

*Adolescence and the Trauma of Maternal Inheritance in L.M. Montgomery's **Emily of New Moon***

• Kate Lawson •



Résumé: Le roman *Émilie de la nouvelle lune* (1923) de Lucy Maud Montgomery est un roman d'apprentissage fort complexe, centré autour du difficile passage de l'enfance à l'adolescence de l'héroïne éponyme. Après la perte de son père, Émilie doit s'adapter à un nouveau contexte social, des plus conformistes. À l'univers répressif de ses tantes s'oppose le caractère ouvert et volontiers rebelle de son héritage maternel. L'issue du conflit, ambivalent et quelque peu empreint, dans son expression littéraire, de l'imagerie des romans gothiques, permettra à l'héroïne, du moins en apparence, de surmonter le traumatisme de la maturation sexuelle et d'assumer son identité.

Summary: L.M. Montgomery's *Emily of New Moon* (1923) is a Canadian Bildungsroman which begins with the death of the heroine Emily's father, a death

which precipitates Emily's entry into a female-dominated world of familial, social and sexual conformity. The paper first examines the overall structure of gender relations in the novel, and then explores the novel's overdetermined figuration of Emily's preadolescent body as it moves towards sexual maturity, in particular, Emily's body as inheriting a sexually rebellious maternal lineage which counteracts the repressive matriarchal power of aunts and family. In Emily's Gothicized and hallucinated "solution" to the dark and secret story of a rebellious woman's sexual excess, Emily seemingly solves the "riddle" of adult female sexuality and resolves the trauma of sexual maturity.

L. M. Montgomery's *Emily of New Moon* (1923) is a Canadian *Bildungsroman* which traces the growth and development of the orphan heroine Emily after her beloved father dies and she is forced to make a place for herself in a female-dominated world of familial, social and sexual conformity. Tracing Emily's growth from ages eleven to thirteen, the novel thus begins with the traumatic loss of the protective paternal figure, representing it as a precursor to the burgeoning of adolescent sexuality and individuality. The constraints of social conformity then imposed on the adolescent girl are represented, as in many children's stories, as a specifically feminine form of repression.¹

This paper first examines the overall structure of gender relations in the novel, principally Emily's relation with her tyrannical Aunt Elizabeth and with the series of weak and deficient male father-figures. Although these father-figures nurture Emily's formative growth as a writer, they do not figure in the other equally important cornerstone of Emily's psychic development, that is her growth into femininity. This growth into femininity requires an incorporation into Emily's personality of the hitherto unattractive elements of femininity represented by Emily's aunts. Secondly, the paper explores the novel's overdetermined figuration of Emily's *body* in arriving at sexual maturity, in particular Emily's body as inheriting a sexually rebellious maternal lineage which counteracts the repressive matriarchal power of aunts and family. In Emily's Gothicized and hallucinated "solution" to the dark and secret story of a rebellious woman's sexual excess, Emily solves the "riddle" of adult female sexuality and resolves the trauma of sexual maturity. However, the Gothic solution, and the fragmentation and disruption figured in this "solution," indicate the unresolved and unresolvable aspects of a maternal inheritance which forces itself on Emily's recalcitrant body.

Critics writing on *Emily of New Moon* have most often treated it, with reason, as Montgomery's *Künstlerroman*, the novel which records the artist's, and perhaps Montgomery's own growth as a writer, a growth which is hindered, or perhaps ultimately destroyed, by the patriarchal values which govern her society. Mary Rubio, for instance, argues that the *Emily* series "focuses on how a young woman who wants to become a writer learns to nego-

tiate with a patriarchal society which discourages female self-hood and individuality, denying her ‘a room of her own’” (8). Similarly, Ian Menzies argues that Emily gives up her career “in favour of following the norms of her gender”: “Montgomery is able to convey through Emily’s failure, the unfathomable courage it must have taken for a young woman from Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, during the Victorian era, to stay true to her own quest” (60). Elizabeth Epperly titles her chapter on *Emily of New Moon*, “The Struggle for Voice,” arguing that the various male characters whom Emily encounters, Father Cassidy, Mr. Carpenter and Dean Priest, “each challenge Emily’s conception of herself as writer-heroine” (152). While this paper does not take issue with this major strand of Montgomery criticism, it attempts to look at gender relations in the novel not so much in the context of Emily’s career as a writer as in the context of Emily’s psychological development into adult womanhood, that is, at the novel as *Bildungsroman* embodied within the *Künstlerroman*. Elizabeth Waterston suggests that all of Montgomery’s novels are best seen as *Bildungsroman*: they are portraits of adolescents “torn by mixed emotions of admiration, rivalry, dependence [and] hostility all operating at an unconscious level. . . . And adolescence, that time of intense dreaming, of romantic yearning and disturbing hostility, remains a part of every consciousness” (218-19). This paper specifically examines adolescence in the context of female inheritance: what does it mean to mature into a woman given a troubling legacy of angry and rebellious female ancestors? Since Emily’s writing is a cornerstone of her psychological development (particularly in her relationship to adult males), aspects of Emily’s development as an artist cannot be ignored; however, they will be treated as integral to Montgomery’s depiction of adolescent sexuality.

That the powers of social conformity enforced on the pre-adolescent and adolescent girl are feminine seems to be an unmistakable point in both this novel and in many works of children’s fiction. Bruno Bettelheim argues, in *The Uses of Enchantment*, that fairy tale conventions are the product of deep psychological patterns:

What blocks the oedipal girl’s uninterrupted blissful existence with Father is an older, well-intentioned female (i.e. Mother). But since the little girl also wants very much to continue enjoying mother’s loving care, there is also a benevolent female in the past or background of the fairy tale, whose happy memory is kept intact, although she has become inoperative. . . . In a girl’s oedipal fantasy, the mother is split into two figures: the pre-oedipal wonderful good mother and the oedipal evil stepmother. (112, 114)

In simple terms, Emily’s mother, Juliet Murray, is the benevolent but “inoperative” or lost preoedipal mother while her father, Douglas Starr — “so tender, so understanding, so wonderful!” (12) — dies at the novel’s opening, or as Bettelheim describes the convention, is stricken with “failure” or “un-

fortunate ineffectuality." The girl is thus left under the control of the oedipal "evil stepmother" figure in the novel, Aunt Elizabeth.²

