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STEPHEN CRANE'S "BRIDE" AS COUNTERMYTH OF THE WEST

JULES ZANGER

It has become a critical cliche to recognize Stephen Crane's "The Bride Comes to Yellow Sky" as a parody of the traditional, cliche-ridden Western. His transformations of that form's conventional hero, heroine, and badman, as well as of the climactic, de rigueur shootout are amusing and obvious. In the story Crane depicted the Pullman journey of a middle-aged, honeymooning couple, Jack Potter, a Texas marshal, and his plain, "under-class" bride, to their home in Yellow Sky. There they are confronted by the rampaging Scratchy Wilson, the last of the badmen, who on learning that the marshal has taken a wife, holsters his revolvers and slouches off in confused disappointment, "a simple child of the earlier plains."

Eric Solomon, in his *Stephen Crane: From Parody to Realism*, writes, "All the donnees of the Western story are reversed; the empty forms are shattered. The marshall is an unarmed honeymooner; the gunman is a childish old man; the gunfight is aborted." Donald B. Gibson describes it as "a spoof on the kind of sentimental Western fiction written earlier by Bret Harte and the many lesser writers who have turned out drivel about the frontier West ever since."2

The identification of this particular parodic intention of Crane's story seems unassailable, if a little reductive; why, however, Crane should have chosen to parody what had become in his own time a moribund and juvenile mode—"drivel" and "empty forms"—and why McClure's, the leading muckraking journal in America, should have chosen to publish such a self-limiting parody are questions that perhaps deserve consideration.

THE MYTH OF THE WEST

I believe that "Bride," beyond its parodic deflating of a minor popular juvenile form, was a response to what was in 1898 a much broader...
and more significant issue: the transformation of an American myth of the West, not by reality, but by an alternative myth empowering and justifying the extension of an eastern, bourgeois hegemony of values. Western lands from the beginning had been settled by large corporate groups for mining, lumbering, and agricultural purposes. Following this pattern, in the last decades of the century the open range was transformed into the Cattle Kingdom, divided into baronies, some as large as a hundred miles long, mainly held by corporations that had sprung into being as the railroads penetrated the Great Plains. The great cattle boom attracted not only eastern entrepreneurs but also British and continental investors who competed for range and cattle rights. Ray Billington observes that “by the end of 1885 the Plains country was entangled in a barbed-wire network.” Though this pattern of settlement did not actually mark a significant change in the economic development of the West, it did violate a deeply held popular perception. The new West was a precarious amalgam of feudal authority and venture capital that in most regards was the opposite of that individualistic, pastoral, democratic myth of the West that had dominated the American imagination throughout the earlier part of the century.

Consequently, this transformed West of wired pastures and corporate investment required a transformed myth that would justify these departures from tradition, invite eastern confidence, and obscure the new West's unchecked entrepreneurial aggressiveness, an aggressiveness beginning to be threatened in the industrial East by unionization and legislative controls. The new myth was to take the form of a celebration of the West as the true, essential America, embodying Anglo-Saxon ideals and achievements, not simply in opposition to western savagery, but to eastern decadence and metropolitanism as well.

A leading articulator of this vision was Theodore Roosevelt, who had invested a fifth of his fortune in two cattle ranches in the Dakota Badlands. Out of his experience in the West, Roosevelt wrote three frequently reprinted books, Hunting Trips of a Ranchman (1885), Ranch Life and the Hunting Trail (1888), and The Wilderness Hunter (1893), as well as numerous articles, in which he romantically idealized the West and especially the cowboys and, at the same time, reassuringly insisted on their potential for bourgeois co-option, assimilation, and appropriation. This was a relatively new perception. In the decade of the 1870s, according to Henry Nash Smith, “the term ‘herder’ was as likely to be used as the classic name of ‘cowboy’ and it usually called up the image of a semibarbarous laborer who lived a dull, monotonous life of hard fare and poor shelter.” Whether regarded as semibarbarous or as ruggedly individualistic, the cowboy was seen as possessing an untameable, even sinister potential for anarchic violence.

