimes even encouraged-as an outlet by the controlling patriarchal discoursic paradigm. Letting women read and talk to each other may generally have been thought to be harmless in terms of its social impact, yet it turned out to be anything but.

The key ideas about the way in which this worked are those of discourse, as noted, and performativity, the latter in the sense commonly employed

by Judith Butler. The dominant discourse required the performance-the inhabiting-of gender roles within social boundaries, but the very performance of such roles allowed those governed by the subjugating discourse gaining power, in economic, political and intellectual terms.

1 French Salons

The salons of the time were allowed by Louis XIII (r. 1610–1643) and Cardinal Mazarin. They were an upper-class phenomenon, yet a large part of their influence sprang from the fact that, as it was women involved, the normal male hierarchical structures were applied differently. Therefore, it was more likely to find bourgeoisie writers, philosophers and artists valued than within the more formalized *Académies* that infested the French artistic world.

It seems to be the case that the salon was, on the surface, feminine, both culturally and socially. Nevertheless, it was more complex considering the backdrop: the male dominated discourses of intellectualism and the arts were placed within a feminine arena. Women were expected to talk, primarily, about what men did, as Simone de Beauvoir noted in *The Second Sex*. The evolution of the salon followed the interrelation between genders and classes through 17th and 18th centuries. The complexities thus created had a tremendous impact on the feminine literary practice within the salon context.

There were, of course, backlashes, such as the 1694 *Contre les femmes* (1694), part of the *querelle des femmes* argued by such notable misogynists as Nicholas Boileau. It has been argued that the eighteenth century actually saw a backsliding of social progress, and that the salons became increasingly male-dominated for a number of reasons. A seed had, however, been planted that was to find more fertile soil elsewhere. Therefore, let us now turn our gaze across the Channel.

2 English Literary Organizations

England had, arguably, a much stronger tradition of female writers, from Lady Mary Wroth, who has been the subject of recent discussion by Professor Akiko Kusunoki, to the Quaker women who, following the Restoration, wrote numerous pamphlets justifying the behaviour of their husbands. Generally, in seventeenth-and eighteenth-century England, female writers modeled their work on that of their French counterparts in terms of theme and structure, as they did with the organizations for social interaction. The salon in France was sociologically not mainstream, but still highly influential. It was, however, a phenomenon rooted in upper-class sensibilities, whereas that in England was much more of a middle-class activity. Women were increasingly educated and wealthy, with significant leisure time. Thus, their money gave them a certain amount of power, as we shall see. This was further driven by a growth in the literacy rate. Around 1750, it was about 40% (it was 60% for men)

In England in the eighteenth century, salon-type activities such as the drinking of tea with the consequent discussion of literature and the arts became social activities centred on women, to which many men were drawn, although one might observe that they needed to enter such a complex new world more as supplicants than conquerors. This was so much so, in fact, that those men who joined salon-like activities were often considered effeminate. Literary friendship societies arose that were overwhelmingly populated by women, and their importance was such that producers of plays tended to seek their opinions in terms of the works chosen and even in alterations to the texts, designed to flatter 'feminine' sensibilities.

Thus, where in France the discourses of class, gender and money were in conflict, in the cheerfully mercantile long eighteenth century of England, commerce was king-or, indeed, queen.

3 Later Manifestations

As any historian of Feminism will tell you, women's literary societies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were hotbeds of discontent with regard to the imposed social order. Many of these are very well documented, such as the Blue Stockings Society, which was founded in the 1750s, and the *Manchester Ladies' Literary Society*, whose Lydia Becker (the same Becker who published the *Women's Suffrage Journal* between 1870 and 90) had an interesting correspondence with Charles Darwin. Educating women in the sciences was yet another important step towards emancipation.

Conclusion

Franz Fanon, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, his primary work on oppression, theorized that the force of social change needed to rest its foundations upon the manipulation of the *lumpenproletariat*, as they were the ones with nothing to lose. Astonishingly, the type of quiet social revolution that sprang from the combination of female friendship and literature did not develop in this way at all, but rather was the result of a gradual overcoming of discourses from within, rather than without. It was, at core, a performative exercise in that women developed power and influence while remaining within socially proscribed boundaries of the feminine.

