TONO-GATSBY: DID F. SCOTT FITZGERALD REJECT THE INFLUENCE OF H. G. WELLS?

Michael Sherborne

Abstract. James Miller Jr's proposition that F. Scott Fitzgerald had to reject the damaging influence of H. G. Wells before he could produce a masterpiece like *The Great Gatsby* (1925) has been widely accepted by Fitzgerald scholars. Central to Miller's thesis is a claim put forward by Henry James that Wells wrote ill-conceived novels of 'saturation', in contrast to the more sophisticated novels of 'selection' produced by himself and Joseph Conrad. Miller suggests that Conrad and James's approach to the novel became the model for Fitzgerald's best work, replacing the detrimental example of Wells. This article questions the validity of the saturation/selection opposition, drawing on Wells's own arguments against James's conception of the novel, then challenges the claim that Fitzgerald rejected Wells's example by analysing the resemblances between *The Great Gatsby* and a Wells novel which Fitzgerald admired, *Tono-Bungay* (1909). The analysis proposes that in several respects Wells's novel is the more artistically successful of the two. Since *The Great Gatsby* is accepted as a modern classic while *Tono-Bungay* has a more problematic status in the literary canon, the article concludes by reviewing the reputations of the two novels and suggesting reasons why scholars have prioritised the former text over the latter.

Sooner or later, anyone studying *The Great Gatsby* encounters the James Miller Jr thesis that F. Scott Fitzgerald had to reject the damaging influence of H. G. Wells before he could produce a masterpiece like *The Great Gatsby* (1925). This thesis takes its cue from Henry James's 1914 article 'The Younger Generation', which dismisses both H. G. Wells and Arnold Bennett as role models for up-and-coming authors. James ridicules them for maximising content rather than insight, complaining that they cram an excess of events and themes into their fiction instead of carefully presenting a more manageable number. Wells and Bennett, in James's formulation, write novels of 'saturation', whereas the true literary artist like Conrad, and by implication still more like James, writes novels of 'selection'.[1]

[1] Henry James, 'The Younger Generation' [1914], in *Henry James and H. G. Wells*, ed. Leon Edel and Gordon N. Ray (London: Hart-Davis, 1958), 178-215.

Wells responded in his experimental satire *Boon* (1915) by arguing that James was perpetrating a false analogy with painting and music.[2] While we may expect unity of effect from these arts, storytelling flourishes through complexity and digression. Too determined an attempt to give a story a clear, consistent orientation through 'selection' is liable to result in mere 'omission'. In Wells's view, James's over-refined approach impoverishes his characters by depriving them of opinions, fantasies and desires. They 'never make lusty love, never go to angry war, never shout at an election or perspire at poker'.[3]

In an earlier piece, a 1911 talk for the *Times* Book Club, revised for publication in 1914 as 'The Contemporary Novel', Wells had advanced a more elaborate argument.[4] Although 'The Contemporary Novel' was written before James's article, it nonetheless came after a decade of discussions with James and is informed by their ongoing debate. Here, Wells aligns himself with an English tradition of discursiveness, represented by Dickens, Fielding and Sterne, and a French one of 'exhaustiveness', represented by Romain Rolland and by Gustave Flaubert's *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (1881). Wells cites Edgar Allan Poe's essay 'The Philosophy of Composition' (1840), which champions unity of literary effect but concludes that this can be achieved only in the short story and the poem. How can a novel be a fully realised work of art when it cannot be experienced in a single sitting?[5] Wells agrees with Poe that unity cannot be the chief merit of a novel, yet he agrees with James that the novel is a genuine art form.

To resolve the apparent contradiction, Wells suggests that the purpose of the novel is not to give an authoritative perspective on a confined situation, but the reverse: to generate new perspectives, challenge mental boundaries and, by mixing and parodying genres such as the realist novel, biography, autobiography, science fiction, journalism and sociology, test composition to the point of destruction, if not somewhat beyond: 'any comment that seems to admit that, after all, fiction is fiction, a change in manner between

---

[2] H. G. Wells, 'Of Art, Of Literature, Of Mr Henry James', originally published as Chapter 4 of *Boon* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1915), also reprinted in *Henry James and H. G. Wells*, 234-60.

