

Daisy Miller: Cowboy Feminist

By Lisa Johnson, *State University
of West Georgia*

“[C]ertain (not all) male texts merit a dual hermeneutic: a negative hermeneutic that discloses their complicity with patriarchal ideology, and a positive hermeneutic that recuperates the utopian moment—the authentic kernel—from which they draw a significant portion of their emotional power.”

—Patrocínio Schweickart

Daisy Miller shoots from the hip. This directness—her great flaw, according to her social circle (and many of her readers)—is what compels me most. She speaks her mind and forces others to speak theirs, offering rare relief in the oppressive Jamesian atmosphere of unspoken but ubiquitous and unbending cultural rules. Her story of enculturation and personal defiance, on the surface a cautionary tale for wayward girls, contains what Patrocínio Schweickart calls an “authentic kernel” or “utopian moment.” From this seed of rebellion, feminist readers draw out a counter-narrative of American womanhood defined by freedom despite social constraints. Within James criticism feminist critics consistently emphasize the liberatory dimension of Daisy’s story, placing the evidence of patriarchal control—Daisy’s death—in brackets. While traditional critics repeat Winterbourne’s fatal mistake of evaluating Daisy in terms of regulatory categories of womanhood (good or bad, innocent or wild), calling her “the wonder and horror of all decorous people,” asking “What *is* one to do with such a contrary girl?,” feminists embrace Daisy’s integration of these qualities, recognizing the protest coiled inside her indecorousness.¹

Judith Fryer focuses on this integration of contrary values in *Faces of Eve*, arguing, “James gives us here a type of American girl who is both bold and good,” marking a new era in depictions of womanhood in American literature. Daisy’s self-reliance as a woman is, according to Fryer, what Americans like—and what

they fear—about this novella (97–101). Louise Barnett likewise reads Daisy with believing eyes, presenting her as a figure of “Jamesian feminism”:

Daisy remains the most uncompromising and uninhibited of James’s many freedom-seeking heroines, a resister of patriarchal authority who “has never allowed a gentleman to dictate to [her] or to interfere with anything [she does].” She breaks rather than bending to social demands. (287)

Finally, Virginia Fowler contributes to this recuperative feminist force, asserting, “of James’s American girls: what survives in our memory of these fictional heroines is not the ‘strain’ they encounter on the European stage, but the ‘resistance’ they display in their dramas” (61). I join these women in affirming the textual impact of Daisy’s resistance to physical and psychological enclosure. Her moments of defiance linger long after the sting of her death subsides. For this reason, I focus on the center of her narrative instead of the end, in a sense writing beyond the ending by connecting *Daisy Miller* with a variety of feminist contexts to reveal its potential as a parable for gender outlaws.²

The seeds for such a reading lie in Tristram Coffin’s 1958 piece (after which my title is modeled), “Daisy Miller: Western Hero.” Coffin’s brief article, which appeared first in *Western Folklore*, points out that *Daisy Miller* follows the “cowboy formula” of Western American literature: “[T]he independence of thought and action, the self-imposed morality, the laudable innocence, the straightforward distrust of subtlety and ‘front’ that have become hallmarks of the western hero are all carefully drawn into Daisy Miller to give her her American nature” (136). “This was the era,” writes Coffin, “of [. . .] the glorification of the outlaw” (137). Although he flirts with gender-bending effects by calling Daisy “a western hero with parasol and bank account” (136), Coffin does not pursue the implications of placing a woman at the center of an American mythology, much less an adventure genre. Modleski’s study of women heroes in Western movies fills this gap:

There was a significant subgenre of nineteenth-century dime-store Westerns featuring women dressed as men. These women did not appear on the scene all at once, however, but were part of a more gradual transformation of the Western heroine from, in Henry Nash Smith’s words [in *Virgin Land*], “the merely passive sexual object she had tended to be in the Leatherstocking tales” to a more active protagonist. (161)

Daisy, in this light, can be seen as part of a gradual transformation of women in American literature from object to subject position. While she adorns her body in dresses, her mentality, characterized by commitment to freedom at all costs, represents an internal cross-dressing, wherein she takes on attributes historically accorded only to men. In this transsexual crosshatching of desire, Daisy emerges as a “cowboy feminist.”³

The phrase “cowboy feminism,” coined recently by *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd, originates as a form of anti-feminism or backlash. While Dowd alleges a growing desire among contemporary women for relationships with manly men—the cowboy type—, Daisy’s version of Cowboy Feminism, as I am constructing it, yokes female subjectivity with cowboy agency. I find the term engaging enough to warrant splicing it with this recuperative definition, a critical move resembling Phyllis Barrett’s application of the American Adam category to our canonical female heroes; through it, I put Daisy squarely in the saddle where she can better command the direction of her life, galloping down a new path of American womanhood instead of “mincing” along the old one.⁴ The sexiness of the cowboy life—its animality and renegade mobility—further informs Daisy’s feminism; as she straddles her American woman’s life, she breaks free of the constraining Cult of True Womanhood in which “piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity” are prized (Allen 12). Daisy forays instead into the frontiers of female sexuality and subjectivity, “[s]ymbolically deploying the improper body as a mode of social sedition” (Kipnis 134).⁵ Winterbourne, as central consciousness, reflects on his aunt’s “disclosures” about Daisy’s family and personal life and concludes, “Evidently she was rather wild” (63). Indeed, her wildness—the moments in the text where Daisy acts “improper”—marks a refusal of the very social rules that result in such labels, serving as a force of intervention that responds to Costellian disclosures with the dis-closure, or prying open, of existing social categories for women.⁶

Daisy’s bare-back antics revolve around refusals of propriety that refigure the gendered boundaries of space. She ventures where proper women do not go—into the street, and into frank speech. If manners are, as Terry Eagleton argues, a trick of society in which political agendas become disguised and defused as good taste, then Daisy, in rejecting the seemingly superficial domain of etiquette, rejects as well a social structure that hinges on gender and class oppression.⁷ A key scene in *Daisy Miller*, occurring a little over halfway into the narrative, pulses with this revolutionary energy. Daisy has gone for a walk, despite being cautioned by her mother and Mrs. Walker that it might not be safe to go in the late afternoon. (While safety here refers to the problem of catching Roman fever, it resonates with contemporary concerns about women walking at dusk.) As a compromise, Daisy allows Winterbourne to escort her to meet “the beautiful Giovanelli” yet consistently mocks such orchestrated behavior, exclaiming, “‘Gracious me! [. . .] I don’t want to do anything improper’” (86), and making fun of Winterbourne for his distress. Finally, her patience wears thin, and when Winterbourne makes his “imperious” claim—“‘Pray understand, then, [. . .] that I intend to remain with you’” (88)—Daisy makes a counter-claim for female agency: “‘I have never allowed a gentleman to dictate to me, or to interfere with anything I do’” (88). She asserts her right to walk the road alone, like the desperado she is.