However, female power and control in *Emily of New Moon* have most often been treated by critics, paradoxically, as elements of a *patriarchal* power which at the same time act as a critique of that patriarchy. Mary Rubio begins this line of argument with her assertion that one of the "curious" and "subversive" (24) strategies used by Montgomery is her presentation of the "most overbearing authority figures in women's clothing" (24). Rather than being a "real" woman, Aunt Elizabeth is an example of "the authoritarian manish types who mimic the male prerogative to rule" (24). Rubio concludes that "Montgomery can present what she considers objectionable authoritarian male characteristics with impunity because she disguises them in the female form" (24). Epperly cites this strategy approvingly; calling Aunt Elizabeth "a female-clad patriarch" (152), Epperly says Montgomery presents "patriarchs as women, thus making behaviour and attitudes that would have been acceptable in a man seem grotesque" (7). Similarly, Menzies refers to "the patriarchal Aunt Elizabeth" (60). Since these arguments rely on paradox — a woman may seem to be a woman but she is really acting as and representing a man — they are hard to refute, but also, arguably, difficult to support with textual evidence. In realist terms, Aunt Elizabeth *is* a woman who is the head of New Moon and who seeks to enforce a matriarchal structure of domesticity and "family values."³ However much gender is a construct in the novel, it is clear that Elizabeth herself believes that the femininity she exemplifies is also enjoined upon Emily. In her view, girls should receive only an elementary education, should not learn to support themselves, and should lead impeccable if dull lives: "All we require of you is to be a good and contented child and to conduct yourself with becoming prudence and modesty." To Emily, "This sounded terribly hard" (61). The various male father-figures in the novel, on the other hand, are shown to be ineffectual, systematically weak or powerless, living marginal lives, and unable to assert traditional male prerogatives of power and rule.

One of the first lessons Emily learns is that "Elizabeth's boss of New Moon" (22). Elizabeth herself asserts this power immediately after Emily draws lots to go with her to New Moon farm: "No, don't argue," she says regarding Emily's cats, "You may as well learn first as last, Emily, that when I says a thing I mean it" (47). Her Cousin Jimmy concurs: "When she won't, she won't — Murray like" (47), eventually leaving the beleaguered Emily room only to assert: "Anyway, Aunt Elizabeth, you can't boss God" (80). With such nearly omnipotent power to contend with, characters who would nurture Emily must resort to subterfuge. When they stop in Charlottetown after the death of her father, her aunts go to buy her some decent clothes, leaving Cousin Jimmy to take care of her. His "method of looking after her was to take her to a restaurant down street and fill her up with ice-cream" (54). His reasoning is that there is "No use my getting anything for you that Aunt

Elizabeth can see.... But she can't see what is inside of you" (54). This observation fits well with Emily's entire relation to Aunt Elizabeth's power: only "inner" nourishment — what Aunt Elizabeth can't see — may be given her in contravention of Elizabeth's rule. Cousin Jimmy and Aunt Laura may only give things to Emily "on the sly" (133); Aunt Laura advises Emily: "don't let Elizabeth see you writing" (319). Aunt Elizabeth enforces her will in the visible and outward form which Emily must present, thus compelling Emily to wear "decent" dresses, buttoned boots, and the hated "baby-apron" (82). Even staring at wallpaper brings a rebuke from Aunt Elizabeth: "Don't do it again. It gives your face an unnatural expression" (57).

Although Aunt Elizabeth is the central figure of female authority in the novel, other women, such as Emily's father's housekeeper Ellen Greene, her Aunt Ruth, and her teacher Miss Brownell, are similarly domineering and latently menacing characters. Her friend Teddy's mother, Mrs. Kent, explicitly shares the aggressive tendencies of Aunt Elizabeth; jealous of Teddy's love of anyone or anything beside herself, she hates Emily, poisons his cats, and burns his drawings (290-91).

Set against these powerful and latently violent female figures are the adult males, who are nourishing of Emily's inner self and yet systematically shown to be weak or impaired or marginal. Emily's beloved father, Douglas Starr, is consumptive, racked by coughing and too weak to lift up Emily: "He's been dying by inches for the last five years," says Ellen Greene (9). After his death, the figure of the weak, ineffective but loving paternal male appears in a number of new guises. Cousin Jimmy is loving but "a bit simple" (23). Emily's beloved teacher, Mr. Carpenter, is a drunk and a failure: "He 'took to drink' and went to the dogs generally. And the upshot of it was that Francis Carpenter, who led his class in his first and second years at McGill, and for whom his teachers had predicted a great career, was a country schoolteacher at forty-five with no prospect of ever being anything else" (303). Father Cassidy is the only one of Emily's paternal mentors who is physically sound — "he looked just like a big nut — a big, brown, wholesome nut" (200) — yet as a Catholic priest he stands outside the pale of normal "manhood" for the strict Presbyterian Emily, who is "horribly frightened" (199) at the thought of meeting him. Finally, "Jarback" Priest, the most troubling of Emily's adult male acquaintances, is physically deformed: "he had a malformed shoulder and limped slightly" (275).

Yet these weakened, deformed or eccentric male characters are the ones who (with the exception of Dean Priest) systematically sustain Emily's "inner" life, the life which Aunt Elizabeth can neither see nor ultimately affect.⁴ These men play a crucial role in Emily's budding life as an author, as well as providing emotional support in her daily struggles.

Douglas Starr, Emily's frail father, provides the model for all these loving and infirm paternal figures who follow. He acknowledges to Emily

that "From a worldly point of view I've certainly been a failure" (17), and sees in his daughter the talent he never had: "You have my gift — along with something I never had. You will succeed where I failed, Emily" (13). Douglas Starr, like so many of the men who are to follow in Emily's life, is a failure at everything except loving her.

Father Cassidy is the first person after the death of her father to provide her credible support for her poetry, telling her to "Keep on, — keep on writing poetry" (210). Although Elizabeth Epperly claims that "To many readers this [chapter] will be a chilling" encounter because "his patronizing is but a gentle prelude to the caressing contempt Dean himself will later show for Emily's 'pretty cobwebs'" (153), it seems clear that Father Cassidy's "patronizing" of her epic pretensions shifts as she recites one of her lyric poems, "Evening Dreams," to him: "After the first verse a change came over his big brown face, and he began patting his fingertips together" (209). Emily herself recognizes that "if he bantered her as he had done about her epic — she would know what *that* meant" (209-10). The narrator continues: "Of course, it *was* trash. Father Cassidy knew that well enough. All the same, for a child like this — and rhyme and rhythm were flawless — and there was one line — just one line — 'the light of faintly golden stars' — for the sake of that line Father Cassidy suddenly said, 'Keep on, — keep on writing poetry'" (210). As Emily is a child of twelve, it would hardly be plausible for her to write great poetry, let alone epic. Montgomery accepts the idea of an apprenticeship which Emily must serve; Emily herself, on returning to her poetry after her trip to Wyther Grange, learns to see the weakness of her immature verse: "When she went to the garret next morning and pulled out her precious little bundle of manuscripts to read them lovingly over she was amazed and rather grieved to find that they were not half so good as she had believed they were. Some were positively silly, she thought" (292-93). When she re-reads the poem "Evening Dreams" later in the novel, she "wondered how she could ever have thought it any good" (314). Father Cassidy takes account of her age, makes allowance for her immaturity, and still tells her to "Keep on." This is a great victory; only her father had shown such faith in her abilities before.