[3] Wells, *Boon*, 106.

[4] H. G. Wells, 'The Contemporary Novel' [1911], was included in Wells's book, *An Englishman Looks at the World* (London: Cassell, 1914), and later reprinted in *Henry James and H. G. Wells*, 131-56.

[5] Edgar Allan Poe, 'The Philosophy of Composition' [1840], in *Selected Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. David Galloway (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 480-92.

part and part, burlesque, parody, invective, all such things are not necessarily wrong in the novel.'[6] Reading a novel, in other words, is an adventure ending in a comparatively open outcome, not a conducted tour which leads to a conclusion selected in advance by the author.

While received with sympathy by some of his fellow writers, Wells's arguments fell on stony ground among academic critics, the more so once higher education began to expand in the period of affluence after the Second World War and it became necessary to agree both a canon of texts and procedures through which to study them. I shall return to the issue of canon formation in the final part of my argument. So far as critical method is concerned, literary academics had need of an aesthetic which was sufficiently formalist and content-free to establish Literature as a distinct discipline, one that would not carelessly stray into, say, Politics or History. This would have the additional benefit in the Cold War era of distancing the lecturers themselves from any youthful left-wing commitment or fellow travelling during the 1930s and 40s. At one point 'technique' seems to have been seized on as a defining concept which would ensure that academics and their students focused firmly on *how*, not *what* or *why*. Hence, we find Mark Schorer reviving James's dismissal of Wells as all content and no form in his influential 1948 essay 'Technique as Discovery'.[7]

Taking his cue from both Schorer and James, Miller brought the case against Wells into the context of Fitzgerald's work in his 1957 essay 'The Fictional Technique of F. Scott Fitzgerald', later incorporated in his 1964 book *F. Scott Fitzgerald, His Art and his Technique*.[8] Miller's contention is that Fitzgerald wrote inferior but popular fiction under the influence of Wells and Compton Mackenzie, producing novels of saturation. However, after James's letters to Wells were published in 1920, Fitzgerald began writing under the influence of James and Conrad, thus producing his masterpiece, *Gatsby*, a classic example of the unsaturated novel – low in the cholesterol of digression, high in the Omega 3 of poetic texture. Miller's saturation versus selection thesis is now so enshrined in critical orthodoxy that it

[6] Wells, *An Englishman Looks at the World*, 156.

[7] Mark Schorer, 'Technique as Discovery', in *Forms of Modern Fiction*, ed. W. V. O'Connor (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1948), 9-29, reprinted in *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism*, ed. David Lodge (Harlow: Longman, 1972), 387-401. Schorer dismisses not only Wells but Defoe and Lawrence as failed artists, echoing James's low evaluation of Lawrence in 'The Younger Generation'.

[8] James E. Miller, *F. Scott Fitzgerald: His Art and His Technique* (New York: New York University Press, 1964; London: Peter Owen, 1965).

appears in some textbooks as though virtually a fact, as in Stephen Matterson's *An Introduction to the Variety of Criticism: The Great Gatsby*.[9]

It is not a fact, for four reasons.

1. The two types of novel are not mutually exclusive categories but polemical generalisations. It is difficult to imagine what pure examples of each would look like. Employed judiciously, the terms do have a use. We can probably agree that Wells's *The New Machiavelli* (1911), with its first-person narrator reporting extensively on his life experiences and conclusions through a multiplicity of episodes, could loosely be called a novel of saturation, and *The Time Machine* (1895), with its novella length and narrator who reports the protagonist's adventures at one remove, could reasonably be called a novel of selection. This brings us neatly to the second reason.

2. The Miller thesis wrongly assumes that Wells wrote only saturation novels. Fitzgerald could have learned to write selection novels from *The Time Machine* or *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896). However, post-war critics generally ignored science fiction as a vulgar genre and assumed that Wells's achievements in this form were irrelevant to the study of literature.