But women do not ride easily into the sunset like cowboys. In fact, walking is well-known as a *masculine* motif of freedom and spiritual enlightenment.⁸ By insisting on her entitlement to mobility and solitude, Daisy challenges the concept of separate spheres that pervaded American configurations of gender for the white middle class in the nineteenth century.⁹ She walks, as well, for her health, claiming

if she did not, she'd "expire" (92). The feminist campaign for suffrage linked exercise with wider social freedoms. As Ian Bell notes, the

ideal of "Real Womanhood" that achieved popular appeal in the second half of the nineteenth century [. . .] based its ambitions for wider education and employment on issues of health and physical fitness—an ideal of energy caught by the animation of Daisy's conversation and her predilection for walking. (28)

Daisy embraces the "male" entitlements of mental and physical health, becoming a walker, a mill-er, one who "goes about alone" (79).

Daisy enters the novella under the categorical pronouncement of her brother: "Here comes my sister! [. . .] She's an American girl" (50). She spends the whole of her time thereafter combatting and refiguring the meanings attached to that identity. The story of the American girl marches ahead of her, obscuring the details of individual experience; it blots her out, predisposing people to react to her in specific ways. "How pretty they are," Winterbourne comments, reacting to Daisy as category, rather than person (51). "American girls are the best girls," he quips giddily (50). Embattled, himself, over the reductive nature of social labels, Winterbourne's values—what he means by "the *best* girls"—remain uncertain. In contemporary parlance, the phrase "good girl" connotes submission (something you say to a dog), and, depending on context, can either mean submission to social norms of femininity (reserving one's sexuality for marriage) or its opposite, submission to one's sexual urges (and sexually servicing a male partner—"nice people swallow," according to late-twentieth-century bumper sticker wisdom). In other words, "good" and "bad" girls—virgins and whores—both fulfill acceptable roles within patriarchy. Both are defined in terms of men's desires, men's sexuality. Winterbourne, as central consciousness, personifies the centrality of the male body in patriarchal configurations of sexuality. Might one say his ambivalence reflects the wider body of male-authored canonical texts as part of, yet resistant to, the patriarchal status quo (pace Leland Person)? In the same way, Winterbourne's definition of "the best girls" reflects the ambiguity surrounding the question in this book of what, exactly, American girls should be like. Are they flirts? Do we wish them to be? Where, finally, does "American" end and "girl" begin? Winterbourne's affiliations with Old World values—his aunt who "decline[s] the honour of [Daisy's] acquaintance" (64), as well as his internal battle over "the right way of regarding Miss Daisy Miller" (111)—are counterpointed by his own semi-base desires. His infatuation with this very pretty girl, James's repeated puns on his narrator's "stiff" behavior, and the closing lines of the novella which inform the reader that Winterbourne is back in Geneva "'studying' very hard—an intimation that he is much interested in a very clever foreign lady" (116) mark Winterbourne as an erotic being. Master of "circumsexualocution," James provides only glimpses of male sexuality.¹⁰ Like many of James's male characters, Winterbourne responds to Daisy's wild energy but doesn't act decisively on his desire, alternately aroused and repulsed by the prospect. Winterbourne's contradictory values underwrite the complex question

of what it might mean to be one of the best girls—performing femininity successfully according to social prescriptions *or* exceeding that role by embracing sexuality despite the rules of right behavior. Readers needn't worry if we haven't decided, for neither has he. Indeed, the question of who gets to define the "good girl" generates both plot and spirit in this story.

Daisy's insistence on walking links her not only with the male subject position, then, but also with various outlaw female subjectivities. Rosa Linda Fregoso's examination of Chicana urban identities, oddly, but fruitfully, illuminates Daisy Miller's outrage on girlhood. Fregoso examines "pachucas," personifications of urban cool and tough femininity with "vibrant makeup and ratted hairdos." "Loud and boisterous" (73), these homegirls offer feminism a figure of the young American woman as "agent of oppositional practices" (78). Pachucas take to the streets—"contested semiotic terrains within the public sphere"—in order to "access public life" (75), despite the continued coding of the street as male, part of the open space men expand into and explore, where women (are supposed to) fear to tread. By entering this space, the pachuca regenders the public arena, bringing the girl into the street and the street into the girl. Without erasing the key elements of race and class in Fregoso's analysis, I would like to argue that when Daisy insists on walking in the streets rather than staying home, or at least riding in an enclosed carriage like a "good" woman, she reveals an inchoate impulse towards a more street-smart femininity. Daisy shares with many women an opposition to traditional connotations of upper-class femininity and physical constriction, as codified in nineteenth-century advice books: "The true lady walks the street, wrapped in a mantle of proper reserve, so impenetrable that insult and coarse familiarity shrink from her." Indeed, "[s]he is always unobtrusive, never talks loudly, or laughs boisterously, or does anything to attract the attention of the passers-by" (Culley 125).¹¹ Daisy, on the other hand, makes a spectacle of herself: "*Elle s'affiche*" (97). She makes a scene in the street—more "pachuca" than "lady," marking the borders of permeable class and race borders (as *nouveau riche* and as a white woman spending time with her "dark" suitor). Fregoso notes the interchangeability in certain contexts of "pachuca" with "puta" (81)—Spanish for whore—underscoring social readings of the young woman's body in resistance as sexual outlaw, prostitute, woman of the streets. Daisy fits neatly within this context of alternative American womanhoods. On her body, national mythologies of mobility and sexual freedom converge: Daisy is a tramp.¹²

This insult can, like many denigrating epithets, be recuperated and charged with positive feminist energy. "Nice" society (Mrs. Costello, Winterbourne, and Mrs. Walker) reads in Daisy traces of the prostitute or fallen woman, though her behavior hardly escalates to the level of actual whoredom; nevertheless, an association with the prostitute, as with the cowboy and pachuca, affords her a latitude of speculation in which to develop and exercise more broad-minded perspectives on the female body—where, when, and how it might suitably appear in public. The strength of Daisy's character is fired in the oven of the outsider position. In a recent exploration of the "slut phenomenon" in contemporary society (the use of the "slut" label to police girls according to conventional American ideals of femininity), Leora Tanenbaum marks the relationship between

being scapegoated and developing a more sophisticated moral integrity: “These girls flaunt a proud, rebellious persona. Their attitude is: Why not flee the suffocation of conformity? Why not show everyone that being ‘good’ is a farce?” (41). Daisy shares with the girls of Tanenbaum’s study an undeserved bad reputation and corresponding outrage at the unfair rules of girlhood. Instead of going “underground,” Daisy comes out as a gender outlaw.¹³