It was a slow revolution, partly because, for a long time, even the participants had no idea that it was going on. Once, however, momentum had been achieved and the goals were defined, there was suddenly an entire middle class of educated women fully cognizant of their powers as both social and economic entities. They knew, in other words, that they were oppressed, and they knew that they had tools with which to fight this oppression, with the results that we all know and the names that resonate heroically to this day.

As for the secondary question, raised at the beginning of this discussion,

of whether or not literature study matters, the answer has-surely-to be yes. This example is vindication enough by itself, but it is only one of many. The abolition of slavery began as a literary experiment, as did numerous other social revolutions, both positive and negative. Studying the humanities educates a population and keeps its members alive to the possibility of questioning what might otherwise be taken as fundamental. It is a way of encouraging choice and intellectual freedoms.

YoRAP 2012–2013「〈"女"同士の絆〉を考える」報告
Women's Friendship and Literature
—文学の世界における女性同士の絆
Saturday, 16th, February, 2013

The Desire for Sisterhood: Shirley Jackson's Heroines and the Complexity of Female Companionship

Samantha LANDAU
ICU Graduate School/Center for Gender Studies, Research Institute Assistant

Introduction

In existing scholarship, more often than not, female companionship is reduced to either wicked or helpful with no in between. This rather negative interpretation creates a lack that forces us to ask ourselves whether women's literary history, as scholar Betsy Erkkila argues, is a "site of dissension, contingency, and ongoing struggle rather than a separate space of some untroubled and essentially cooperative accord among women," or whether it is far more complicated (Erkkila, 3). The contrast between this somehow reduced form and irreducibility of the actual relationships produces an interesting predicament-be it between blood-relatives or friends, female companionship cannot and should not be reduced to either positive or negative, but be allowed to exist, as all human relationships do, in a more ambiguous state.

This ambiguous state allows us to go past the terminology of "sisterhood" defined as friendship and companionship between non-blood-related women and "sisters" defined as those related by blood. Further, it opens the door to discuss how sisters can be companions or not, and how women who are not blood-related can have a deep level of companionship comparable to the level of sisters. Judith Butler, in her seminal work on Sophocles's *Antigone*, presents both the opinion of Hegel,

who defines kinship as a "relation of 'blood' rather than one of norms" and the opinion of Lacan, who separates kinship from the social sphere through the symbolic (3).

Lacan's interpretation is also apropos for the novels of Shirley Jackson.[1] Jackson's works blur the line between friendship and sisterly affection through the heroine's desire to make all friends sisters and all sisters friends, thereby creating a symbolic "home" for herself (the ultimate desire). While the reader often lives by the saying "you can choose your friends but you can't choose your family," Jackson's heroines rebel; they seem to tell us that we can choose both our family and our friends. As a result, Jackson's heroines have a tendency to disassociate from their blood relations in order to re-identify themselves in a new social context (or fantasy), or choose who in their family deserves to be kin and who does not. Following Lacan's interpretation of kinship rather than that of Hegel, this lecture examined how that tradition of complex sibling relationships in Western literature gave rise to the complicated nature of sisterhood present in Jackson's novel *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*.

Literary sisters, Sisterhood in Literature

Before analyzing *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*, some exemplary fairy tales, myths and verse provided key background to the image of sisterhood in Western literature. There are four main types of sisterhood/sister relationships that Jackson has complicated into the two texts: sisters who are each other's compliment, sisters who fight and then reconcile, sisters who are represented as "wicked siblings" and remain unrepentant and female companions or friends who fulfill the role/function of sisters. The first may be interpreted psychoanalytically as facets of the same personality; the second is representative of psychological growth-individuation-but has not been addressed by psychoanalysis enough because brother-sister or child-parent relationships are given more

emphasis; the third is addressed at length by scholars who adhere to the discourse of strife among women; and the fourth may be due to rejection by a real sister/wicked sister and/or loss of a real sibling.

Some, like Grimm's "Snow White and Rose Red" are perfect opposites in perfect harmony. They are not only praised by their parents for their good behavior and sisterly love, they demonstrate their cooperation in the story by helping both the bear and the dwarf; further, they are rewarded for their efforts with marriage to two brothers; it is assumed that they then live happily ever after, together.