In Roosevelt’s books written in the 1880s, however, the cowboys are “sinewy, hardy, self-reliant, their life forces them to be both daring and adventurous, and the passing over their heads of a few years leaves printed on their faces certain lines which tell of dangers quietly fronted and hardships uncomplainingly endured.” These are the new heroes, he tells the reader: “In place of these heroes of a bygone age, the men who were clad in buckskin and carried long rifles, stands, or rather rides, the bronzed and sinewy cowboy, as picturesque and self-reliant, as dashing and resolute as the saturnine Indian fighters whose place he has taken.” Despite these heroic and adventurous qualities, the image Roosevelt presents of his cowboys is comfortably domestic:

My home ranch stands on the river brink. From the low, long veranda, shaded by leafy cottonwoods, one looks across sand bars and shallows to a strip of meadowland, behind which rises a line of sheer cliffs and grassy plateaus. This veranda is a pleasant place in the summer evenings when a cool breeze stirs along the river and blows in the faces of the tired men who loll back in their rocking chairs (what true American does not enjoy a rocking chair?), book in hand... The long winter evenings are spent sitting around the
hearth stone, while the pine logs roar and crackle, and the men play checkers and chess in the firelight.  

In *The Rough Riders* (1899), appropriately prefaced by a Bret Harte poem, Roosevelt adopts Harte’s technique of discovering in his crude and violent characters those sterling qualities most reassuring to his eastern readers. Where Harte, however, reveals the capacity for gentleness and love in his roughest characters, as he does in “The Luck of Roaring Camp,” Roosevelt discovers patriotism, loyalty, and the capacity for discipline, service, and obedience. He begins by describing his recruits:

They were to a man born adventurers, in the old sense of the word. . . . Some of them went by their own name; some had changed their names; and yet others possessed but half a name, colored by some adjective, like Cherokee Bill, Happy Jack of Arizona, Smoky Moore, the broncobuster, so named because cowboys often call vicious horses . . . “smoky” horses, and Rattlesnake Pete, who had lived among the Moquis and taken part in the snake dances. Some were professional gamblers, and, on the other hand, no less than four were or had been Baptist or Methodist clergymen—and proved first-class fighters, too, by the way. Some were men whose lives in the past had not been free from the taint of those fierce kinds of crime into which the lawless spirits who dwell on the border-land between civilization and savagery so readily drift.

Nevertheless, he reassures his readers,

The men were singularly quick to respond to any appeal to their intelligence and patriotism. The faults they committed were those of ignorance merely. When Holderman [the Indian cook], in announcing dinner to the Colonel and the three Majors, genially remarked, ‘If you fellars don’t come soon, everything’l get cold,’ he had no thought of other than a kindly and respectful regard for their welfare, and was glad to modify his form of address on being told that it was not what could be described as conventionally military. . . . It was astonishing how soon the men got over these little peculiarities. They speedily grew to recognize the fact that the observance of certain forms was essential to the maintenance of proper discipline. They became scrupulously careful in touching their hats, and always came to attention when spoken to. 

At a time when the East was being massively transformed by the influx of the “New Immigrants” from southern and eastern Europe, the West had become for Roosevelt and many like him—eastern, Ivy-League educated, well-born, and wealthy—a last bastion of the Anglo-Saxon establishment. In this period Roosevelt shared his beliefs with his friends Henry Cabot Lodge and Madison Grant, who in 1915 was to write the elegiac *The Passing of the Great Race*, a racial vision of history derived from the theories of Gustave Le Bon, leading Roosevelt to support immigration restriction. At best, Roosevelt’s attitude toward foreigners was an amused condescension. In *The Wilderness Hunter*, he approvingly wrote,

Native Americans predominate among the dwellers in and on the borders of the wilderness and in the wild country over which the great herds of the cattlemen roam; and they take the lead in every way. The sons of the Germans, Irish, and other European newcomers are usually quick to claim to be “straight United States,” and to disavow all kinship with the fellow countrymen of their fathers.