Shannon Bell examines the prostitute body as site of resistance to cultural norms, providing a vocabulary for reading Daisy as social critic. Daisy performs a contestatory aesthetics of the female body by walking where and when she pleases and asserts herself as a “new sexual political subject” (17). Her strategies of dissent resemble those of contemporary performance artists:

us[ing] their marginalized and “obscene” bodies as sites of resistance to reclaim and remap their own identities, to deconstruct the masculinist, feminist, and heterosexual inscriptions on their bodies, and as a consequence to destabilize the hegemonic discourse itself. (17–18)

Standing outside the social purity doctrine of her day, Daisy deconstructs masculinist *and* feminist claims on her body, refusing to be “good” according to either paradigm.

The nineteenth-century controversies surrounding the female pedestrian infuse Daisy’s street scene with weighty historical import. A battle raged over a woman’s right to appear in public without being accosted by lewd men—or police officers! Rising industrialism’s necessary invention of “shopping” and “shopping malls” clashed with conservative bourgeois notions of family, domesticity, and femininity. Judith Walkowitz examines late Victorian London for the stories designed to coerce women into staying home. Once the infrastructure of etiquette no longer achieved this goal satisfactorily, scare tactics added external pressure. Specifically, Walkowitz analyzes the Jack the Ripper phenomenon and the ways the gruesome Whitechapel murders were disseminated through graphic, frightening newspaper headlines and stories, revealing the punitive relationship between being a woman in public, being a public woman (a prostitute), and being slayed and eviscerated—uterus cut out and laid neatly at one’s immobilized feet.

Walkowitz’s study resonates uncannily with certain articulations of contemporary sex worker feminisms that emphasize ongoing prohibitions against women in the streets. Priscilla Alexander writes of the present-day female pedestrian’s situation as a site where *whore feminism* intersects with the interests of all women:

I believe that as long as women are arrested for the crime of being sexually assertive, for standing on the street without a socially acceptable purpose or a male chaperone, I am not free. As a woman and a feminist, I believe we will never have rights, opportunities, choices, work options, or an income equivalent to men’s unless we can stop being afraid of being either raped or called “whore.” (84)

Alexander's discussion of police "arrest[ing] women who *seem* to be prostitutes" (85) based on attire or whereabouts indicates the contemporary continuation of nineteenth-century-style sexual persecution and feminist resistance. The specifics of her charge against these cultural restrictions sound startlingly nineteenth century:

Although on their face the laws refer only to the explicit exchange of sex and money, police do sometimes arrest women who are not prostitutes but who *seem* to be prostitutes because of what they are wearing or because they are in an area where prostitutes are *known* to contact customers. The laws reinforce age-old conventions regarding female display and behavior, laws that I believe have a chilling effect on all women. (85)

Narratives of sexual impropriety—all the rules that define acceptable female self-presentation and behavior—while offered to women in the guise of beneficent cautionary tales (wouldn't want you to get hurt, little girl), operate, nevertheless, on the assumption that if you step out of line, you may be raped or even murdered, and you will have asked for it. Ellen Carol DuBois and Linda Gordon draw this connection between nineteenth- and twentieth-century sexual terrorism as well, asserting, "We declare our right—still contested viciously—to safety not only in our homes but in the streets. We *all* intend to be streetwalkers" (42). In this transformative light, Daisy's defiant walk to the Coliseum after dark (though ultimately fatal) can be seen half-seriously as the prototypical "Take Back the Night" march.

Daisy is not a "good" woman—she does not, in other words, perform the role of Woman "correctly."¹⁴ "It was impossible," thinks Winterbourne as he silently escorts Daisy and Giovanelli, "to regard her as a perfectly well-conducted young lady" (90). She upsets the order of things, with a body that alternately plays with and mocks "proper" display of femininity. Her conflicts with the rules of etiquette are inscribed through the terminology of "exposure": Winterbourne "wondered what on earth had been in Daisy's mind when she proposed to *expose* herself, unattended, to [the crowd's] appreciation" (86, emphasis mine), and Mrs. Walker enjoins him to drop Daisy, "to give her no further opportunity to *expose* herself" (95, emphasis mine). Having confronted Daisy for her "dreadful" behavior of walking with "two men" (90), Mrs. Walker is angry at Daisy's unwillingness to be "saved," equating Daisy's simple walk with "running absolutely wild" (91). Mrs. Walker replies condescendingly to Daisy's compliment of her carriage-rug: "Will you get in and let me put it over you?" (91). By appearing on the street, socializing with men, and refusing to let Mrs. Walker put a rug (or anything else) over on her, Daisy challenges accepted ideas, using her "obscene" body as a site of resistance and laughing off the attempts of Winterbourne and Mrs. Walker to police her according to social dicta. These two long arms of the law—the male and female forces of patriarchy—join together in

herding Daisy towards her assigned place and role. Mrs. Walker tries to shame Daisy into behaving appropriately, telling her, ““You are old enough to be more reasonable. You are old enough, dear Miss Miller, to be talked about”” (92). Such threats serve in this case to fortify Daisy’s oppositional attitude. She will not get into the carriage—neither buggy nor proper feminine bodily comportment—recognizing it as a vehicle of socialization and conformity:

Daisy gave a violent laugh. “I never heard anything so stiff! If this is improper, Mrs Walker,” she pursued, “then I am all improper, and you must give me up. Good-bye; I hope you’ll have a lovely ride!” and, with Mr Giovanelli, who made a triumphantly obsequious salute, she turned away. (93)

Consistently underlining the absurdity of social etiquette, Daisy laughs (like Cixous’s Medusa) as a form of social criticism. James uncharacteristically qualifies Daisy’s laugh here as “violent” rather than “little,” giving force to her response.

When Winterbourne echoes Mrs. Walker’s shaming strategy, she turns the conversation coolly:

[. . .] “It has never occurred to Mr Winterbourne to offer me any tea,” she said, with her little tormenting manner.
 “I have offered you advice,” Winterbourne rejoined.
 “I prefer weak tea!” cried Daisy, and she went off with the brilliant Giovanelli. (100)

At the intersection of cowboy honesty and feminist epistemology, Daisy perceives manners as bigotry and conformism rather than innocuous good taste. Before dismissing Winterbourne and his weak-tea advice, Daisy asks,

“But did you ever hear anything so cool as Mrs Walker’s wanting me to get into her carriage and drop poor Mr Giovanelli; and under the pretext that it was proper? People have different ideas! It would have been most unkind.” (98)

In this moment, Daisy’s central characteristics, empathy for others and trust in herself, make her an American hero. She sticks her neck out for someone else, literally, exposing her body to “[t]he slow-moving, idly gazing Roman crowd” (86).