Sisters who fight and reconcile may do so against a common enemy, as in the story of "Bluebeard," collected by Charles Perrault. Two sisters, neither of whom desire to marry Bluebeard, quarrel over who should have to go with him. They soon reconcile, however, when the younger one gets into trouble by becoming too curious and opening the only room in the house forbidden to her: a room that contains the bodies of Bluebeard's former wives. Bluebeard, upon discovering the elder comes to her rescue by calling their brothers to rescue them both.

Others exemplify the sister who is unable to understand the heroine and/or is jealous of her good fortune, like those of Psyche, in the Greek myth of Eros and Psyche. In some versions of the tale, Psyche's sisters can neither see Eros, nor his palace; they believe Psyche to have gone mad.[2] In other versions, their vindictive and jealous acts cause their demise.[3]

While myths and fairy tales present sisters in a more "archetypical" form, later literary works involve sisters who are a combination of more than one type. One should mention those that arise in Shakespeare's plays; however, they are less relevant to our discussion, as they are more often bonds of animosity rather than companionship. For example, Bianca and Katherine in Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* are at odds not only over their differences in personality, but also their radically different outlooks on society. They reconcile only through marriage, and the viewer cannot be

sure whether they will ever really like each other. In *King Lear*, the sisters Gonerill and Regan are pernicious and conniving; furthermore, after the third sister Cordelia is banished, they fight amongst themselves and Gonerill ends up poisoning Regan and then committing suicide. While Cordelia seems to forgive them, their bond cannot ever be one of friendship.

In contrast to Shakespeare's sisters, horribly at odds with each other, Sophocles's Antigone and Ismene are inseparable until they quarrel over the burial of their brother, Polyneices, in Sophocles's *Antigone*. From Antigone's perspective, their relationship is antagonistic; Ismene has betrayed her sister, and worse, betrayed their faith/customs, in refusing to help Antigone bury their brother against the King's decree. Yet Ismene offers to share in Antigone's fate; or stand in judgment in her stead:

> Ismene: But amid your troubles I am not ashamed to make myself your companion in misfortune.
> Antigone: Whose deed it was, Hades and the dead can testify. I do not care for a friend who shows her friendship in words.
> Ismene: No, sister, do not refuse me the right to die with you and pay tribute to the dead.
> Antigone: Do not share my death, and do not lay claim to things in which you had no hand. My dying will suffice (Sophocles, 540–548).

It is clear that Ismene wishes to share the blame with Antigone for the burial. But her motive is unclear from the text: whether she wishes to take credit for Antigone's adherence to their faith, or whether she would rather die with her sister than see her sister suffer (or lose her), we do not know. The play, focusing on Antigone's perspective and actions, does not give us a chance to delve too deeply into Ismene's inner thoughts. It is clear, however, that Ismene wants both a sister and a companion in Antigone. Yet

Antigone, with her words, "I do not care for a friend who shows her friendship in words," rejects *both*.

In poetry, the sisters Lizzie and Laura of Christina Rossetti's "The Goblin Market" not only present companionship with sexual overtones, they are so inseparable that one cannot live without the other. They are both tempted by the fruits from the Goblin Market, but it is Laura who eats the forbidden food, and Laura who then dwindles away with obsession — because only those who have not eaten the fruit can hear its sellers hawking. Lizzie braves the same fate by going to get her the same Goblin fruits that made Laura sick as the anti-dote to make her well. The poem concludes with Laura telling her children how her sister is the most important person in her life:

> "For there is no friend like a sister
> In calm or stormy weather;
> To cheer one on the tedious way,
> To fetch one if one goes astray,
> To lift one if one totters down,
> To strengthen whilst one stands." (Rossetti, 47)

Sisters, Laura seems to be telling her children, are more than blood relations; they are one's lifeline. Further, they can pull "life out of death" (Rossetti, 41). In other words, sisters can be each other's salvation and, perhaps, resurrection. Their faith, undisturbed by the more broad social order (one notes that no one tells Lizzie not to save Laura), can subscribe a definition of sister that is both kin and best friend.

Thus, we find sisterly relationships complicated by perspective: on one hand, a sister may truly present herself to be wicked, vindictive and conniving. On the other hand, the companionship of sisters may be a matter of life and death, as with Lizzie and Laura in Rossetti's poem. In

more ambiguous cases, such as that of Antigone and Ismene, sisters may find themselves at odds, one longing for companionship and the other rejecting that desire.