Mr. Carpenter is the other major figure who contributes to her writing career. The novel ends with his cheering words: "But go on — climb!" (350). Mr. Carpenter judges her poetry, not by the standards he would apply to any other juvenile writer, but by the more demanding standards of literary excellence. When he first takes over the school, Emily is puzzled by his behaviour:

[She could not] understand why he made red pencil corrections all over her compositions and rated her for split infinitives and too lavish compositions and strode up and down the aisle and hurled objurgations at her ... and then told Rhonda Stuart and Nan Lee that their compositions were very pretty and gave them back without so much as a mark on them. Yet, in spite of it all, she liked him more and more as time went on. (307)

Mr. Carpenter has not won the position of "one of the gatekeepers of the literary establishment" (Epperly 154) through his own success in poetry or literature; he is a self-acknowledged failure. After his interview with Emily, he admits "This child has — what I have never had and would have made any sacrifice to have" (350). Neither successful nor talented, he is nevertheless an educated man who recognizes excellence when he finds it — in Ilse's elocution, in Perry's speeches, and in Teddy's drawing — and nurtures all of them to the best of his ability. Raging when he sees halfhearted effort, helping where he can, he acknowledges, for instance, that he knows little about art, but nevertheless assigns Teddy more art and less arithmetic in school, and procures "certain elementary text books on drawing which he gave him" (306). Mr. Carpenter does not discriminate on the basis of gender, but on the basis of talent and excellence, saving his harshest criticism for that which he loves best: literature, and Emily.

Cousin Jimmy is the most curious figure of paternal support in the novel. An unabashed disciple of poetry and of beauty, he nourishes Emily as both a poet and as the girl whom he loves. His gifts of "Jimmy books" for her poetry and ice-cream and doughnuts for her pleasure are the only luxuries allowed her at frugal New Moon. Equally important, Jimmy had that extraordinary talent which Douglas Starr did not possess, had the talent for which Mr. Carpenter would have sacrificed anything, and yet that talent was robbed from him, or perhaps better, deformed in him; as a result of being pushed down the well, he has become, like Douglas Starr and Mr. Carpenter, "a failure" (147), and worse than either of them, "a mental weakling" (147). "Cousin Jimmy's poetry was surprisingly good — at least in spots" (147), the narrator comments; other "spots," one assumes, are fatally weak. Although Cousin Jimmy provides paper for Emily to transcribe and preserve her verse, he himself only recites his poetry; thus, poignantly, his uneven verse will be lost forever. Cousin Jimmy, of all the adults in the novel, is the figure who most clearly represents male talent, even genius, but a genius tragically lost: "Emily, listening to him, felt vaguely that if it had not been for that unlucky push into the New Moon well, this queer little man beside her might have stood in the presence of kings" (148). Instead, he is reduced to a man who has even lost control of his own bank account, a man ruled by Aunt Elizabeth's iron law.

Dean Priest, with his deformed shoulder and hateful relatives, seems at first to be a man who continues this pattern of male weakness and inner nourishment of Emily. Partaking of the same physical weakness as Douglas Starr — he is "trembly" (275) after he pulls her out of danger at the shore — he is in fact a contemporary of her father and studied with him at Queen's Academy. Yet Dean Priest is not like the other adult males in the novel. Clever, well-educated, wealthy, he never admits to any failure, save that (eventually) of making Emily love him. Given his age, Emily naturally thinks of him as another paternal figure; the reader however knows what Dean means by his

thoughtful "I think I'll wait for you" (278), and his promise to teach her "love talk" for her novel writing (280). Dean Priest will not be a nurturing father-figure like Mr. Carpenter or Father Cassidy or Cousin Jimmy; rather he will be a jealous lover, jealous of her relationship with Teddy, but more particularly jealous of her devotion to her writing. Like Aunt Laura who provides a loving if ineffectual counterpoint to Aunt Elizabeth's female tyranny, Dean Priest is the strong and demanding male counterpoint to the weak and ineffectual father-figures who populate the novel.

Emily's growing maturity thus takes place in a context of gender relations which posit a fairly straightforward figuration of weak but nurturing father-figures set against a tyrannical and forbidding stepmother. Although this pattern is complicated by figures such as Dean Priest and Aunt Laura, the most significant challenge to Emily's maturity is the nature of her maternal inheritance, an inheritance which necessitates not the *rejection* but the *incorporation* of "Murray"-ness into her personality. While the nurturing father-figures tend to lead her away from her troubling Murray inheritance in their encouragement of her writing, in themselves they only provide examples of failure and frustration. To mature and succeed, Emily will have to master the Murray legacy, a legacy which becomes more insistent as she matures. The Murray inheritance, seemingly embodied as a repressive power of conformity, is also a legacy of anger, resistance and defiance. Emily's maternal lineage comes to be represented as having two basic aspects: first is the rage which Aunt Elizabeth and other Murray ancestors exhibit and which Emily also experiences; second are the specific and increasingly insistent demands of an adult female sexuality which Emily experiences as a maternal affect.

Although Aunt Elizabeth's command over the externals in Emily's life is seemingly matched by her own commanding and prim exterior, that exterior in fact conceals an astonishing inner rage, a rage which complicates the figure of Aunt Elizabeth as an image of female self-discipline and conformity. Cousin Jimmy initially tells Emily the story of how Elizabeth pushed him down the well: "I made Elizabeth mad — forget what I said — 'twasn't *hard* to make her mad, you understand — and she made to give me a bang on the head. I saw it coming and stepped back to get out of the way — and down I went, head first" (69). Great-aunt Nancy is more direct; Emily records in her diary that Great-aunt Nancy "called [Elizabeth] a 'tyrant' one day and then she said 'Jimmy Murray was a very clever boy. Elizabeth Murray killed his intellect in her temper — and nothing has been done to her. If she'd killed his body, she would have been a murderess. The other was worse, if you ask me'" (261).⁵

Elizabeth's temper is shown at many points in the novel, and although it frequently dominates over Emily, it is on occasion matched and

bested by Emily's own rage, a rage which Emily cannot summon consciously but which comes in moments of psychic stress. For instance, when Emily becomes depressed after being deceived by her "friend" Rhonda Stuart, Aunt Elizabeth, able only to see Emily's external self and not her inner distress, decides that Emily's luxurious hair is the cause of her "languor" (109), and decrees that it must be cut off.⁶ Emily, crying that her hair is her "one beauty," says despairingly, "I suppose you want to cut off my lashes too" (110). The narrator continues: "Aunt Elizabeth *did* distrust those long, upcurled fringes of Emily's, which were the inheritance from the girlish stepmother, and too un-Murray-like to be approved" (110). As she approaches Emily with the scissors clicking, Emily "felt her brows drawing together in an unaccustomed way — she felt an uprush as from unknown depths of some irresistible surge of energy." Speaking with unaccustomed authority, Emily pronounces: "Aunt Elizabeth ... *my hair is not going to be cut off*. Let me hear no more of this" (111). Astonishingly, Aunt Elizabeth, looking at "the transformed or possessed child before her" (111), is stricken with terror and relents. We learn that Emily's power comes from the magical "Murray look" in which she reincarnates her dead grandfather Archibald Murray.⁷