The imagery surrounding Daisy throughout the novella reverberates with her performance of public womanhood in the street scene. In the first scene she enters as an emblem of exposure and enclosure: “She was bare-headed; but she balanced in her hand a large parasol, with a deep border of embroidery; and she was strikingly, admirably pretty” (51). This combination—bare-headed and holding a parasol—establishes the central tensions in Daisy’s character: between self-revelation and socially constructed barriers, between retreating under the cover of conventional femininity and advancing from beneath it. The ambiguous

presentation of her body—is she covered or bare?—belongs within a history of images in literature that eroticize the female head, “a site of contestatory practices that undo and threaten the ruling symbolic system” (Eilberg-Schwartz and Doniger 10). Daisy’s bare head is sexy, fresh, and free—and evocative of her covered genitals; as a representation of her sexuality, it invites, repels, and confounds the social gaze.¹⁵ The parasol, designed to protect the world from Daisy’s head and vice versa, functions as a “social skin,” a term defined by Terence Turner: “The surface of the body, as the common frontier of society, the social self, and the psychobiological individual, becomes the symbolic stage upon which the drama of socialization is enacted, and bodily adornment [. . .] becomes the language through which it is expressed” (15). Whereas the parasol is intended by society to create a pocket of inside space for women outside, Daisy uses it flirtatiously. Like a pair of panties, Daisy’s parasol covers, eroticizes, and reveals seductive peeks at her sexual body, emphasizing her defiant visibility and providing strategic invisibility. With it, Daisy hides from sight in a *tête-à-tête* with Giovanelli that “exposes” her to criticism despite her literal hiddenness, and through it, the narrator fuses the supposed lovers into “the couple with the parasol” (96). However, in the motion of lowering her parasol (54), Daisy comes out from under one of the many shields created for women’s bodies, a “drama of socialization” and resistance enacted on its screen. In this light, Mrs. Walker’s coercive strategies on the street might be seen as an attempt to remove Daisy (her bare head, her sexual body, her outlaw female presence) from sight. The shame-inducing value of feminine modesty is unveiled as cultural artifice concealing the machinations of the upper class to insure its reproduction. Daisy refuses the invitation to invisibility.

Beyond the literal parasol as sign and shield of femininity, lies the parasol as yonic image (along with Daisy’s flower name), opening and closing like a (public) cervix.¹⁶ The parasol externalizes, makes hyper-visible, Daisy’s sexuality. Through its function as feminine adornment and its physical resemblance to the uterus’s entryway, the parasol creates, in the language of feminist postmodern aesthetics, “an excess of visibility” (Kipnis 10). Instead of obscuring Daisy from the reader’s sight, the parasol foists her subversive femininity—girl parts on display—into the faces of her companions and readers. A fetishistic representation of the unbroken hymen, this thin membrane qualifies as one of James’s “circumsexualocutions,” functioning not only as a social skin, but as a *second skin*, a slick encasement through which Daisy flaunts her body as she seems to cover it prettily.

Eventually, in this study of the female body in postures of pleasure and protest, Daisy’s death must be retrieved from those convenient brackets. Invoked frequently to underscore the ultimate conservatism of James’s text, this ending has been called everything from overkill and absurdity to nothing less than inevitable. Yet, feminist critics consistently downplay its negative interpretations, casting a heroic aura about Daisy’s demise: “She breaks rather than bending to social demands” (Barnett 287). Ihab Hassan writes, “She is, in short, a rebel, and the price of her rebellion is death” (qtd. in Wagenknecht 4), to which Edward Wagenknecht responds: “Daisy does not really defy society but only disregards it,

and if there is an element of heroism involved in carrying personal independence to such lengths, her behavior is [. . .] too spontaneous to permit the reader to posit any calculated choice or predetermination” (8). I disagree. While conceding Diane Price Herndl’s point that “illness is a very peculiar weapon, and ‘victories’ won by its means are mixed at best” since the “only chance to ‘win’ is to die” (200), I find it revealing to consider Daisy’s death a mode of heroism and social critique. At the Coliseum, Winterbourne mothers her, “‘Quick, quick,’ [. . .] if we get in by midnight we are quite safe” (113). Her retort, chalked up too simply to mere childishness—“I don’t care [. . .] whether I have Roman fever or not!” (113)—might instead be seen as impatience with being steered physically and conceptually by Winterbourne and the elite, patriarchal culture he represents. How do we read her “little strange tone” (113), and why? What is it that prompts critics to dismiss it as meaningless tantrum (“Daisy’s folly” in Patricia Crick’s endnotes [DM 126]) rather than rebuke, refusal, *revolt*?¹⁷

In choosing the risk of contamination over the safety of convention, Daisy acts with a recklessness that, for better or worse, places her within the American heroic legacy. Simon Reynolds and Joy Press write,

The rebel is always running away from home. He defines himself against domesticity and dreads being house-trained; home is precisely where adventures don’t happen. Heroic life is only possible when the rebel has made the break, distanced himself from what Robert Bly calls the “force-field” of women. (43)

Reynolds and Press continue: Immobility is threatening; movement in itself defines them as “free men.” These men are continually re-making the break by making a break for it (49). Daisy is a text-book rebel, and her trip to the Coliseum where she contracts Roman fever enacts a kinetic resistance to the politics of feminine immobility. She is a “bad boy,” making a break for it, playing outside after dark, living fast and dying young. This is not to say Cowboy Feminism results in death (malaria results in death); Cowboy Feminism is about placing the female body beyond the boundaries of conventionally feminine spaces. Illness and death are part of every adventurer’s risk, but they have been used to frighten women into domesticity (à la Jack the Ripper or, more recently, the Ripper-style television show, “Law and Order: Special Victims Unit”). Daisy rejects this sort of social terrorism.