In modern literature, the line between sisterhood and sister can become more ambiguous still, complicated both with the desire to connect as friends and the social burden to take care of each other as an inseparable family unit. The sisters in Shirley Jackson's stories present a prime example of this ambiguity. More often than not, the stories also feature psychologically disturbed heroines who experience difficulties with their families and their surroundings. Some of those heroines quest for something stable to call "home" and people to call "family." It is important to note that Jackson does not emphasize the importance of family as equivalent to blood relationships as much as she emphasizes family as a psychological or psychic connection.

The Complexity of Female Companionship in *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*

We Have Always Lived in the Castle presents the story of two sisters whose relationship is complicated by a secret of parricide: the story's narrator, Mary Katherine Blackwood (nicknamed Merricat), has poisoned most of her family by putting arsenic into the sugar bowl at dinner, and made her sister, Constance, into her accomplice. Constance was put on trial instead of Merricat and subsequently aquitted. Following the legal ordeal, the two sisters continue to live in the venerable Blackwood family estate with their Uncle Julian, who survived the poisoning but was mentally disabled by it. The story starts just before Constance and Merricat's cousin Charles comes to visit and tries to take possession of the house and the family's belongings and bring them back to the city with him. While Constance is being indecisive about whether to leave or stay, Merricat's antagonism towards Charles escalates, resulting in the burning of the mansion. All but

the back rooms of the first floor are reduced to ash; Uncle Julian dies, but Merricat and Constance escape and hide in the woods. Afterward, they return to the house, and Charles' final attempts to lure them away fail. Merricat and Constance decide to remain in the house, basically living only in the kitchen; Merricat remarks that they have come to live on the moon at last, and their house, which "smelled of smoke and ruin" "was a castle, turreted and open to the sky" (Jackson, 177). *We Have Always Lived in the Castle* is story with complex imagery and character development as well as a heavy plotline that is deeply connected to the theme of sisterhood as an alternative to the patriarchal social order.

First, despite the very gothic overtone, much of the book comes off as darkly comic, and the harmony between the sisters echoes that of Snow White and Rose Red, Lizzie and Laura. Merricat describes her sister thusly:

> When I was small I thought Constance was a fairy princess. I used to try to draw her picture, with long golden hair and eyes as blue as the crayon could make them, and a bright pink spot on either cheek; the pictures always surprised me, because she *did* look like that; even at the worst time she was pink and white and golden, and nothing had ever seemed to dim the brightness of her. She was the most precious person in my world, always (Jackson, 28).

This description sounds more like something out of a fairy tale than a description of a real person. Merricat has a tendency to describe the world around her in terms of story-telling, not unlike the aforementioned Grimm's or Perrault's heroines. Like those heroines, her story-world is real, and it revolves entirely around the magical atmosphere she has woven around her sister, the center of her world. We are not privy to Constance's thoughts, as the story is narrated by Merricat. However, it is obvious through Constance's actions (washing the arsenic-laden sugar bowl so

Merricat is not accused, cooking for her constantly, and staying with her in the burnt-out house rather than seek comfort elsewhere) that the relationship is reciprocal.

The narration of *We Have Always Lived in the Castle* relies heavily on the implied mental instability of the narrator, Merricat, to give an uncanny perspective of the tragic events that befall the Blackwood family both before and after the trial. Merricat's remarkable strangeness is evident from the very first paragraph of the story. Therein, she states that if she had been lucky she would "have been born a werewolf," dislikes both baths and dogs, and likes her sister and the death cup mushroom (Jackson, 1). Seemingly random pieces of information like this abound in Merricat's narration: she repeatedly states that she wishes she could "live on the moon;" she takes items from the house and buries them, nails them to trees, or breaks them in significant fashion in a way that reminds one of totems.[4] All of these objects once belonged to her deceased parents and represent their fractured power. Therefore, it may be extrapolated that she is using their latent power to protect herself and her sister from unnamed enemies, which exist past the boundaries of the drive and the woods beyond the house itself, and who desire to revert the Blackwood home back into a locus of the patriarchal order.