3. The thesis assumes that saturation novels, aimed at an earnest but shallow audience, are by definition bad art. James himself regarded the saturation novel as a distinctively populist form, symptomatic of the cultural damage done by 'the democratic example'.[10] On this assumption, Fitzgerald's *This Side of Paradise* (1920) and Wells's *The World of William Clissold* (1926) can be dispatched simply by weighing them, without the need for tiresome reading and thinking. They are saturated and therefore of limited merit – much like *Moby Dick*, *Bleak House*, Dos Passos's *USA Trilogy* or, to take James's own instances of fiction spoiled by careless construction, *Sons and Lovers* and *War and Peace.* These examples speak for themselves. The assumption that novels that are wide-ranging in content, various in incident, rich in reflection and possibly experimental in structure are necessarily inferior to those in which a narrator assembles a few scenes and presents them in a tight perspective is nonsense.

4. There is no evidence that Fitzgerald actually followed the programme Miller suggests. On the contrary, he had a lifelong dislike of James's novels and was a great enthusiast for Wells, describing *The New Machiavelli* in 1917 as 'the greatest English novel of the century' and, later the same year, praising *Boon*, the very book containing Wells's spirited

[9] Stephen Matterson, *An Introduction to the Variety of Criticism: The Great Gatsby* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990).
[10] James, 'The Younger Generation', 179.

response to James, as 'marvellous'.[11] Miller's sole evidence for a change of heart is a letter written in April 1925, around the time *Gatsby* was being finished, in which Fitzgerald observes that the war 'wrecked' Wells, Mackenzie and their generation. Miller interprets this to mean that 'in reality' Fitzgerald was shifting his allegiance.[12] In reality, he probably meant simply that the cultural changes brought about by the war had left the older authors' style and subject matter looking badly dated. It is true that elsewhere in his letters Fitzgerald does dismiss Wells at his wildest, so he clearly accepted that there were times when Wells's digressiveness becomes damaging, but this is a view we can all accept without requiring us to dismiss Wells's better books.

Having loosened up the saturation/selection categories, let us now set *Gatsby* beside what is arguably Wells's best 'saturation' novel, *Tono-Bungay*, and see whether Fitzgerald's and Wells's approaches are as disparate as the Miller thesis implies. Both novels have a central character who is a notorious figure with redeeming features. Wells's Edward Ponderevo is a businessman who markets a dubious tonic, Tono-Bungay. His career and this product symbolise the failings of Edwardian capitalist society. He becomes rich and famous, but his dream collapses, undermined by dubious financial dealings, and he dies in disgrace. Fitzgerald's Jay Gatsby is a gangster involved in the distribution of bootleg liquor. His career and this product symbolise the failings of Jazz Age capitalism. He becomes rich and famous, but his dream of winning his former sweetheart Daisy collapses and he dies in disgrace. Each rise and fall is narrated retrospectively by an associate of the main character who is compromised by his involvement with the protagonist's activities but who struggles to extract a positive conclusion. Each book ends with a highly rhetorical and not entirely convincing coda in which the narrator tries to put forward a fresh perspective, using the image of a boat failing to maintain its heading.

In both cases, the protagonist and the narrator represent conflicting aspects of the author. Edward Ponderevo represents Wells the commercially successful writer, creative, adventurous and ambitious, but he also embodies the fear in Wells's literary conscience that novels need to transmit some kind of redeeming vision if they are to be more than a superficial tonic like Tono-Bungay. Jay Gatsby represents Fitzgerald the commercially successful writer who has become a Roaring Twenties celebrity, famous for his partying lifestyle, but who knows in his literary conscience that most of his writing is

[11] Miller, 16.
[12] Ibid., 82.

beneath his potential and fears that he and his decade will end in a morally deserved crack-up. While questioning and satirising society, the books are also powerful because they enact their authors' inner conflicts.

Wells's narrator, Edward's nephew, George Ponderevo, is sceptical of Tono-Bungay's value, seeks to achieve something as solid as scientific research, is fearful that even science cannot provide the ultimate answers and longs for redemption through some kind of quasi-religious perspective. Fitzgerald's narrator, Nick Carraway, who is Gatsby's neighbour and go-between in his affair with the married Daisy, is sceptical and initially contemptuous of Gatsby's career and aims. Nonetheless, he longs to find some kind of redemption in the disillusioned world after the Great War and finally comes to see Gatsby's career as a bizarre twist on the American Dream, a life spent pursuing an ideal which proved worthless but which at least provided an energising purpose. These are, then, notably similar tales, in their events, their themes and the way they are told, but we can add further parallels.