Owen Wister, another member of the Roosevelt circle, particularly emphasized the ethnic background of the cowboy in his essay “The Evolution of the Cowpuncher”: “the knight and the cowboy are nothing but the same Saxon in different environments, the polished man in London and the man unpolished in Texas.” Roosevelt’s friend and illustrator, Frederic Rem-
ilton was less moderate than either in his
ethnic predispositions; in a letter to his friend
Poulton Bigelow he wrote, “Jews, Injuns,
Chinamen, Italians, Huns—the rubbish of the
Earth I hate—I’ve got some Winchesters and
when the massacring begins, I can get my share
of them, and what’s more, I will...”

The older western myth had emphasized its
hero’s individualism, his idiosyncratic, outlaw
(in the sense that he was outside the social
order) nature. If the West was to be rewon for
eastern interests, the westerner as wild man, as
semisavage, and the West as wilderness
landscape had to become tamed, domesticated,
ultimately utilizable and coherent. Roosevelt’s
longtime friend, admirer, and Harvard school-
mate, Owen Wister, who was introduced to the
West by Richard Trimble, manager of a Wyo-
ming cattle company and member of the no-
torius Wyoming Stock Growers Association,
first presented this new westerner in a series of
sketches in Harper’s Weekly in 1893 and then
in a novel, Lin Mclean, in 1897. Wister’s
civilizable, compatible western hero was to receive
his popular apotheosis in The Virginian in 1902.

In the course of that extremely widely read novel,
dedicated to “my dear critic” Theodore Roo-
sevelt, its cowboy hero was transformed from a
happy-go-lucky, gun-toting, prank playing “child
of the earlier plains” into a perfect bourgeois:
marrid to the new school marm, property-own-
ing, and off his horse and into a buckboard—
“an important man, with a strong grip on many
various enterprises, and able to give his wife all
and more than she asked for or desired.” Five
years earlier, Stephen Crane had anticipated
this re-vision in “Bride.” There, however, Crane
did not celebrate the bourgeois conversion.

“The Bride Comes to Yellow Sky”

A major thematic element in “Bride” is the
triumph of a bourgeois culture over a primitive
one. It is important, therefore, to recall that at
the end of the nineteenth century the American
bourgeoisie had as its critic and avowed enemy
what Peter Gay called “the implacable avant
gardes... disdaining the bourgeoisie as bereft
of taste, avid for money, and hostile to culti-
vation.” Crane the ironist was, in many sig-
nificant ways, a leading member of that avant-
garde, as a religious iconoclast, as an experi-
mental artist, as an enthusiastic critic of bour-
geois morality and hypocrisy in his writings, and
as an equally enthusiastic dissenter from that
morality in his private life. It is from this point
of view, I suggest, that “Bride” is written, rather
than from that celebratory one expressed in the
works of Wister and, before him, of Theodore
Roosevelt, in whose accounts of the West tra-
ditional bourgeois values were conjoined with
longings for aristocratic privilege and prestige.
The essential parodic target of “Bride” is not
the trivial literary form it employs but rather
the self-congratulatory bourgeois transforma-
tion it dramatizes.

The instrument of transformation in Crane’s
story is the great Pullman carrying Jack and his
bride into their new lives with all the speed and
power of the industrial age itself. Its appearance
among “the woods of light and tender trees”
had become sufficiently commonplace by the
end of the century that the oneiric and sinister
metaphor that opens the story is immediately
accessible.

The great Pullman was whirling onward with
such dignity of motion that a glance from
the window seemed simply to prove that the
plains of Texas were pouring eastward. Vast
flats of green grass, dull-hued spaces of mes-
quint and cactus, little groups of frame houses,
woods of light and tender trees, all were
sweeping into the east, sweeping over the
horizon, a precipice. (p. 109)

The shock and dismay felt earlier in the cen-
tury by Thoreau, Hawthorne, and Emerson at
the intrusion of the great hooting machine into
their pleasant Concord woods are no longer so
apparent: The landscape has now become eva-
nescent and dreamlike. Significantly, Crane’s
landscape has none of the epic grandeur—the
overwhelming mountains, stark deserts, steep
canyons—traditionally associated with the West.
Instead he shows the reader a muted, domes-
ticated, curiously fragile topography. The machine, however, is all dignity and solidity and, running on its iron schedule, denies the watcher even surprise.