This combat between Aunt Elizabeth and Emily indicates one of the most powerful forces in the novel, the force of inheritance, of personality as determined not by conscious choice but as driven by unconscious patterns of behaviour related to the past rather than to the present. This force of inheritance links the story powerfully with the Gothic genre, for, as Chris Baldick notes, "the tyranny of the past," "a fearful sense of inheritance" (xix) is one of the most characteristic tropes of Gothic. In looking at the eyelashes of Emily which remind Elizabeth not of "proper" Murray eyelashes, but of her own stepmother,⁸ Elizabeth is distrustful. Her "evil stepmother's" rage at Emily, exhibited in the clicking, malicious scissors, is in part a rage against the girl who incarnates *her own* stepmother, but who is then capable of being transfigured into the incarnation of her own tyrannical father, Emily's grandfather. For Emily, Elizabeth may be the "tyrant" of New Moon as great-aunt Nancy claims, but in her own psychic life Elizabeth is faced by the ambiguous figure of a niece who is at once the incarnation of the father's "tyranny" (60) and of the interloping stepmother. Thus Elizabeth, like Emily, inherits an inter-generational family drama which links her present fears, angers and obsessions firmly to the past.

Female rage in the novel does not begin with Aunt Elizabeth or her father, however; it has its prototype in two female ancestors of Emily.⁹ The first is Mary Shipley Murray, Emily's great-great-grandmother who emigrated to Canada from the "Old Country." Bound for Quebec, and after a terrible sea-voyage, Mary Murray insists on being put ashore on Prince Edward Island "to feel solid ground under her for an hour or so" (74) when the ship stops to take on water. When the time comes to re-board the ship, Mary refuses, insisting: "Here I stay" (74), a declarative which becomes statement

of fact, and then is spitefully and blasphemously inscribed onto her tombstone by her husband after her death. The second is Elizabeth Burnley Murray, another great-great-grandmother who also emigrated to Prince Edward Island, but who had the opposite reaction to her new home. She was, in Cousin Jimmy's words, "homesick, Emily — scandalous homesick. For weeks after she came here she wouldn't take off her bonnet — just walked the floor in it, demanding to be taken home" (75). These two refusals — the refusal to leave and the refusal to stay — indicate a deep and furious ambivalence in Emily's maternal heritage. New Moon farm is both central to who Emily is — she is "Emily of New Moon" — and New Moon is an "alien, hostile world" (59), a land of exile from her paternal heritage. On her first night at New Moon, weeping in bed beside the "griffin"-like (59) Aunt Elizabeth, Emily thinks passionately: "She *must* go back — she couldn't stay here — she would never be happy here! But there wasn't any 'back' to go to — no home — no father —" (59). Like her Murray foremothers, Emily has a deeply traumatic relation to the place she is in, and to the place she has lost. The break with the paternal past is made permanent by the end of the novel when Aunt Elizabeth reads Emily's letters to her father, letters which formerly had "seemed to bring him so near" (97). After Aunt Elizabeth's trespass into that relationship, Emily finds that "The sense of reality — nearness — of close communion had gone" (325). The novel represents Emily's maturity as an enforced loss of the paternal which brings about the confrontation with a maternal inheritance figured both as the site of a profound loss and of profound rage. The extraordinary Gothic elements at the end of the novel emerge most clearly at the site of this confrontation.

The Gothic elements of *Emily of New Moon* have been most thoroughly investigated by Lorna Drew who argues that "female gothic" effects such as "an engagement with nature, a maimed male . . . and alternative worlds manifested in dreams, fantasies and visions . . . point towards the proedipal mother whose presence links the heroine with the prelinguistic" (19).¹⁰ Although the role of the proedipal mother in the novel is arguably related to the Kristevan semiotic in Emily's writing, the mother also has an important role in the novel's representation of trauma, and more specifically the adolescent girl's experience of sexual maturity as in itself traumatic and linked to the burden of femininity represented in the maternal body. For this analysis, Nicholas Abraham's and Maria Torok's claims concerning the intersubjective nature of family trauma are particularly apposite.

The novel opens with the death of Emily's father, an event which readers might expect to be the chief trauma of the protagonist's life. Coming in from an exhilarating dance through the woods on a May evening — all the more exhilarating because she has been caged in the house by a cold winter and a wet spring — Emily is confronted by the unloving housekeeper, Ellen, who stops her on the threshold and says: "Do you know that your pa has only a week or two more to live?" (8) The shock of this blunt revelation —

“like a physical blow” (8) — stuns Emily; however, the death of the beloved father in the next chapter, while sad, is not overpowering. The resilient Emily, defiant and rebellious, preserves her identity in the face of the grim circle of her oppressive and repressive Murray family relations, who arrive after the death of her father. The “letters” which she writes to her dead father keep her identity intact in spite of her loss. The beloved but lost father figure thus retains an imaginative and emotional integrity for Emily, allowing her, as previously discussed, to discover other adult men who will perform this role in relation to her; what becomes problematic in the novel is the inheritance from her *mother*, a mother whose life has had an incalculable effect on her own but who died when she was four years of age and who is remembered only as a corpse “lying ... in a long, black box” (16). Emily’s problematic relationship with her barely-remembered mother is reflective of Montgomery’s own life; a journal entry from January 2, 1905, indicates her deep sense of ambivalence towards her own dead mother:

This evening, reading over a packet of old letters, I came across a very old one written to my mother in her girlhood by a girl friend....

It is dreadful to lose one’s mother in childhood! ... How often, smarting under some injustice or writhing under some misunderstanding, have I sobbed to myself, ‘Oh, if mother had *only* lived!’

But quick on the heels comes an instinctive thought, ‘But oh, if she were like Aunt Emily, or even like Aunt Annie, that would make it worse.’ Even in childhood I realized *that* would have been for me a worse tragedy than her death. (I. 300)

The dead mother can be imagined as loving and understanding, or just as easily as distant and insensitive. What is clear in the novel is that Emily’s “mother” is the product of just such an ambivalent fantasy.

Emily’s mother was named Juliet, a name with inevitable dramatic resonance in the mind of the adolescent girl. Juliet’s rebellion against her family’s wishes in her love for Romeo is paralleled in the novel by Juliet Murray eloping with the poor Douglas Starr and thus being disowned by her “respectable” middle-class parents. When Emily goes to live at New Moon farm with her aunts Elizabeth and Laura they are at first fearful that Emily will “take after” her father — that is, will be consumptive. They soon put aside this worry, however, and instead closely monitor her behaviour for signs that she “takes after” her mother, that is, that her mother’s sexually rebellious personality is emerging. Her aunts are fearful that history will repeat itself and that the scandal and loss of elopement will once again blight the family: Aunt Elizabeth “fears she can’t trust me out of her sight because my mother eloped,” says Emily (*Emily Climbs* 5). Emily’s aunts read the story of their sister’s rebellious marriage and death, not as a romantic story of two lovers finding a brief happiness, or even as a commonplace story

of domestic happiness followed by all-too-common early death, but rather as scandalous sexual disgrace.