Both books define their main characters by the places where they live. Edward's stately home, Lady Grove, with its doomed Crest Hill extension, is a status symbol, not a real home, just like Gatsby's imitation Norman town hall in West Egg. The momentary freedom promised by George's London with its 'splendid and alluring' women is matched by Nick's New York where 'romantic women' fuel his promiscuous fantasies.[13] Yet in George's London, there are also 'dingy' suburbs 'under grey skies that showed no gleam of hope' and New York has its 'valley of ashes' where 'ash-grey men' labour,[14] exploited and ultimately destroyed by the wealthy movers and shakers whom Edward and Gatsby aspire to join, unsurprisingly since Fitzgerald told Edmund Wilson that he shared Wells's view of society – or, as he calls it, the 'no hope for Tono-Bungay theory'.[15]

In both books, the emptiness of social values is revealed in inane conversations. *Tono-Bungay* gives us the comical blithering of the servants at Bladesover and the flippant riffing of Edward's artist friend Ewart. *Gatsby* offers the pretentious chatter of Daisy, her husband Tom and his mistress Myrtle, as well as the sentimental but sinister table talk of Gatsby's underworld associate Meyer Wolfsheim.

---

[13] H. G. Wells, *Tono-Bungay* [1909] (London: Penguin, 2005), 107, Book II, Ch. 1:2; F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* [1925] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 63, Ch. 3.

[14] Wells, *Tono-Bungay*, 93, Book I, Ch. 3:7; Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, 29, Ch. 2.

[15] Letter of 1918, quoted in Miller, 17.

Both books anchor their stories in documentary material. Wells based Edward's downfall on that of the businessman Whittaker Wright, his death on that of the novelist George Gissing and Tono-Bungay itself, in all likelihood, on Coca Cola, which originally contained cocaine and was marketed as a tonic. Fitzgerald based Gatsby on a bootlegger called Max Gerlach, Jordan Baker on the golfer Edith Cummings and Wolfsheim on the racketeer Arnold Rothstein.

As the example of Wolfsheim reminds us, both books are also guilty of employing Jewish stereotypes, in Wells's case through Sir Reuben Lichtenstein and a Romanian Jewish sea captain apparently intended to caricature Conrad. It is true that Fitzgerald satirises hard-core racism through Tom's muddled enthusiasm for Goddard's *Rise of the Coloured Empires*, a reference to Lothrop Stoddard's book *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy* (1920). As well as introducing the comically macabre figure of Wolfsheim, Fitzgerald cannot resist equipping Nick with a Finnish housekeeper in the mistaken belief that every mention of her national origin will reduce us to a state of helpless mirth.

In their strengths and their weaknesses, the resemblance between the two novels is clearly quite considerable. However, this may be dismissed as mere content analysis or saturation criticism, leading us out of the literature business towards the minefields of history and politics. What of narrative technique?

I have already mentioned the compromised narrator, interposed between the reader and the protagonist, who struggles to produce a redeeming perspective. The presence of this figure leads to both books opening with a display of self-analysis in which the narrator tries to establish himself as a mixture of authority and fallibility. Nick tells us he is 'inclined to reserve all judgements', but is soon passing harsh judgements on virtually every character he encounters, unashamedly introducing Tom Buchanan to us as 'supercilious … arrogant … effeminate' and 'cruel'.[16] He also tells us that he is inclined to believe himself unusually honest. However, his unreliability is made evident when he tells us that he moved East because he was 'restless' after the Great War. At the end of the first chapter, he lets slip in conversation that he had broken up with his fiancée in the West and moved East to escape the scandal. More bluntly, George Ponderevo tells us that he is a scientist, not a novelist, so his story will have no 'neat scheme' from which we can draw conventional conclusions. Indeed, it is never quite clear

[16] Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, 7, 13, Ch. 1.

whether he is engaged in confessional autobiography or dramatising his experiences into some kind of novel, which makes it difficult to know by what criteria to assess his tale. He even admits in the final chapter that 'It may be I see decay all around me because I am, in a sense, decay.'[17] In both books, therefore the reader is warned not to incautiously align themselves with the narrator, yet the first-person narrative and the force with which events and ideas are presented make it very difficult to establish any other perspective than the one offered.