Though grown familiar by the end of the century both as literary trope and as cultural experience, this conjunction of railroad train and rural American landscape remains in Crane's story filled with tension. In part this was because the myth and countermyth those images represented still were deeply rooted in the American consciousness. In part, also, each of the opposing elements is shown as containing its own negation. Scratchy Wilson represents most immediately the real toad (or snake) in the earthly garden that was the mythic West; Crane had no need to belabor the hollowness of the western pastoral. On the other hand, that vision of modernity, technology, progress, and triumphant bourgeois social order emblemized by the train had to be subverted, as we shall see, more subtly because the social forces it represented were so powerfully on the ascendant. Finally, however, Crane's presentation of the familiar trope is unsettling because he has inverted its most basic dynamic: instead of presenting the train conventionally as an intrusive, invading presence thrusting itself into the idyllic garden, we are shown, paradoxically, the "whirling," speeding train as the still center of an otherwise unsubstantial world from which all of the familiar elements of solidity and order—the farmhouse, the homestead, the earth itself—are in flight.

Crane's perception of the train as destructive of the ordered past had been comically anticipated in a newspaper article he wrote while visiting San Antonio in 1895. Instead of the Pullman, however, he wrote of its diminished, urban version, the trolley: "Trolley cars are merciless animals. They gorge themselves with relics. They make really coherent history too like an omelet. If a trolley car had trolleyed around Jericho, the city would not have fallen: it would have exploded."15

If Crane's Pullman destroys the old natural order of the West, it carries a new order emblemed in the marriage of Jack and his bride. For both Crane and his opposite number, Owen Wister, a major symbol of the changes the West was undergoing was marriage. Wister's Lin Mclean and The Virginian are as much about marriage as any Jane Austen novel and offer to the reader an idealized vision of that institution that corresponds to Wister's approving perception of the social and economic forces changing the West. The courtship of Molly Wood shows us the Virginian learning to read Shakespeare and Sir Walter Scott as well as how to settle down and invest his money. Retaining his manly western attributes, his honor and courage, his grace and speed with his six-gun, in marrying Molly and becoming a landed proprietor, the Virginian has achieved a superior degree of civilization and fulfilled the western promise of the transformation of the lowly. His achievement, however, is only part of the general transformation the West is undergoing:

By the levels of Bear Creek that reach like inlets among the promontories of the lonely hills, they [the cowboys] came upon the schoolhouse, roofed and ready for the first native Wyoming crop. It symbolized the dawn of a neighborhood, and it brought a change into the wilderness air. The feel of it struck cold upon the free spirits of the cow-punchers, and they told each other that, what with women and children and wire fences, this country would not long be a country for men.16

Crane's presentation of marriage, while as central as Wister's, is significantly different. Peter Gay has suggested that for the nineteenth century the train had become a powerful erotic symbol, "a conjunction of change and sensuality."17 Appropriately Crane links the train and sensuality by presenting his newlyweds in the charged public intimacy of the Pullman, speeding them, implicitly, toward sexual consummation. It is difficult, however, to anticipate a more awkward, embarrassed, and angular union. It is not merely that these two are not the conventional handsome hero and pretty ingenue of the traditional Western. What Crane shows us,
especially in the case of Jack, is that the bourgeois transformation involves a loss of grace, confidence, and potency, precisely those attributes of manliness so central to Roosevelt’s and Wister’s image of the heroic westerner. We see Jack, previously “a man known and feared in his own corner” (p. 111) now as “furtive and shy” (p. 109), seized with “a new cowardice” (p. 112) with fumbling hands “heavy and muscle-bound” (p. 112), and, in his encounter with Scratchy, without a gun, unmanned. In contrast, Scratchy Wilson, the unregenerate man for whom Crane shows no slightest shred of elegiac nostalgia, is described as walking with “the creeping movement of the midnight cat,” while his hands move “with an electric swiftness” and “like lightning” and “in a musician’s way” (p. 117). When he is confronted with the bride, however, he slouches heavily away, dragging his feet, his boots making “funnel shaped tracks in the heavy sand” (p. 120).