The first description by the narrator of Emily's appearance, and the first gesture of her extended family upon meeting Emily is a reading of her body to discern her true lineage, her body being a marker of breeding and inheritance. While this reading is in one way a reflexive Puritan gesture — "What's bred in the bone will out in the flesh" — the novel's stress on actual *physical* inheritance and the life of the body makes *Emily of New Moon* a rather daring novel of adolescent sexuality for the 1920s.¹¹ The narrator comments in the opening chapter that Emily's "smile began at the corners of her lips and spread over her face in a slow, subtle, very wonderful way, as Douglas Starr often thought. It was her dead mother's smile" (5). Similarly, on first meeting Emily, her aunts and uncles determine that she has "her grandmother's hair and eyes ... old George Byrd's nose ... her father's forehead [and] ... her mother's smile ... [and] long lashes" (30-31). Emily reacts with characteristic defiance: "'You make me feel as if I were made up of scraps and patches!' she burst out indignantly" (31). Yet as the novel progresses, Emily's body continues to reveal her lineage, most notably in the magical "Murray look" of command when she reincarnates her dead grandfather Archibald Murray. Emily learns to take this diverse inheritance humorously as time goes on. When she first meets Dean Priest, he begins the typical anatomy of her parts. She cuts him short with her recitation:

... it's only my eyelashes and smile that are like Mother's. But I've got Father's forehead, and Grandma Starr's hair and eyes, and Great-Uncle George's nose, and Aunt Nancy's hands, and Cousin Susan's elbows, and great-great-grandmother Murray's ankles, and Grandfather Murray's eyebrows. (281)

As Emily matures, the focus of her aunts' comments shifts from the *heterogeneity* of Emily's familial inheritance to the *singularity* of the maternal inheritance — from her mother Juliet and her grandmothers. Her inherited maternal attributes, conspicuous in her eyes, smile and ankles, are not simple characteristics, but understood by all around her as *expressive* attributes — sexually expressive in a manner wholly unconscious to and uncontrollable by Emily. Emily's aunts read her sexually maturing body as evidence of the same potential for sexual passion which led her mother Juliet Murray to elope, and they institute a policy of rigid control over her movements and her dress. For example, they insist that she go to school dressed in an infantile "baby-apron" and only grudgingly allow her to visit Teddy Kent — her later love interest — after Dr. Burnley orders the aunts to let go.

In the psychoanalytic view of trauma put forward by Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, the child inherits the traumas and repressions of a maternal past:

Every child's emergence as an individual is distinctive, constituted by repressions of uniquely charged pieces-of-the-mother, each bearing affects specifically related to the singular circumstances and psychic traumas of the mother's life. Moreover, since every mother is also the child of another mother, she must herself be understood as always already carrying the contents of another's unconscious. (Rashkin 18)

Unlike Freud and most psychoanalytic critics who insist on the formative and universal role of the oedipus complex and castration in the development of human sexual identity and of trauma, Abraham and Torok see the processes of psychic maturation and trauma formation as individually determined. Sidestepping general arguments which distinguish the role of the preoedipal from the oedipal mother (such as Kristeva's or Bettelheim's), Abraham and Torok argue that some elaborations¹² of the oedipus complex in fact lead "to both theoretical and practical impasses":

To take myths and fantasies literally is to grant them excessive dignity at the expense of metapsychology. To turn a blind eye to the contingency of fantasies or, worse, to claim to formalize them in the mode of descriptive structuralism, is to fail to recognize their true mainspring: the specific tension that arises between the Envelope [the ego] and the Kernel [the unconscious]. (Abraham and Torok 94-95)

Taking account of contingencies, Abraham and Torok suggest that the crucial maternal role is not programmatic; the individual begins as "an undivided entity" which is "gradually defined by a constant process of differentiation or 'division' from a more primary union: the mother" (Rashkin 16). In this process, the accidents of history and experience — the mother's as well as the child's — ensure that each child's individuation is unique; it is in this sense that Abraham and Torok insist that a child bears "affects specifically related to the *singular* circumstances and psychic traumas of the mother's life."

In studying a literary text, the tools of analysis may then be deployed, as Esther Rashkin says, "to identify visible elements of selected narratives as symptoms or 'symbols' that point to unspeakable family dramas cryptically inscribed within them" (5). While the narrative of Juliet Murray's elopement is not kept secret from Emily, the *reason* for Juliet's runaway marriage is an "unspeakable family drama" in the sense that adolescent female sexuality in itself is a scandal in a family where puritan sexuality — embodied in the maiden aunts Elizabeth and Laura — provide the norm for female behaviour. Like much adolescent fiction,¹³ sexuality is a secret which the protagonist is enjoined not to discover, but to which the protagonist's body and unconscious mind give forcible witness.

Thus, Emily's maternal inheritance will speak. Both of her male friends, Teddy and Perry, are captivated by her reincarnation of her mother's

smile: "She smiled her slow, blossoming smile at Perry and thereby reduced him to helpless bondage" (157); the "soft purple-grey eyes and ... smile made [Teddy] think all sorts of wonderful things [he] couldn't put into words" (198). Old Jock Kelly offends Emily when he tells her that she should be married soon before her "come-hither eyes" do too much "mischief" (243) with men. Her great-aunt Nancy instructs her to display her ankles to advantage, and confirms that she will be able to attract men if she "learns to use [her] eyes and hands and feet properly" (251).

Like many adolescents, Emily finds the sexual precocity of her body humiliating and embarrassing, and tries simply to deny any such effect. Yet the anxieties attached to these uncontrollably expressive sexual marks and their relation to her maternal inheritance dominate Emily's unconscious. In particular, Emily's sexual anxieties are given shape in the life of the other woman in the novel whose body is similarly expressive — the mother of Emily's friend Ilse Burnley, the woman who, in Abraham and Torok's term, incarnates the phantasmic maternal body. Beatrice Burnley was marked by "a little birthmark over her left eye-brow — just like a tiny red heart" which led her to be called "the Ace of Hearts" (266). The story of Ilse's mother, and in particular Emily's Gothicized hallucination of her death, becomes the reservoir into which Emily's anxieties concerning sexual maturity and the relation to the maternal are displaced.

Abraham and Torok, in *The Shell and the Kernel*, argue that a phantom is a symbolization created by trauma, a symbolization which allows the subject to continue to function, but also creates within that functioning a "configuration of incoherence, discontinuity, disruption and disintegration" (Rand 6). What is particularly apposite in Torok and Abraham's conception of the phantom to the Gothic effects in the novel is that although the phantom fills a "gap" in an individual psyche, the *production* of that phantom is the result of an intersubjective and inter-generational process: "what haunts are not the dead, but the gaps left within us by the secrets of others" (171) — particularly the maternal other. Maternal "inheritance" in the novel is fraught with secrecy, repression and aggression, leading Emily to hallucinate a phantasmic maternal body, a body which will "solve" the riddle of female sexuality, and open the crypt¹⁴ of the maternal secret.