While humans normally understand their identities as separate beings through the process of individuation, Merricat instead determines her individuality as a discrete being by linguistically and physically constructing signs and symbols (totems) that further her separation from the rest of society. By using these symbols, she both connects and distances herself from the past of the Blackwood family, which she perceives as a threat. Her skills of determining the difference between the objects that belonged to her family and her feelings for her family, whether love or hate, have been destroyed. Having replaced her family with the objects themselves, she separates herself from the morality that had been

imposed upon her by the social order in her household prior to their deaths and therefore feels no remorse for having murdered them. One might suppose at this point that Merricat is insane because she cannot differentiate between real objects and their representations anymore. The objects delegated as protective totems are merely phantoms of anxiety and nostalgia, belonging to a prior time when Merricat asserts that her parents cared about her and her family was at the top of the town hierarchy.

Constance seems to understand and even encourage her sister's delusions. Thus, significantly, Merricat wishes to live in the sphere of comfort and unconditional love provided to her by her sister. This sphere rejects all forces and persons representative of the old order, which she associates with oppression. In other words, Merricat desires to make real her perception of a mothering ideal to which her mother miserably failed to reach — but which her sister Constance represents to her. Constance, in turn, wants to embody her sister's ideal. According to Julia Kristeva, this presents a kind of projective identification, or "since I do not wish to know that I hate her, she hates me."[5] In other words, the hatred that the sisters feel towards their mother is expressed only as her hatred for them. That hatred enables Merricat and Constance replace their negative mother-daughter relationship with their positive sisterly bond.

Perhaps Merricat's parents never treated their daughters badly; we are given no evidence either way. We only know that her sister Constance does treat her in the way she wishes to be treated. Kristeva tells us that the child in question, who refuses to admit that it is she who hated her parents and not her parents who hated her, need not elaborate on the subject of hatred. She desires merely to assimilate her parents in order to replace them. Assimilating her parents by murdering them gives her the power to choose their replacement (Kristeva, *New Maladies of the Soul*, 186). She has destroyed her mother in order to install her elder sister in the role of

mother instead, and in doing so, also rejects her place in the household as an adult. It seems a warping of the concept of the Oedipal complex, in which one desires to replace one's parents by way of violent revolt and murder (Ibid.). Nevertheless, it is this transgression that precipitates Merricat's further delusions: by murdering her parents and destroying their home, she has stormed the castle and violently overthrown the family hierarchy. In so doing, achieved her ultimate *happiness*: to live in an alternative social order defined by sisterly friendship.

This happiness is threatened only by Cousin Charles's visit. She blames his ability to intrude upon their relationship on the failure of her totems:

> Charles had only gotten in because the magic was broken; if I could re-seal the protection around Constance and shut Charles out he would have to leave the house. Every touch he made on the house must be erased.
> "Charles is a ghost," I said, and Constance sighed (Jackson, 99).

Not only is Merricat referring to "magic" here, she also refers to Charles as a "ghost." He is indeed a ghost in that he recalls their deceased father and mother, a ghost of the patriarchal order that Merricat thought she had destroyed. As a ghost, Charles belongs to a land of the supernatural beyond human control, and can infiltrate Merricat's "protection." But Charles is no match for the sisters' co-dependency and fierce loyalty to each other. Instead of being able to coax Constance into coming away with him, he only succeeds in making Merricat hate him; at first, Constance is willing to differentiate herself from Merricat. But eventually, because Merricat hates him, Constance comes to doubt him too. Like Lizzie and Laura, Constance and Merricat loathe being at odds, and further, are unwilling to allow anyone else to intrude on their relationship. Thus, if Merricat hates someone, Constance logically seems to follow.

The intense bond between the sisters is not only visible through Merricat's hatred and rejection of Charles; it is also symbolized by the kitchen and Constance's obsession with it. After the Blackwood Estate is burnt by angry villagers at the end of the story, the top floors, the parlour, and the dining room, all are burnt and uninhabitable, perhaps indicating that a hierarchy has been completely destroyed along with that part of the house: the dining room was the scene of the parricide, the parlour where the matriarchs entertained guests (a custom that Merricat disdained despite admiring the room itself), the upper rooms proof of where the family lived and slept (but also where Merricat was often punished by being sent up to bed without supper). Out of all of those many rooms, the disarray of the kitchen is the only thing that shocks Constance.