The imagery of infection further encodes a possible social critique in the mosquito-ridden Coliseum, which doubles Daisy’s sexual female body as a projection of cultural fears surrounding notions of “purity and danger.” Daisy is dirty, sullied by her connection with Giovanelli, the dark suitor to whom she stands too close and sees too late at night, the cultural and economic outsider who amplifies Daisy’s affiliations with the lower class (she is new money, rather than old). Elizabeth Grosz (via Julia Kristeva and Mary Douglas) characterizes dirt as “that which is not in its proper place, that which upsets or befuddles order. [. . .] Dirt signals a site of possible danger to social and individual systems” (192). The viscosity of the female body offers “testimony of the fraudulence or impossibility

of the ‘clean’ and ‘proper’” (194). Like the parasol, the Coliseum provides a concrete image of the girl parts Victorian culture required one to hide from sight, acting as a dark warning of what happens when girls step outside the boundaries of their proper sphere *and* as a voyeuristic thrill, for in warning young women, the image draws our eyes to the very things (sex, the abysmal vagina, the impermanence of class, race, and gender boundaries) we are not meant to see.

The association of (bad, wet) women with contamination is of particular relevance in the period of the nineteenth century surrounding the publication of *Daisy Miller* in 1878. Walkowitz writes:

As the permeable and transgressed border between classes and sexes, as the carrier of physical and moral pollution, the prostitute was the object of considerable public inquiry as well as the object of individual preoccupation for respectable Victorians. Official concern over prostitution as a dangerous form of sexual activity, whose boundaries had to be controlled and defined by the state, led to the passage of the first Contagious Diseases Act in 1864 (followed by the Acts of 1868 and 1869), which provided for a medical and police inspection of prostitutes in garrison towns and ports. (22–23)

Daisy likewise becomes a permeable body and pollutant through her encounter with the “miasma” (110) of the Coliseum, “a nest of malaria” (111) as Winterbourne calls it, a setting which reinforces his sexually biased view of Daisy as a dirty girl, a “reprobate[]” (111)—in fact, a whore. Thus, the setting that initiates Daisy’s demise reiterates popular negative views of womanhood in the late nineteenth century, but it also contains within it the contemporaneous feminist critiques of the Contagious Diseases Act, wherein women refused the cultural lie that prostitutes bear dangerous infections while their male clients do not. The rescue worker Josephine Butler protested the medical examinations of prostitutes as “instrumental rape” and depicted “regulationists as sadistic aristocratic villains who conspired to control women through state sanction” (Walkowitz 92). As the double of Daisy’s body, the natural setting of the miasmatic swamp renders visible the socially constructed imbrications of femininity, contagion, and public space. As malarial body, as contagion, Daisy represents challenges from feminists and the prostitutes for whom they advocate (then and now) to the patriarchal social order.

Still, my more practical-minded feminist readers will no doubt insist on the immutable reality that, fearless or not, *Daisy is dead*. Not much of a role model in that. Nonetheless, I take this story as grounds for a liberatory feminist reading. *Daisy Miller* reflects that era’s competing discourses of womanhood, but it is equally important to recognize its position in the current historical moment, characterized similarly by various models of femininity invested with moral significance long after one would think the two had been separated. I follow Jane Flanders in applauding the attention male authors brought to “the injustice” dramatized in “the ‘fallen’ woman theme”: “By the nineteenth century, and into the twentieth, only men were able to write sympathetically about such taboo

themes as adultery, prostitution, or rape—and even then against violent public disapproval” (98). Bourgeois notions of propriety are revealed as disciplinary apparatus used to induce physical and conceptual stillness in white middle-class American women. Daisy’s resistance to this internal colonization creates a tension between socially sanctioned morality and feminist moral agency. In a similar reading of a recent, controversial film, Patricia Mann endeavors to theorize agency for women suspended between social structures that oppress and liberatory social critiques: “If all the male law enforcement officers gathered to watch the final arc of *Thelma and Louise* cannot yet comprehend their journey, they may possibly recognize the surplus of social desires which carries these women beyond their juridical grasp” (212). The gender-bifurcated response to this movie mirrors what happens in scholarship on *Daisy Miller*—feminist audiences hang suspended in the arc of resistance, relishing a rare representation of our “surplus of social desires,” whereas nonfeminist critics combine mock dismay with good-humored dismissal of this “contrary girl,” safely buried in the end.

Does James kill Daisy off, or does he draw attention, through images of infection, to the social “death” women risk with alternative embodiments of femininity? Nancy Bentley asks, “Does writing about manners defend or undermine the hierarchies they serve?” (8). Is James an “invisible agent of power” or “hero of subversion” (9)? Bentley sees James as “ambiguously partaking of both” roles, and I read Daisy’s death as a particularly rich dramatization of this unresolved tension. Beyond the pedestrian observation that “it depends on how you look at it,” the reader’s biases indeed inform the decision to see Daisy’s death as authorial punishment or, conversely, a dramatization of life cut short for women in general. A feminist theory of reading designed to celebrate agency within structural limits leans towards the latter and finds support in Ross Posnock’s groundbreaking rejection of the “domesticated Henry James” as “caricature” (21) and revelation of James’s underappreciated critique of “the bourgeois self” (4), “a subtler, if less glamorous” form of social criticism born of “contradiction that we are at once within and without [our culture]” (5): “Having punctured, if not overturned, the complacencies and confinements of the genteel, the Jamesian self finds the space to improvise new forms of identity and pleasure, including those found in exhilarating, isolating experiences of passion and exposure” (5). Posnock builds this theory on late late James, “a second major phase (1907–14) of autobiography, cultural criticism, and aesthetics” (4), making no reference to *Daisy Miller*, yet kernels of critique clearly exist within this very early work.¹⁸ Daisy’s death, in this light, exemplifies James’s technique of “mak[ing] the exchanges of drawing-room culture indistinguishable from acts of coercive force,” where “violent manners” (Bentley 70) endeavor to discipline Daisy into a docile body. Daisy dies, but she never turns docile.

Instead, Daisy’s appropriations of masculine liberties and her subversion of feminine limitations celebrate the “volatile body” (Grosz’s term). Grosz writes:

Misogynist thought has commonly found a convenient self-justification for women's secondary social positions by containing them within bodies that are represented, even constructed, as frail, imperfect, unruly, and unreliable, subject to various intrusions which are not under conscious control. (13)

Women's bodies, however, have the potential to enact a different kind of status, defined by autonomy, strength, and presence in excess of social constructions of Woman. Daisy's story is in part the story of wresting the female body from misogynist contexts and replacing it somewhere closer to liberation. Grosz pinpoints the reason for "the enormous investment in definitions of the female body in struggles between patriarchs and feminists: what is at stake is the activity and agency, the mobility and social space, accorded to women" (19). Certainly, this is what is at stake for Daisy, rendering her immediately recognizable to the contemporary woman reader. Reading her as a volatile body—one who passes among available subject positions, crossing gender lines to pursue her desires and in the process refiguring what is possible for American women—reveals in *Daisy Miller* an embedded text of social criticism and women's liberation. Her body agitates and booms, speaks volumes.