The consequences are evident at the conclusion of the books, when both narrators lapse into cosmic generalisations which we may or may not receive with irony. The endings are memorable, even powerful, but neither is entirely satisfactory in achieving closure. Each seems to be making an argument, but jumps from point to point disconnectedly, relying on tone and imagery to cover the gaps.

Wells's book is more wide-ranging in its action and more uneven in delivery than Fitzgerald's, which is usually the chief charge brought against it. Yet in one crucial respect, it is actually more coherent. By making George Edward's nephew and partner, Wells places him in the ideal position from which to tell the tale. Edward and his wife, 'Aunt Susan', naturally rely on and confide in George, and George is plausibly present at key moments. In contrast, Nick enters the Gatsby story through the coincidences that he is Daisy's cousin and, rather implausibly, Gatsby's next-door neighbour. Nevertheless, he does not have enough access to the main characters to carry out his narrative function properly, forcing Fitzgerald to resort to several desperate expedients: Nick is equipped with a personality which encourages others to confide in him, though this personality is never made visible to the reader; he embarks on an unlikely affair with Daisy's friend Jordan, with whom he has no discernible affinity; and he is constantly being invited along to accompany people who in real life would surely have preferred their activities to remain unwitnessed.

It has been put to me that Fitzgerald's approach is the more effective of the two because Nick learns about Gatsby gradually, taking the reader along with him, whereas George has all-knowing hindsight, but this is simply not the case. In order to unfold the events in the order Fitzgerald requires, Nick has to conceal, then reveal, key information about Gatsby's history, in no relation to the sequence in which he learns of it. Furthermore, his knowledge of Gatsby's inner life is beyond credibility. When Gatsby was

[17] Wells, *Tono-Bungay*, 13, Book I, Ch. 1:2; ibid., 382, Book IV, Ch. 3:1.

seventeen, Nick assures us, a 'universe of ineffable gaudiness spun itself out in his brain while the clock ticked on the washstand and the moon soaked with wet light his tangled clothes upon the floor'.[18] It is difficult to see how Gatsby can have confided such vivid reminiscences to Nick, while never becoming really close to him in any of the novel's dramatised scenes or revealing a vocabulary much larger than the phrase, 'Old sport'. Perhaps we should infer that Nick is inventing an inner life for Gatsby to suit his own needs, though this interpretation risks undermining the effectiveness of the novel's basic narrative.

If, as E. M. Forster assures us, Wells's characters are flat but satisfyingly vigorous, Fitzgerald's struggle to achieve that elusive second dimension.[19] Gatsby's 'old sport', Daisy's giggle and Wilson's greyness have to stand for their whole personalities, making them notoriously difficult for even the most skilled actor to embody in adaptations for the cinema. Think of Gatsby's balletic entry, reaching for the green light in the distance with outstretched, trembling arms, and his departure, gunned down on a lie-lo which inexplicably fails to puncture or even to tip him off. Such moments live in the novel only through the meaning they have for Nick and are effective only if they are not visualised.

It is true that sexual relationships are better depicted in *The Great Gatsby* than in *Tono-Bungay*, though this is a limited claim, since they are probably *Tono-Bungay*'s worst feature. The reunion of Gatsby and Daisy at Nick's house works only because it happens out of sight – it is *told* as an accomplished fact rather than *shown* through developing conversation and body language – but should not that remind us of something? One of James's chief exhibits against Wells in 'The Younger Generation' was the episode in *Marriage* (1912) where Trafford and Marjorie establish their amorous relationship while hidden from the reader's view. To James, Wells's failure to dramatise such a key scene showed his carelessness and lack of human engagement. Fitzgerald commits precisely the same literary sin here, although far more adroitly than Wells. Accidentally or deliberately, and I am inclined to think deliberately, we see Fitzgerald at the heart of *The Great Gatsby* defying James's rules and embracing the methods of Wells.

By now, I can rest my case that the two books are quite similar in what they seek to do and how they seek to do it. One is, if you will, a wide-ranging novel of saturation, the other a more tightly focused novel of selection, but this does not make them opposites or establish one as the superior of the

[18] Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, 105, Ch. 6.
[19] E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* [1927] (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 80.

other. So, to return as promised to the question of canonicity, why is *Gatsby* rated as a classic novel, widely taught in schools, colleges and universities, while *Tono-Bungay* has a rather more questionable status and rarely figures on syllabuses?