Crane’s perception of a fracturing, unraveling world both denies that earlier anarchic pastoral vision of the West and challenges the new, ordered bourgeois vision that was replacing it. Crane’s West, at least as he establishes it in “Bride,” is made up of jarring cultural discontinuities to which all of the story’s allusions to caste and race contribute.

The first section of “Bride” introduces both these elements. Jack and his bride are not “furtive and shy” in the Pullman simply because they are rustic and newlywed; they are awkward and uncomfortable because they are intensely aware that they, according to the mores of their time, are where they do not belong. At the end of the century, the Pullman was a luxury car intended for the very rich. Lord Charles Russell, who visited the United States in 1883, wrote, “It is clear that in this country of so-called equality, one thing that most strongly recommended the Pullman was the fact that it enabled the rich to create the clearest possible inequality in the conditions of even ordinary travel.” Pullman travelers in the West were customarily “a superior class—of Easterners:—it costs too much to get here for the scum of the earth to be among them.” It is this social and economic inequality that informs the amusement with which Jack and his bride are regarded by their fellow passengers and is underlined in that devastating, by today’s more hypocritical standards, description of the bride’s “under-class countenance.” When Jack suggests that they eat in the dining car where they “charge a dollar,” the bride’s response, “Charge a dollar? Why, that’s too much—for us—ain’t it, Jack?” (p. 110) wavers between an indifferent realism and a naive and plaintive hope. The correctness of her initial response is validated by the amused superiority of the Negro waiters in the diner who patronize them in a manner very like that of plantation house servants patronizing white trash. The “dazzling fittings of the coach,” the numerous mirrors, the figured velvet seats and bronze figures and frescoes, may suggest European high culture as they refer the reader to palaces and museums, but their primary allusion is not so much to European culture as it is to eastern wealth and tasteless bourgeois acquisitiveness and display: the “environment of the new estate” (p. 110) to which Jack aspires. The overwhelming impact of the Pullman on the bedazzled newlyweds is undercut for the reader by the realization that the “separated chamber” sturdily supported by a “bronce figure” can be nothing else than the toilet, and that the evocative effect of the “frescos [sic] in olive and silver” is deliberately negated by the observation that they have been painted “at convenient places on the ceiling” (p. 110).

If Jack and his bride are awkward and plain and naive, the dazzling new estate they find themselves in is at least equally flawed. The malice and snobbery of the other travelers, the porters, and the waiters, the ostentation and pretentiousness of the Pullman car, all suggest the hollowness of the culture symbolized. The social divisions expressed in the encounters between Jack and the waiters are extended in a series of allusions that suggest something of the past and future complexity of Crane’s West. In the very limited context of the story, Crane introduces references to a whole series of mar-
ginal Americans: Negro porters, Mexican sheepherders, Apache scalp-hunters, Jewish shirt-makers, eastern drummers. This West is hardly the seamless Anglo-Saxon garment Roosevelt shows us.  

The pattern of cultural disjunctions established in “Bride” is echoed by its structural and stylistic divisions. This barely twelve-page story is formally divided by Roman numerals into four separate sections, each with its own cast and locus: Jack and his bride on the train, the townsfolk in the Weary Gentleman Saloon, Scratchy on the street in front of the saloon, and, finally, the Potters and Scratchy in front of Jack’s house. The fragmented presentation of the action is made even more striking by the chronological violence done to the conventional sequence of events when section II is made to begin twenty-one minutes before the conclusion of section I.