Further, her death modulates into the more evocative and ambiguous image of her grave. As a final physical performance piece, this "raw protuberance" (*DM* 115) brings to mind the art work of Cuban-American feminist performance artist, Ana Mendieta. In her *Siluetas* series, Mendieta made imprints of her body in natural surfaces such as sand, ice, and wood, and then photographed them. Rebecca Schneider's comments on Mendieta illuminate Daisy's grave:

[W]omen are invisible to the degree that they are visible—that is, as visible, women will be read relative to man. [. . .] Thus "Woman," striving to be other than representative of the phallic order, can paradoxically find herself striving to appear as invisible—to make her disembodiment apparent. (117)

Whereas Schneider emphasizes the documentation of "erasure" in Mendieta's series, I would emphasize, both in this context and the context of reading Daisy's conclusion, the *unrelenting presence* such images create. The shape of a woman's body remains before the reader's/viewer's eye after the actual woman is gone; this insistence on presence, this "excess of visibility," continues to comment on and resist the social forces that drive women underground even after the woman has moved on—or been rubbed out.¹⁹ In the cemetery, Winterbourne stands rebuked by the obscene text of Daisy's mound and his own complicity with the cultural violence she endured. Daisy lies decomposing in her grave, but her body presses forward before our eyes with a message of insurgence solid as earth, her "plot" surrounded by "April daisies," signs of rebel girls to come.

I am particularly interested in the uses of this feminist reading for teaching *Daisy Miller* in high school and college literature classrooms. If Leora Tanenbaum's *Slut! Growing Up with a Bad Reputation* is any indication—and I think it is—the bad girl reputation haunts women today as it did in the nineteenth century. Naomi Wolf makes a clear connection between this problem of reputation, physical safety, and restrictions on the female pedestrian:

The young girl's lust for space comes at the same moment her culture tells her that her developing body puts her in danger whenever she roams "too far." She experiences at once an expansion of her desire for physical freedom and a contraction of her chances of gratifying it. (29)

In the flux of adolescence—hormones, spoken and unspoken cultural scripts, flames of desire both for other bodies and for one's own—Daisy stands out as an icon of defiance, and her story is familiar—a mish-mash of good intentions, innocent desires, and the misreadings of culture.

I first read *Daisy Miller* in high school, returning to it periodically throughout college and graduate school. As Fowler predicts, what stays with me is not Daisy's death, but all the moments she went misunderstood, and all the moments she resisted censure. She taught me how not to be a "good" woman, how to be a woman in my own right, a woman of my own writing. She unsettled the categories I found myself caught within and confounded by. Surrounded by good girls in Bowdon, Georgia—where the cool kids were the church kids, and lipstick was for tramps, the Bible Belt strapped round my neck—what was I supposed to do with my unruly desires? Where was I to turn for another way of "becoming Woman"?

In contrast to the majority of American girls past and present, Daisy does what she pleases. As Mrs. Costello says, she's "'a young lady *qui se passe ses fantaisies!*'" (104). We never see her retreating to her bedroom to cry over her many social slights. We never see her spend an afternoon pining over lost love. Daisy retains the power of the girl within.²⁰ Having her in our canon—a woman Adam, a Cowboy Feminist—young women might gather strength just hearing her speak her mind, seeing her stand up to the matrons and patriarchs, watching her determine to take some male space and freedom for herself, and for us. In the recently released overview of third-wave feminism, *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*, co-authors Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards outline a thirteen-point agenda for social change; the tenth point—"To liberate adolescents from slut-bashing, listless educators, sexual harassment, and bullying at school, as well as violence in all walks of life, and the silence that hangs over adolescents' heads, often keeping them isolated, lonely, and indifferent to the world" (280)—provides a solid rationale for politicizing *Daisy Miller* in the classroom. Daisy's self-assurance emboldens, and a chorus of girl voices join her in saying with Emersonian bravado: "'If this is improper [. . .] then I am all improper, and you must give me up.'" Through her story, we aspire to the qualities of the Western American hero: forthrightness, adventure, and self-counsel. Contemporary singer Paula Cole, in a recent pop song, asked ironically, "Where have all the cowboys gone?" It would be nice to think of Daisy and answer: we have become them.

NOTES

The author would like to thank David Newton, Debra MacComb, Susan Strehle, Julie Haurikiewicz, and Bob DeMott for contributing to the production of this article.

¹The first quote belongs to Richard Grant White, who wrote these words in 1879, prefaced with the snide assertion, “Daisy Miller is a beauty, and, without being exactly a fool, is ignorant and devoid of all mental tone or character” (qtd. in Stafford 107). Moore asks the question that follows in his introduction to the 1986 Penguin edition of *Daisy Miller* (DM 31). Critiquing masculinist responses to *Daisy Miller* would be both too easy and too mundane; understanding the paucity of positive feminist criticism, on the other hand, intrigues. While a handful of feminist critics have forayed into James territory, I would argue that many avoid it for reasons similar to those Baym outlines in her controversial discussion of Nathaniel Hawthorne as a feminist. Baym argues that “prefeminist critics wrote with the intention of uncovering antifeminism in Hawthorne’s works, and therefore, curiously, their findings were congruent with those of the feminists. This congruence may be a partial explanation for the relative dearth of feminist work on Hawthorne: in effect, the antifeminists had done the feminists’ work for them!” (58). Baym’s call for a more complex feminist literary criticism, capable of perceiving positive representations of women in Hawthorne’s work, could productively be extended to James.

²DuPlessis uses the phrase “writing beyond the ending” to indicate twentieth-century women’s narrative strategies for subverting conventional romance plots. The phrase strikes me as useful for feminist critics who create new contexts in which to consider canonical texts in a related move to liberate our heroines.

³Wardley points out the Americanism of Daisy as cowboy as well, noting, via Leslie Fiedler, that

James’s readers generally agree that Daisy, or “Annie P. Miller” as it says on her cards, is the “improbable sister to the hard-riding, hard-shooting, sometimes cigar-smoking heroines of the dime novel, related through Molly Wopsus of Joaquin Miller to Annie Oakley.” Crossing the threshold into Mrs. Walker’s salon, the girl from “that land of dollars and six-shooters” crosses the border between genres, between the American western and the Continental *nouvelle*. (247)

⁴Barrett comments on the pattern in masculine American literary criticism of ignoring the women heroes of our fiction. She constructs a list of female Adams whose “sights are set not on conventional ‘female’ goals like marriage and motherhood, but on the ‘male’ goal of self-realization.” “In short,” writes Barrett, “these women stride, rather than mince, through our fiction, bathed in that mythic glow which we have traditionally associated with Cooper’s Natty, Twain’s Huck, and other male American Adams. [. . .] Like the acknowledged Adams, these women are appealing—and sometimes dangerous—innocents; they, too, long for the open road and the freedom of the forest” (40).