Emily's initial fascination with Ilse's mother is initiated by the secrecy surrounding her story. Emily overhears her aunts Elizabeth and Laura referring to Beatrice Burnley on many occasions, but they stop whenever they realize that Emily is within earshot. The overpowering desire to find out what happened to Beatrice Burnley is finally satiated by the re-telling of the story by Emily's disreputable great-aunt Nancy, a woman who revels in scandal and bitterness. As Aunt Nancy begins telling the story, Emily's excitement is palpable: "Her finger tips were growing cold as they always did in excitement, her eyes turning black. She felt that she was on the verge of

solving the mystery that had so long worried and puzzled her" (266). Emily learns that Beatrice Mitchell married Dr. Burnley when she was eighteen and he thirty-five. They had one child, Ilse, and when Ilse was still an infant Beatrice was visited by her cousin and childhood companion Leo. Beatrice Burnley went to the shore one night, ostensibly to say farewell to Leo, a sailor, but she never returned home to her husband and daughter. Leo's ship was subsequently lost, and all assume that the eloping couple drowned together — a fitting end for an adulterer and her conspirator.

Emily's reaction upon hearing this story is extreme: her adolescent inquisitiveness into the mysteries of adulthood — "the mystery that had so long worried and puzzled her" — has been answered by a repugnant sexual story, a story which she calls "strange, cruel, heartless" (269). Presumably the reason for her great distress is that Beatrice Burnley's story is an ugly inversion of the hitherto, for Emily, romantic narrative of Emily's eloping mother. What power could lead a nineteen year-old girl to run away with a man, she must wonder, and is my body already giving evidence of what that uncontrollable power might be? Emily cannot believe that the story is true, and yet everything around her confirms its truth — the misogyny of Ilse's father, the missing gravestone in the churchyard, Ilse's ignorance of her mother's death, and most importantly her own growing awareness of the powers of sexual attraction. The ugly story makes Emily "afraid she could never be happy again — so intense was her reaction to her first revelation of the world's sin and sorrow" (270). The novel thus concentrates its representation of the trauma of adolescent sexuality in the maternal figure of Beatrice Burnley, the woman whose story unconsciously reveals to Emily that the maternal inheritance is constituted by both an abandonment of the child and by an uncontrollable sexual passion which may result in vice and unhappiness.¹⁵ At the same time, Emily represses her awareness of the pleasure which must be inherent in this uncontrollable passion.

These conflicting impulses lead to the novel's most striking scene of hallucination and Gothic effect. Returning from Aunt Nancy's to New Moon with her secret knowledge of Beatrice Burnley, Emily falls ill.¹⁶ Delirious with a high fever, Emily "sees" the woman with "the ace of hearts on her forehead" dancing over the fields at night, a scene which recalls Emily's joyful outdoor dance which opened the novel. The hallucinating Emily calls out: "she is coming so gladly — she is singing — she is thinking of her baby — oh, keep her back — keep her back — she doesn't see the well — it's so dark she doesn't see it — oh, she's gone into it — she's gone into it!" (333). The child's fantasized blissful narrative of the mother's desired return to her baby is traumatically interrupted by the mother's loss, her incomprehensible refusal to return and satisfy the child's desire. The mother falls into a well, which becomes for the child an abyss of longing from which there will be no return, leaving the child to mourn her loss.

In the midst of her high fever, Emily demands of her sweet Aunt Laura that she go and “get her out” (333), retrieve the maternal body. Although the loving Aunt Laura promises she will, Emily knows that Laura is lying, and so turns to her cruel but severely honest Aunt Elizabeth: “I know *you’ll* keep your word.... You are very hard — but *you* never lie” (334). Aunt Laura is horrified by Elizabeth’s promise to Emily: “it will open up all the old scandal again,” she says (335). Nevertheless Aunt Elizabeth orders the old well opened and searched; the body of Beatrice Burnley is found, and the “real fate of the loving, laughing young wife” is revealed (336). “Truth lies at the bottom of a well,” as the proverb says,¹⁷ or as “simple” Cousin Jimmy puts it, “There is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed” (335).

The story of Beatrice Burnley thus turns out to be in fact a story identical with, not the inverse of, the story of Juliet Murray — a common enough tale of bourgeois romantic marriage followed by the tragedy of early death. In the magical mode of adolescent fiction, the discovery by the heroine of the literal pitfalls of adult female sexuality are encrypted again as soon as they are discovered, and the story of maternal abandonment and of rebellious sexuality is normalized into a tale of domestic melodrama. Thus, when the story of Beatrice Burnley is re-told to Emily upon her recovery, it is “stripped ... forever of the taint and innuendo” (338) of a sordid feminine sexuality.

The intrusion of the phantom and the momentary opening of the crypt of the maternal secret open Emily to the world of adult experience. At the end of the novel, she has left childhood behind and now has “great grey shadowy eyes that had looked into death and read the riddle of a buried thing, and henceforth would hold in them some haunting, elusive remembrance of the world beyond the veil” (341). The veil is a metaphor used throughout the novel to describe the thin line which separates the world of the familiar, of “reality,” from the “other” world of unknown and unconscious experience. At the opening of the novel when Emily was dancing with her imaginary friend, the Wind Woman, the “other world” was a place of natural beauty and goodness. The narrator says that Emily had always experienced herself as being “very, very near to a world of wonderful beauty. Between it and herself hung only a thin curtain; she could never draw the curtain aside — but sometimes, just for a moment, a wind fluttered it and then it was if she caught a glimpse of the enchanting realm beyond” (7). Emily calls these moments of Wordsworthian revelation of perfect beauty, “the flash” (7). It is on the return home from this otherworldly revelation that Emily hears that her father is to die. Thus when her father tells her that he understands death as the crossing of a threshold — “in death you open and shut a door” (18) — Emily, dismayed by the solidity of the door metaphor, re-figures death as a swaying curtain, and recalling the “other” world of imaginative freedom and beauty, imagines her dead father slipping “into that world of which the flash had given her glimpses. He would be there in its beauty — never very far away from her” (19). The book’s initial chapters thus

set a pattern of experience where Emily's movements towards real or imaginative freedom are checked by trauma, but from which she recuperates by an imaginative re-figuring of the traumatic experience into transcendent terms which are familiar and comforting. This fictional re-figuring has actual results for Emily's psychic wholeness. By placing her father "just beyond that wavering curtain" (19) rather than behind a closed door, she is able in a meaningful way to write the letters to her father which continue her sense of close spiritual connection to him.