> "My kitchen," Constance said. "My kitchen."
>
> She stood in the doorway, looking. I thought that we had somehow not found our way back correctly through the night, that we had somehow lost ourselves and come back through the wrong gap in time, or the wrong door, or the wrong fairy tale. Constance put her hand against the door frame to steady herself, and said again, "My kitchen, Merricat" (Jackson, 167–8).

The kitchen, which has been the scene of many important moments between the sisters, is rendered here as a sacred space and its defilement leaves the sisters questioning reality, wondering whether they went through "the wrong door" or even made a leap through time. It is also in this scene that the sisters decide to re-consecrate the kitchen as the only room that they will inhabit in the burnt-out house-and both insist that they are "so happy" (Jackson, 214). Constance's focus on food as a main indicator of the ability to provide for one's family, especially good-tasting food prepared with a merry attitude, recalls the sphere of "happy homemaking,"

and the sphere of many "happy" Blackwood wives and mothers and is also deeply connected to Merricat's ideal of womanhood. It is curious then that Merricat should idealize what her sister makes, instead of her mother or foremothers. Dietary organization and nutrition may also be read as a "full acceptance of archaic and gratifying relationship to the mother" and of "a prolific and protective motherhood" (Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 115). If the reconciliation between mother and daughter can be achieved through satisfying the body's need for nourishment (Ibid.), it is certainly significant that their mother was more concerned with keeping them out of the drawing room, where she entertained her guests than she was with the preparation of the food (Jackson, 33–34). After their mother's death, Constance and Merricat live almost all of their lives in the kitchen and "toward the back of the house, on the lawn and the garden where no one else ever came," as if they no longer need to pretend that the other rooms of the house have meaning for them (Ibid., 28). The only thing they do worry about is the fragility of their hermit existence, which is best represented by the two teacups, which Constance fears might break at any moment (Jackson, 212). Even without a handle, a cup can be used. However, for Constance, who has already lost most of her kitchen wares and supplies from previous generations of women, the breaking of one more item would remind her of what they lost, instead of allowing her to focus on what she has gained: the companionship of her sister.

The happiness of the sisters in *We Have Always Live in the Castle* is one characterized by murder and destruction of both the traditional family structure and societal values. Rather than mother/daughterhood as reigning central to the growth of Jackson's female characters, it is the nurturing of sisterhood that becomes privileged because it circumvents the social order and creates a narcissistic world in which Merricat will be cared for but never punished. While it may be said that "mother/daughterhood is ... one of the most persistent ways that feminism has

articulated women's alternative networks of communication," Jackson's novel has a more profound statement to make about the image of sisterly affection (Williams, 52). In choosing to live in the remains of her burnt house with her sister, Jackson only companions, female or otherwise, that Merricat and Constance need are each other. Thus sisterhood in *We Have Always Lived in the Castle* triumphs over the patriarchal order. Perhaps it is not exactly the way Antigone would have liked to have triumphed over Creon, but it is certainly something.

Conclusion

In conclusion, sisterly relationships in Western literature present a complex image of female companionship. In the works briefly examined in this presentation, from fairy tales and myth to modern novels, sisterhood is represented as both a blood tie and a friendship that has the power to sustain life. In Shirley Jackson's works, the propensity of her heroines to choose their sisters over the social order is represented in the relationship between Merricat and Constance in *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*. Their relationship recalls those of other sisters in literature, such as Lizzie and Laura of Rossetti's "Goblin Market" and presents itself in juxtaposition to the relationships of sisters in discord like those of Shakespeare's *King Lear* and the Oedipus plays of Sophocles.

Inseparable friendships between sisters evoke an ambiguity that asks us to challenge our ideas about the role of sister as merely "wicked" or "good." These relationships force us to reexamine our own definition of sisterhood and its place in the social hierarchy of both society and family. Family and the social order do seem to circumscribe sisterhood, yet sisters stand apart from it unyielding. Whether real, or fiction, we should reconsider the importance of female companionship and its effects in our reading and discussion of literature.