⁵This phrase appears in Kipnis’s analysis of tastelessness as class warfare, examining the contemporary porno magazine *Hustler*, whose founder, Larry Flynt, shares with James’s Daisy a relentless agitation of class boundaries on speech and the body. “Tastelessness,” Flynt asserts, “is a necessary tool in challenging preconceived notions in an uptight world where people are afraid to discuss their attitudes, prejudices, and misconceptions” (qtd. in Kipnis 225).

⁶Reading Daisy as a Cowboy Feminist necessarily raises the question of whether Henry James was a feminist. Several critics argue convincingly for the influence of feminism on James’s aesthetics, including Allen (29–30), Fowler (4–6), Barnett (281), and Ian Bell (28). Person argues for the validity of connecting other nineteenth-century male authors with contemporary feminist poetics. I could not make a claim either way, but James’s latent homosexuality and profession as an artist place him in unconventional relationships to gender, suggesting reasons for a vested interest in destabilizing hegemonic narratives of sexuality. Graham makes this case in the recent biography, *Henry James’s Thwarted Love*. Finally, such a reading makes, if not a claim for James’s feminism, at least a claim for a feminist reading of James.

⁷I base this argument on Eagleton’s ideological critique of manners.

⁸I’m thinking here of Thoreau’s essay, “Walking,” in which the gender of mobility is clearly masculine. A. R. Ammons’s “A Poem is Like a Walk” traces walking as a motif in men’s poetry.

⁹Fryer, in *Felicitous Space*, writes, “The separate spheres of the two sexes in America, those Tocqueville had observed in 1830, had become so clearly marked by the end of the nineteenth century [. . .] as to suggest to American cultural critics ‘an abysmal fracture’” (9). In such a historical setting, Heilbrun’s words to contemporary women ring even more true for Daisy: “I want to tell women that the male role model for autonomy and achievement is the one they still must follow. [. . .] Women have denied themselves as examples the only models of achievement history offers us” (31). Contrasting thwarted female characters in novels by women with their male-authored counterparts, she concludes, “Male writers [. . .] create women characters who achieve a sense of their own

selfhood, their own free sense of choosing. Life to these fictional young women presents itself as, in [Henry] James's words, "dazingly livable" (73).

¹⁰ Davidson argues, "in *Daisy Miller*, James shows individuals perpetually searching for various 'circumsexualocations'—ways of talking around all problems of generation" (366).

¹¹ From John H. Young's *Our Department, Or the Manners, Conduct and Dress of the Most Refined Society*, cited in Culley's Norton edition of *The Awakening*.

¹² Bell pinpoints the principle opposition in this novella as "between Daisy's insistent mobility [. . .] and the fossilizing of the American matrons" (27). For the connection between Daisy and prostitution, see Wardley (246).

¹³ The phrase, "going underground," comes from Gilligan and Brown. Other works on feminism and psychological development include Hancock, Pipher, and Orenstein.

¹⁴ On this point I take exception to Tintner's essay linking Daisy to Chaucer's *The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women*. Tintner posits Daisy as a "martyr to love" (12), a reading that obscures Daisy's subversive qualities.

¹⁵ Eilberg-Schwartz and Doniger observe "the frequent association of the female head and the vagina," tracing this cultural phenomenon from Freud through Cixous, as well as into the anthropological debate surrounding hair symbolism in various cultures (3). Doniger describes displacements from the vagina to the eye, "when, for instance, the cloth that usually covers the genitals is literally displaced to the head" (27).

¹⁶ Annie Sprinkle, contemporary prostitute performance artist, performs an act called "A Public Cervix" in which she invites audience members to look at her cervix through a speculum on stage. Daisy's parasol might be seen as a nineteenth-century version of this act. This connection counters Page's reading of the parasol as a narrative strategy representing the degree to which Winterbourne and the reader cannot see Daisy or access her consciousness at crucial moments in the text; instead, I propose the parasol marks the subversive invitation to look at Daisy's body, her cervix writ large and held high above her head, a "public service" message of sorts.

¹⁷ Price Herndl does not treat *Daisy Miller* extensively, but her footnote on the novella confirms my double-sided interpretation: "Daisy's illness and death are caused by both her *independence* and her heedless going about at night" (226, emphasis mine). Price Herndl's theory further illuminates a recuperative feminist angle on Daisy's death, as she argues that the political purpose of illness in fiction is to "represent[t] a world in which women suffer political injustices directly in their bodies" (216); "One of the workings of cultural power, then, is to divert political disease into an overwhelming attention to the individual body and away from the body politic" (220). Does James mean to obscure or reveal the political dimensions of Daisy's infected body? Does Daisy die, figuratively speaking, from what Price Herndl calls "the 'Malaria' of women's oppression"? Price Herndl insists on the need to "reexamine all representations of illness to understand when the literary figures are genuinely resistant to oppression and when such figures support the cultural drive to distract us from it." I doubt, frankly, that James intended Daisy's death to be "genuinely resistant to oppression," but the feminist theory of reading I perform here highlights the novella's resistant possibilities in the service of contemporary cultural reform.

¹⁸ Posnock argues, "*The American Scene* constitutes a calculated act of affiliation with the new century and its endless possibilities (12); in it, James "playfully mocks the genteel chronicler and critic, with their conventional gestures of lament and offended sensibility" (14), a tone James emits through Daisy Miller's mouth as she teases Winterbourne and performs mock modesty for him and the offended Mrs. Walker. Posnock's biographical research turns up the author's supportive attitudes towards "the emancipated woman," advocating her "freedom to annex the male identity" (23), a political stance that suggests Daisy's death may have reflected "the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anxiety about and fascination with forms of being that resist normalization (29), rather than suggesting James "didn't know what else to do with her," as one of my "old school" male colleagues once quipped.

¹⁹ I refer here not only to Daisy's death but to the controversy surrounding Mendietta's death as a possible murder by her husband rather than suicide.

²⁰ The phrase, "girl within," comes from Hancock's book of the same title, in which she addresses adult women's processes of reconnecting with the fearless spirit of her childhood before adolescence and its socialization of girls into proper women.