Much of the problem rests with the received history of the British and American novel. Critics who would normally laugh at notions of historical progress and deconstruct them as naïve meta-narratives do still cling to one of their own, which runs roughly as follows. Victorian novels are loose, baggy monsters, partially redeemed by their powerful subject matter of social transformation. Modernist novels are miracles of artistic innovation which raise storytelling to a new height. And in between there are the so-called Edwardians. To make the historical plot coherent, these Edwardians must have written novels without the redeeming content of the Victorians or the artistry of the Moderns, thus providing a convenient contrast to the great names either side of them. Wells was an Edwardian, roughly speaking, so we should belittle him. The orthodox scheme, in other words, prevents us from dealing with the Edwardians in their own right or recognising that Wells actually spans the Victorian and Modern eras in interestingly anomalous ways.[20]

Tono-Bungay is much easier to read than *Gatsby*, so is harder to justify as a text for degree-level study, while telling a story that is complex and many-sided and which requires some historical imagination to appreciate. *Gatsby* is written in a dense style, suitable for academic explication, while telling a story that is easy to follow and, in the era of celebrity culture, readily understood around the world. The story also treats the theme of the American Dream, so is particularly suitable for teaching in the USA. Its publication in 1926 places it squarely in the desirable era of Modernism, while Fitzgerald's debt to Conrad and allusions to T. S. Eliot nicely align the novel with the Modernist canon. Despite all these advantages, *Gatsby* struggled for a long time to find acceptance. It received decidedly mixed reviews on publication, was deleted from the Modern Library series because of lack of sales and in 1940 generated just $2.10 in royalties.[21] It was not until teachers found a use for it in the 1950s as an iconic text of American Modernism that it came to be rebranded as a classic.

---

[20] See Chris Baldick, *The Modern Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2-5.

[21] Sarah Churchwell, *Careless People* [2013] (London: Virago Press, 2014), 322-8, 332, 354, 361.

Finally, we cannot ignore these novels' titles. Unless you pick up the Coke reference, *Tono-Bungay* has an ugly, meaningless sound to it, perhaps something to do with toes, toenails, bungs and bungling. At first, Fitzgerald wanted to call his book 'Among Ash Heaps and Millionaires'. He later moved on through a series of proposals: 'Trimalchio', 'Trimalchio at West Egg', 'The High Bouncing Lover', 'Gold-hatted Gatsby' and, as the book was going to press, 'Under the Red, White and Blue'.[22] In his lifetime, Fitzgerald did not have the status enjoyed by Wells, whom no publisher would have dared to cross. In fact, Fitzgerald's publishers were so accustomed to correcting his notorious misspellings ('apon' and 'yatch', for example) that they had no compunction about improving his titles too. The brief noun phrase which they imposed in his despite, 'The Great Gatsby', has a classic simplicity, is infectiously alliterative and contains the riddling adjective 'great' which flags up the novel's central ambivalence. Against the ugly, hyphenated and uninformative 'Tono-Bungay', there is no contest.

What, then, can we conclude? Firstly, Fitzgerald certainly did retain the influence of Wells in *The Great Gatsby*. Secondly, it is far from self-evident that he was a better writer than Wells, rendering the current judgement on the two novels open to scepticism. The New Critics of the post-war era favoured controlled ambiguity: that is to say, they valued a complex text from which a suitably trained reader could construe the rich, subtle, coherent meaning intended by the author. Today's postmodern critics favour what we might call inherent ambiguity, exposing intended and unintended complexities within the text to reveal deeper meanings concealed from the author and her or his society. In this context, it is possible that *Tono-Bungay* might suit today's critical requirements as much as *Gatsby*, leading to a reappraisal of Wells as an author who manifested radical perspectives without imposing a false, selective coherence on them and encouraged his readers to draw their own conclusions. In any case, and thirdly, it should be possible to value a novel for what it is, without devaluing another one for what it is not.

[22] For background information on *Gatsby*, including the rejected titles and Fitzgerald's spelling problems, see Matthew J. Bruccoli's introduction and notes to F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).