Many of the images Crane creates contribute to this sense of disorder. John Cawelti, in his The Six-Gun Mystique, defines the Western, among other things, as “a story that takes place somewhere in the western United States in which the characters wear certain distinctive styles of clothing.” The detailed and persistent clothing imagery Crane employs in “Bride” — Jack’s new and uncomfortable black suit, the bride’s embarrassingly elaborate blue cashmere dress, Scratchy’s maroon shirt and child’s boots — in denying the conventional expectations established by the setting, further suggests a world of skewed or broken connections. From the initial verbal disjunction of “Yellow” and “Sky” in the title to that final one in which Scratchy picks up his “starboard” revolver, Crane’s style hints at an almost surreal incoherence underlying the common-sense surface of the new image of the West and represents a denial and subversion of it.

CRANE AND ROOSEVELT

Crane’s antagonism to the Roosevelt-Wister myth of a triumphantly bourgeois new West is rooted certainly in his habitual avant-garde mind set as well as in the experience of his visit to Texas in 1895. Crane felt a strong personal animus for Roosevelt, however, that would have made him particularly skeptical of Roosevelt’s vision. In 1896 Crane presented Roosevelt, who was currently New York City’s commissioner of police, with a signed copy of George’s Mother; Roosevelt then requested an autographed copy of his Red Badge of Courage, which he, at that time, especially admired, and the two apparently became enthusiastic friends. According to his niece, Helen Crane, Crane could “talk all night with Theodore Roosevelt.” In the same year, Crane felt sufficiently confident of Roosevelt’s good will to show him the unpublished manuscript of one of his Mexican stories. This story, “A Man and Some Others,” elicited from Roosevelt a response that both reflected Roosevelt’s conventional ethnic biases and anticipated the issues that would divide them: “Some day I want you to write another story of the frontiersman and the Mexican Greaser in which the frontiersman shall come out on top; it is more normal that way.”

Their relationship was to change in September 1896, when in the course of the notorious Dora Clark affair, Crane, defending the falsely accused prostitute, testified against one of Commissioner Roosevelt’s policemen, preferring charges against him for false arrest. Crane believed that Commissioner Roosevelt had whitewashed his policeman, and Roosevelt insisted that Crane was “a man of bad character .... consorting with loose women.” The quarrel was never made up. Crane, who later became war correspondent for the New York World, accompanied the Rough Riders led by Roosevelt into their first action, the Battle of Las Guasimas, where they were promptly ambushed. His dispatch to the World was headlined “Stephen Crane Calls It a Blunder.” Roosevelt, in turn, though he praised the other correspondents, never mentioned Crane’s considerable presence throughout the campaign, except obliquely: “I did not see any sign among the fighting men, whether wounded or unwounded, of the very complicated emotions assigned to their kind by some of the realistic modern novelists who have written about battles.”
CONCLUSION

If, as I have been suggesting, one of Crane’s intentions in writing “Bride” was to subvert both the older myth of a wild, romantic West and Roosevelt’s bourgeois myth supplanting it, that intention failed. Existing as established structures of reference and emotional resonance, these myths contributed to and helped shape Crane’s story, but each of them had its own positive narrative that was to prove stronger in an expansive, confident America than Crane’s ironic negations. Crane’s unpopular point about the West in “Bride” might have been summed up by Milan Kundera when, in quite another context, he wrote “Stupidity [ugliness, mediocrity, dullness] does not give way to science, technology, modernity, progress—on the contrary, it progresses right along with them.” Within three years of the publication of “Bride,” The Great Train Robbery (1903) appeared, and the newly born moving picture industry would take up both myths and eventually discover for them broader audiences than those to which any literary work could aspire.

NOTES


13. See in this regard Edwin H. Cady’s account of Crane’s complex and individual relationship to the avant-garde and “modernity” in his critical biography Stephen Crane (note 2 above), pp. 69-95.


19. Crane here anticipates those criticisms of the “bipolar” perception of the West as containing only