WORKS BY HENRY JAMES

DM—*Daisy Miller*. Ed. Geoffrey Moore. New York: Penguin, 1986.

OTHER WORKS CITED

Allen, Elizabeth. *A Woman's Place in the Novels of Henry James*. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Alexander, Priscilla. "Feminism, Sex Workers, and Human Rights." *Whores and Other Feminists*. Ed. Jill Nagle. New York: Routledge, 1997. 83–97.

- Ammons, A. R. "A Poem Is Like a Walk." *Claims for Poetry*. Ed. Donald Hall. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1982.
- Barnett, Louise K. "Jamesian Feminism: Women in *Daisy Miller*." *Studies in Short Fiction* 16 (1979): 281-87.
- Barrett, Phyllis. "More American Adams: Women Heroes in American Fiction." *Markham Review* 10 (1981): 39-41.
- Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*. New York: Farrar, 2000.
- Baym, Nina. "Thwarted Nature: Nathaniel Hawthorne as Feminist." *American Novelists Revisited: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Fritz Fleischmann. Boston: Hall, 1982. 58-77.
- Bell, Ian F. A. "Displays of the Female: Formula and Flirtation in 'Daisy Miller.'" *Henry James: The Shorter Fiction*. Ed. N. H. Reeve. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1997. 17-40.
- Bell, Shannon. *Reading, Writing, and Rewriting the Prostitute Body*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.
- Bentley, Nancy. *The Ethnography of Manners: Hawthorne, James, Wharton*. Cambridge Studies in American Literature. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Brumberg, Joan Jacobs. *The Body Project: An Intimate History of American Girls*. New York: Vintage, 1997.
- Coffin, Tristram. "Daisy Miller: Western Hero." *James's Daisy Miller: The Story, the Play, the Critics*. Scribner Research Anthologies. New York: Scribner, 1963.
- Culley, Margo, ed. *The Awakening*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1994.
- Davidson, Cathy N. "'Circumsexualocution' in Henry James's *Daisy Miller*." *Arizona Quarterly* 32 (1976): 353-66.
- Doniger, Wendy. "Put a Bag Over Her Head: Beheading Mythological Women." *Off with Her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*. Ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz and Wendy Doniger. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995. 15-31.
- Dowd, Maureen. "Cowboy Feminism." *New York Times* 11 Apr. 1999: 17.
- DuBois, Ellen Carol, and Linda Gordon. "Seeking Ecstasy on the Battlefield: Danger and Pleasure in Nineteenth-Century Feminist Sexual Thought." *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Ed. Carole S. Vance. London: Pandora, 1992. 31-49.
- DuPlessis, Rachel Blau. *Writing beyond the Ending: Narrative Strategies of Twentieth-Century Women Writers*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985.
- Eagleton, Terry. "The Ideology of the Aesthetic." *The Politics of Pleasure: Aesthetics and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Stephen Regan. Buckingham: Open UP, 1992. 17-31.
- Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard. "Introduction: The Spectacle of the Female Head." *Off with Her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*. Ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz and Wendy Doniger. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995. 1-13.
- Flanders, Jane. "The Fallen Woman in Fiction." *Feminist Visions: Toward a Transformation of the Liberal Arts Curriculum*. Ed. Diane L. Fowlkes and Charlotte S. McClure. University: U of Alabama P, 1984. 97-109.
- Fowler, Virginia C. *Henry James's American Girl: The Embroidery on the Canvas*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.
- Fregoso, Rosa Linda. "Re-Imagining Chicana Urban Identities in the Public Sphere, Cool *Chuca* Style." *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalism, Transnational Feminisms, and the State*. Ed. Caren Kaplan, Norma Alarcon, and Minoo Moallem. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. 72-91.
- Fryer, Judith. *Faces of Eve: Women in the Nineteenth Century American Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 1976.
- . *Felicitous Space: The Imaginative Structures of Edith Wharton and Willa Cather*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1986.
- Gilligan, Carol, and Lyn Mikel Brown. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Graham, Wendy. *Henry James's Thwarted Love*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1999.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.
- Hancock, Emily. *The Girl Within*. New York: Fawcett, 1989.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn. *Reinventing Womanhood*. New York: Norton, 1993.
- Kipnis, Laura. *Ecstasy Unlimited: On Sex, Capital, Gender, and Aesthetics*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.
- Mann, Patricia. *Micro-politics: Agency in a Postfeminist Era*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994.
- Modleski, Tania. *Old Wives' Tales and Other Women's Stories*. Washington Square: NYUP, 1998.
- Orenstein, Peggy. *School Girls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap*. New York: Anchor, 1995.
- Page, Phillip. "Daisy Miller's Parasol." *Studies in Short Fiction* 27.4 (1990): 591-601.
- Person, Leland. *Aesthetic Headaches: Women and a Masculine Poetics in Poe, Melville, and Hawthorne*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1988.

- Pipher, Mary. *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls*. New York: Ballantine, 1995.
- Posnock, Ross. *The Trial of Curiosity: Henry James, William James, and the Challenge of Modernity*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Price Herndl, Diane. *Invalid Women: Figuring Feminine Illness in American Fiction and Culture, 1840–1940*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1993.
- Reynolds, Simon, and Joy Press. *The Sex Revolts: Gender, Rebellion, and Rock 'n' Roll*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Schweickart, Patrocínio. "Reading Ourselves: Toward a Feminist Theory of Reading." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997. 609–34.
- Stafford, William T., ed. *James's Daisy Miller: The Story, the Play, the Critics*. Scribner Research Anthologies. New York: Scribner, 1963.
- Tanenbaum, Leora. *Slut! Growing Up Female with a Bad Reputation*. New York: Seven Stories, 1999.
- Thoreau, Henry David. "Walking." *The Portable Thoreau*. Ed. Carl Bode. New York: Viking, 1947. 592–630.
- Tintner, Adeline R. "Daisy Miller and Chaucer's 'Daisy' Poem: *The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women*." *Henry James Review* 15 (1994): 10–23.
- Turner, Terence S. "The Social Skin." *Reading the Social Body*. Ed. Catherine B. Burroughs and Jeffrey David Ehrenreich. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1993. 15–39.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. *Eve and Henry James: Portraits of Women and Girls in His Fiction*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1978.
- Walkowitz, Judith. *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London*. Women in Culture and Society. Ed. Catharine R. Stimpson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Wardley, Lynn. "Reassembling Daisy Miller." *American Literary History* 3.2 (1991): 232–54.
- Wolf, Naomi. *Promiscuities: The Secret Struggle for Womanhood*. New York: Random, 1997.