The novel ends with a similar "trick." The full riddle of adult female sexuality, of a traumatic maternal inheritance, is grasped by Emily: the adult woman may abandon her maternal role and fall into the abyss of overwhelming sexual passion. While the story of the fall into the well, from the point of view of the child, is a narrative of maternal abandonment and childhood rage, from the point of view of the adolescent girl, the "fall" suggests the dark secret of sinful sexual knowledge. This "secret" is then re-"veiled" as the forces of repression re-read the "fall" into womanhood as a normalizing "solution" to a scandalous tale of female sexuality, so that the "real" maternal body, although recovered, is simply given a decent burial in the family plot in the churchyard. The crypt of the unspeakable family drama of female sexuality is once again sealed.

However, the well in which Beatrice Burnley meets her death is overdetermined in its context in the novel. While symbolic of the secrets of female sexuality, childhood loss and maternal abandonment, the well also bears an important relationship to the novel's continuing representation of female rage and familial aggression. As Ian Menzies notes, "a ninety-foot-deep hand-dug well adjacent to the sea ... is an unlikely feature to exist outside of fiction" and so must have a "true purpose as a literary device" (56). The narrator herself notes that "a very deep well ... was considered a curious thing in that low-lying land near pond and sea" (153). This "curious" feature of the landscape figures in the story on two occasions prior to Emily's hallucination. First is its connection to female aggression in the story of Cousin Jimmy being pushed down the New Moon well. Second is the story of domestic rage in the story of the Lee brothers who dig the fatal well together but then "quarrelled over some trivial difference of opinion as to what kind of hood should be put over it; and in the heat of his anger Silas struck his brother Thomas on the head with a hammer and killed him" (153-54). Both occasions are thus enmeshments of familial aggression and rage. As Dr. Burnley acknowledges, these stories, combined with Emily's anxiety over the "secret" of Beatrice Burnley's death, make her hallucination explicable:

'It can be explained rationally enough perhaps. Emily has evidently been told about Beatrice and worried over it — her repeated "she couldn't have done it" shows that. And the tales of the old Lee well naturally made a deep impression on the mind of a sensitive child keenly alive to

dramatic values. In her delirium she mixed this all up with the well-known fact of Jimmy's tumble into New Moon well — and the rest was coincidence.' (337)

Yet Dr. Burnley's rational explanation is challenged by Aunt Elizabeth, who solidly attributes Emily's vision to a maternally inherited insight into hidden human relationships: "Our stepmother's mother was a Highland Scotch-woman. They said she had the second sight.... I never believed in it — before" (337).

Thus *Emily of New Moon* both speaks to adolescent sexual curiosity, and announces and dramatizes female rage. Although Emily's paternal legacy is initially nurturing and supportive, it is ultimately a legacy of failure, and a legacy which cannot address the growing sexual anxieties of the adolescent Emily. Emily must thus confront her difficult maternal inheritance, an inheritance figured in her female ancestors, her aunts and most importantly her mother. Although the secret knowledge represented by Juliet Murray's and Beatrice Burnley's elopements is successfully repressed and integrated into the life of the mature Emily through the mastery of certain Gothic effects, the novel does plumb the depths of both female rage and female sexual passion. While the novel ends with a normalizing view of adulthood which removes the "taint and innuendo" of female sexual knowledge, the crypt of the maternal body is briefly opened, and the complexity of both female desire and female rebelliousness is revealed.

Notes

- 1 Wicked stepmother figures abound in a variety of fairy-tales including "Hansel and Gretel," "Rapunzel" and "Snow-White." Similarly, Sara Crewe, in Frances Hodgson Burnett's *The Little Princess*, loses her beloved father and is set to work by the malicious maternal replacement, Miss Minchin. Like Emily's Aunt Laura, Miss Minchin's sister, Miss Amelia, is a more loving — but weak and ineffective — maternal figure in the novel. The death of Matthew at the end of *Anne of Green Gables* and the death of the protective uncle Reed before the opening of *Jane Eyre* are other examples of the traumatic loss of the father-figure, leaving the pre-adolescent girl in the hands of less than fully sympathetic "stepmother" figures.

In claiming that Emily's Aunt Elizabeth is a kind of "evil stepmother" character, I disagree at least partially with Lorna Drew who argues that the female characters in the novel are evidence of "female dissatisfaction": the "Emily trilogy is full of women whose sheer bloody-mindedness speaks their unhappiness" (Drew, 26). Characters such as Aunt Elizabeth, Ruth Dutton, and Miss Brownell are certainly "bloody-minded" but also commanding women who exert with pleasure considerable power over their small worlds. However, I do agree with her suggestion that patriarchy seems to be a much weakened force in this novel; Drew notes the many ill, maimed, and "feminized" male characters.

L.M. Montgomery's relation with her grandmother Lucy Macneill may be the source for some of this antagonism to quasi-stepmother figures, and her absent

father — remarried and living in Saskatchewan — the model for the lost but loved father. Both of the grandparents with whom she lived as a child seem to have been stern and disapproving. For example, after an enjoyable school concert, the sixteen year-old Lucy Maud goes home to face their displeasure. Her journal entry of July 1, 1890 records: "I am really sorry it is over for we had lots of fun getting it up. I have enjoyed it all, although, as usual, it was somewhat embittered for me by the fact that grandpa and grandma did not approve of it — why I cannot say. It just seems that they never do approve of anything which means the assembling of young folks together" (I. 21-22).

- 2 Elizabeth Waterston writes: "The heroines of L.M. Montgomery have no mothers. They do have aunts and grandmothers (who can be safely hated). Indeed they usually have a range of aunts, some restrictive, some permissive. The adolescent reader can discriminate ambivalent feelings by loving one aunt (mother-substitute), while hating another" (218).

For a contrary view on absent mothers in fairy tales, see Marina Warner who argues: "The experiences fairy stories recount are remembered, lived experiences of women, not fairytale concoctions from the depths of the psyche; they are rooted in the social, legal and economic history of marriage and the family, and they have all the stark actuality of the real" (287).

- 3 By "realist" I mean conforming to a mode of literal rather than figurative representation; cf. M.H. Abrams: "The typical realist sets out to write a fiction which will give the illusion that it reflects life and the social world as it seems to the common reader" (152). On the subject of "family values," Lorna Drew, picking up on the motif of the island and its relation to Emily's writing, argues that Emily "may write only on the island, performing the important ideological task of marketing both family values and place" (23).
- 4 Here I disagree with both Epperly and Judith Miller. Epperly writes: "On the surface of it, the males, as Judith Miller says, 'seem to encourage writing' (163), but the underlying and encoded messages about women's place in the male literary establishment eventually make their quality of support suspect (not Cousin Jimmy's or her father's, but then Cousin Jimmy is 'simple,' and her father is dead)" (152). Epperly discusses the roles of Father Cassidy (153), Mr. Carpenter (154) and Dean Priest (155-56) in some detail.
- 5 We never learn explicitly the shape or form of Elizabeth's remorse for this deed. However, the scene in which Elizabeth tells Emily to kneel to ask Miss Brownell's forgiveness, but then is checked by Jimmy, is suggestive. After Jimmy says, "A human being should not kneel to any one but God," "A sudden strange change came over Elizabeth Murray's proud, angry face. She stood very still, looking at Cousin Jimmy — stood so long Miss Brownell made a motion of petulant impatience" (177). Given what we know about their relation, it is fitting that Cousin Jimmy speaks with authority to Elizabeth on matters of repentance and forgiveness.
- 6 The threat to cut Emily's hair recalls the act of the witch who does in fact cut Rapunzel's hair, hair which has been both an image of and her means to achieve sexual freedom.
- 7 Archibald Murray was, in fact, a patriarchal tyrant: "the handsome, intolerant, autocratic old man ... ruled his family with a rod of iron all his life and made existence miserable at New Moon with his petulant tyranny of the five years of invalidism that had closed his career" (60).
- 8 Elizabeth's "girlish stepmother" is Emily's mother's mother; the stepmother married Elizabeth's (one assumes elderly) father after her own mother died.