Footnotes

[1] Born in California in 1916, Shirley Hardie Jackson completed 6 full-length novels, numerous short stories and humorous autobiographical tales before her sudden death in 1965 of heart failure. Jackson's works focus on "her interest in the dark side of human nature" (Bloom, 1996). For that reason, some reviewers of Shirley Jackson's literature have compared her to traditionally gothic authors. Although her authorial universe may recall gothic style of the works of James and Hawthorne, its seams cannot be described by a simple lack of rationale in regards to the supernatural, or a perversion caused by commitment to obtaining knowledge beyond worldly means. There is, indeed, nothing so ordinary about the way Shirley Jackson treats her heroines.

[2] See C. S. Lewis's lesser-known work, *Till We Have Faces*, in which the relationship between the sisters features prominently.

[3] Apuleius addresses this type of sisterly antagonism in his version of the tale. See 61–66.

[4] Simply speaking, symbol or sign with a deep relationship to a projected emotion. For example, a neurotic cannot consciously admit his or her feelings with regard to his or her mother, so he or she must project those feelings onto an object symbolic of his or her mother. Freud examines this topic in depth in his essay "Totem and Taboo." See Freud, "Totem and Taboo," 1–162.

[5] Kristeva describes the modern situation of a growing number of borderline, narcissistic and psychosomatic patients who misidentify, engage in projective identification, narcissistic reiteration, or have other troubles with verbal representations that do not really demonstrate the difference between the I and the other. See Kristeva, *New Maladies of the Soul*, 179.

Selected Bibliography

Apuleius. *Cupid & Psyche*. E. J. Kenney. (Ed.). (1990). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bank, Stephen & Kahn, Michael D. (1982). Intense Sibling Loyalties. In *Sibling Relationships: Their Nature and Significance Across the Lifespan*. Michael E. Lamb & Brian Sutton-Smith. (Eds.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. pp. 251–266.

Butler, Judith. (2000). *Antigone's Claim: Kinship Between Life and Death*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Erkkila, Betsy. (1992). *The Wicked Sisters: Women Poets, Literary History and Discord*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freud, Sigmund. (1986). Totem and Taboo. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 13, Trans. and Gen. Ed. James Strachey, with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1955. London: The Hogarth Press, Ltd. and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis. pp. 1–162.

- - - . (1986). Loss of Reality in Neurosis and Psychosis (1924). In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 19. Trans. and Gen. Ed. James Strachey, with Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. 1955. London: The Hogarth Press, Ltd. and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis. pp. 182–187.

Hirai, Masako. (1998). *Sisters in Literature: Female Sexuality in Antigone, Middlemarch, Howards End and Women in Love*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Jackson, Shirley. (1984). *We Have Always Lived in the Castle*. (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Kristeva, Julia. (1982). *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (Leon S. Roudiez, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1980)

- - - . (1995). *New Maladies of the Soul*. (Ross Guberman, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1993)

Levin, Amy K. (1992). *The Supressed Sister: A Relationship in Novels by Nineteenth-and Twentieth-Century British Women*. London: Associated University Presses.

Murphy, Bernice. (Ed.). (2005). *Shirley Jackson: Essays on the Literary Legacy*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Noel, Daniel. (Ed.). (2011). Snow White and Rose Red. In *The Fairy Tales of the Brothers Grimm*. (Matthew P. Price & Noel Daniel, Trans.). Köln, Germany: Taschen. pp. 251–265.

Oppenheimer, Judy. (1988). *Private Demons: The Life of Shirley Jackson*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Perrault, Charles. (1993). Bluebeard. In *The Complete Fairy Tales of Charles Perrault*. (Neil Philip & Nicoletta Simborowski, Trans.). New York, NY: Clarion Books. pp. 35–44.

Rossetti, Christina. (1939). The Goblin Market. In *Goblin Market*. London: G. G. Harrap.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Elspeth Bain, Jonathan Morris & Rob Smith. (Eds.). (1992). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Showalter, Elaine. (1991). *Sister's Choice: Tradition and Change in American Women's Writing*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sophocles. *Sophocles: Antigone*. Andrew Brown. (Ed.). (1987). Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips Ltd..

Williams, Linda R. (1986). 'Happy Families? Feminist Reproduction and Matrilineal Thought' New Feminist Discourses. In *Feminist Literary Theory*. Mary Eagleton. (Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.