- 9 These female ancestors are based on Montgomery's own. See Montgomery's *The Alpine Path* 12, 14.
- 10 Ellen Moers coins the term "female Gothic" in her book *Literary Women*; it receives further adumbration by Gilbert and Gubar in *The Madwoman in the Attic*. Drew's argument employs Julia Kristeva's idea of poetic language being inflected by the semiotic, a state associated with the preoedipal mother. The semiotic is replaced by the (masculine) symbolic order when the infant learns language. As John Lechte argues, for Kristeva, "the semiotic ... is bound up with the body as jouissance" (128) so that for Drew, Emily's "dreams, fantasies and visions" are associated with "the dimension of poetic language [which] corresponds to an experience with the mother" (Lechte, 157).
- 11 Gabriella Ahmansson analyses Anne's desire to alter her body — her hair, her freckles, etc. — in *Anne of Green Gables* (88); the focus on Emily's body is thus arguably evidence of a characteristic interest of Montgomery. Ahmansson also provides an overview of L.M. Montgomery's work as belonging to a tradition of Canadian fiction strongly influenced by the Puritan ethic (47-48).
- 12 Nancy Chodorow's argument in *The Reproduction of Mothering* would be an example of what Abraham and Torok view as an overly deterministic system. Concentrating on the preoedipal phase, Chodorow argues that because girls are mothered by someone of the same gender, girls, universally, develop more fluid ego-boundaries than boys.
- 13 For example, Mary's maturing body is transformed by a power identified as "Magic" in Frances Hodgson Burnett's *The Secret Garden*, a "magic" clearly connected to both the garden's suggestively burgeoning growth and to the story of Colin's mother. Psychoanalytic readings of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* or L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (or the film *The Wizard of Oz*) would similarly suggest that the development of the heroine's adolescent body is a sub-text of those works.
- 14 Abraham and Torok frequently use the metaphor of the crypt to describe the mechanism of repression and the aim of analysis. In analysis patients "disinter" the "crypt" of family secrets by introjecting an unspoken secret through an appropriation of the traumatic event which brings it into full consciousness. In *Emily of New Moon* the opening of the crypt is literal, not metaphoric.
- 15 Drew's argument concerning Beatrice Burnley's role in the Gothic plot is difficult to follow. Drew claims that she "is, of course, an example of the fate in store for women who are rather *too* feminine; her excessive jealousy places her beyond the patriarchal pale. In reviving her tarnished reputation, Emily makes a statement for the presence of a less repressed version of femininity than that manifested in the women around her" (26-27). While this description seems apt for Teddy Kent's mother, who does suffer from "excessive jealousy" and who has her traumatic guilt cleansed by Emily in *Emily's Quest*, it seems hard to argue that Beatrice Burnley is either "*too* feminine" or that she suffers from jealousy at all. While Emily's hallucination of the true story of Beatrice Burnley could be said to redeem "her tarnished reputation," this paper argues that the "solution" offered by Emily's hallucination is, in fact, only another form of repression.
- 16 In a journal entry from January 7, 1910, Montgomery records some of her earliest memories, including the story of her bout with typhoid fever. She recalls a lengthy inability to recognize Lucy Macneill as her grandmother. In her feverish delirium she believes that "this tall thin woman by the bed" (370) cannot be her grandmother, but when she finally recovers "it simply dawned on me that it really was grandmother.... I remember stroking her face continually and saying in amazement and delight, "Why, you are *not* Mrs. Murphy after all — you are grandma" (I. 370). The halluci-

nated scene in *Emily of New Moon*, though more Gothic in its overtones, similarly involves questions of recognition, identity and truth.

17 Proverbial, origin in Democritus.

Works Cited

- Abraham, Nicholas and Maria Torok. *The Shell and the Kernel*. Ed. and trans. Nicholas T. Rand. Vol. 1. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1994.
- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 5th ed. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1988.
- Ahmansson, Gabriella. *A Life and its Mirrors: A Feminist Reading of L.M. Montgomery's Fiction*. Vol. 1. Stockholm: Uppsala, 1991.
- Baldick, Chris. "Introduction." *The Oxford Book of Gothic Tales*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. xi.-xxiii.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales*. New York: Vintage, 1975, 1989.
- Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: California UP, 1978.
- Drew, Lorna. "The Emily Connection: Ann Radcliffe, L.M. Montgomery and 'The Female Gothic.'" *Canadian Children's Literature* 77 (1995) 19-32.
- Epperly, Elizabeth Rollins. *The Fragrance of Sweet-Grass: L.M. Montgomery's Heroines and the Pursuit of Romance*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1992.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Lechte, John. *Julia Kristeva*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Menzies, Ian. "The Moral of the Rose: L.M. Montgomery's Emily." *Canadian Children's Literature* 65 (1992) 48-61.
- Miller, Judith. "Montgomery's Emily: Voices and Silences." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 9.2 (1984): 158-68.
- Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Montgomery, L.M. *The Alpine Path: The Story of My Career*. 1917. Markham, ON: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1997.
- . *Emily Climbs*. 1924. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- . *Emily of New Moon*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1923.
- . *The Selected Journals of L.M. Montgomery*. Vol. 1. Ed. Mary Rubio and Elizabeth Waterston. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1985. 4 vols.
- Rand, Nicholas T. "Introduction." *The Shell and the Kernel*. Vol. 1. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1994.
- Rashkin, Esther. *Family Secrets and the Psychoanalysis of Narrative*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.
- Rubio, Mary. "Subverting the trite: L.M. Montgomery's 'room of her own.'" *Canadian Children's Literature* 65 (1992) 6-39.
- Warner, Marina. "The Absent Mother: Women against Women in Old Wives' Tales." *Only Connect: Readings on Children's Literature*. Ed. Sheila Egoff, et al. 3rd ed. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1996. 278-87.
- Waterston, Elizabeth. "L.M. Montgomery, 1874-1942." *The Clear Spirit: Twenty Canadian Women and their Times*. Ed. Mary Quayle Innis. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1966. 198-220.

Kate Lawson earned her PhD from the University of Toronto. She is currently an assistant professor of English at the University of Northern British Columbia, where she teaches Victorian and children's literature.