

Simone de Beauvoir, stream of consciousness and philosophical fiction: Becoming a self in the first draft of *She Came to Stay*

Christine Battersby 

University of Warwick

Correspondence

Christine Battersby, University of Warwick.
Email: c.battersby@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This article locates Simone de Beauvoir in the stream of consciousness, metaphysical novel, and *Bildungsroman* writing traditions. Its focus is the two opening chapters from the 1938 draft of Beauvoir's first novel, *She Came to Stay*—first published in French in 1943 as *L'Invitée*—and deleted at the insistence of her publishers. Although Beauvoir's own philosophical fictions are, in general, linked to Hegel's phenomenology and to Sartre's existentialism, in the discarded text, it is Schopenhauer and Nietzsche who are key to Beauvoir's account of the developing female self. Beauvoir's narrative and philosophical strategies are compared to those adopted by May Sinclair in *Mary Olivier* (1919). The influence of other stream of consciousness novelists is also registered. Beauvoir's recently published teenage diaries, which record a “passion” for Schopenhauer, are discussed, together with his mysticism and his misogyny. The article ends by considering Beauvoir's reasons for abandoning stream of consciousness narrative techniques.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986) is not usually associated with stream of consciousness fiction. However, there is one extended passage of writing by her which merits an honourable place in this tradition. The section in question is little known, however, and that is because it was not included in Beauvoir's first novel, *L'Invitée* (1943)—published in English under the title *She Came to Stay* (1949a/2006)—for which it had initially been devised, and where it would have provided the opening two chapters of this semi-autobiographical novel. The

deleted French text was eventually published in a collection of Beauvoir's writings (Beauvoir, 1979a, pp. 275–323), and since 2004 an English translation of the two chapters has also been available (2004, pp. 41–75). Perhaps because the chapters were included in a volume devoted to Beauvoir's *Philosophical Writings*, they have received remarkably little attention from literary critics. Even Toril Moi, who registers the importance of reading Beauvoir as a metaphysical novelist, and who laments that Beauvoir's stylistic techniques have been too often ignored, fails to mention these chapters in her own analysis of *She Came to Stay* (Moi, 2013). Philosophers also have tended to ignore them—as have many recent biographers, even where considerable and sensitive attention is paid to the scandalous personal and sexual relationships which gave rise to the published text (Kirkpatrick, 2019, 137–55, 187–95). Insofar as the chapters are discussed at all, this is generally only in the context of the often acrimonious debate about the extent to which Beauvoir influenced Jean-Paul Sartre—her long-term lover and also her philosophical and literary partner in existential phenomenology—or, contrariwise, the claim that Beauvoir's philosophy is derived entirely from that of Sartre, as Beauvoir herself sometimes insisted (Fullbrook, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 2019, 191; Battersby, 1995).

In this article, I will situate these two chapters in the stream of consciousness literary tradition, as I also explore the thematics of Beauvoir's phenomenology of the developing self as revealed in this first draft. Moi (2013) has emphasised the importance of the “metaphysical novel” in France during the 1940s and has also explained that this was a genre that embraced narratives that anglophone critics separate out into “modernist” and “realist” fictions. Her analysis also makes it clear that *She Came to Stay* was, from the date of its publication in 1943, favourably reviewed by critics who treated it as a contribution to this literary genre. Although this 1938 opening falls outside the timeframe of Moi's survey, there is no reason to suppose that the “metaphysical novel” was not also highly valued in France during the late 1930s. Indeed, underlying the narrative of these two chapters, we can find philosophical ideas reminiscent of Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860), as well as several references to Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) who was himself profoundly influenced by Schopenhauer. These philosophical influences are not evident in the published novel, and the stream of consciousness narrative strategies have also been diluted. I will point to some overlaps with the British novelist, May Sinclair (1863–1946), who also looks to Schopenhauer as she utilises stream of consciousness techniques in her own semi-autobiographical *Bildungsroman*, *Mary Olivier* (1919/1980), as well as to intersections with other stream of consciousness writers.

Although Nietzsche's impact on Beauvoir has received scant attention, his importance for 20th-century philosophers and writers has long been recognised—in particular, his emphasis on “becoming who you are.” Famously, in *The Second Sex* (1949b/2011), Beauvoir exposes the difficulties faced by a self who is also biologically female, given that “becoming who you are” is, for women, socially constrained and riven with paradoxes and uncertainties, resulting in modes of self-deception that are extremely hard to escape. As we will see, in these two early chapters, Beauvoir is already beginning to explore the ambiguities in the subject position of the young girl (Chapter 1) and the developing, adolescent, female self (Chapter 2). What is it to become “who you are” when the female self that is in the process of becoming has no clear idea about what it is to be an “I,” or even about where the boundaries of the embodied ego begin and end? Adopting stream of consciousness techniques, Beauvoir's narrative voice picks up a number of themes found in Schopenhauer who regarded the very existence of the ego as an illusion, and who also argued that the “I” is driven by drives and forces that come from beyond and beneath consciousness in ways that lead the “I” to deceive itself about its own choices and motives, especially in regard to erotic love. Since questions about the freedom of choice and the nature of (female) selfhood underlie most of Beauvoir's subsequent philosophical and literary output, my analysis shows that these two unpublished chapters provide an important opening onto Beauvoir's trajectory as an author—even if they are also clearly less politically and socially aware than Beauvoir's published oeuvre.

We know that Beauvoir started work on *She Came to Stay* in 1937–1938, although the exact chronology of the various drafts is not clear (Bair, 1990, p. 206). In 1937, Beauvoir had offered a volume of short stories (Beauvoir, 1979b/1982) to the French publishing house, Gallimard. She used as an intermediary Brice Parain, one of their senior editors, having taken advice from Sartre, who was at the time working with Biran on his first novel, *La Nausée*

(*Nausea*), which was eventually published in April 1938. Sartre had struggled to get his own novel accepted by Gallimard and had been forced to make a cut of 40 pages, along with several other passages deemed too “crude,” too “free,” and “open to prosecution” (Cohen-Solal, 1987, pp. 115–116). Profoundly upset when her volume of short stories was rejected out of hand, Beauvoir started work on the novel and turned to Parain for advice. However, Parain profoundly disliked the two opening chapters and insisted on their removal before a contract could be considered. Knowing Gallimard's stringent requirements, especially with regard to “crudities,” Sartre persuaded Beauvoir to agree to the cuts. Since, as Barbara Klaw has shown, several passages in Beauvoir's two deleted chapters allude to female masturbation, women's erotic pleasures, and lesbian desire, it seems likely that it was precisely these passages that led to Beauvoir's first novel being “castrated” (Klaw, 1995, p. 126) by her eventual publishers. Klaw focuses on Beauvoir's problems as a woman writing in the 1930s, but books written in French and published within France by male authors were also subject to censorship throughout the 1930s (Potter, 2013). This is ironic given that many American, British, and Irish writers relocated to France precisely in order to escape their own country's obscenity laws. Furthermore, the presence of these literary exiles in Paris increased the availability of modernist and stream of consciousness novels in pre-war France.

Describing a (lost) second draft of *She Came to Stay*, Beauvoir lists William Faulkner, John Dos Passos, D. H. Lawrence, and Ernest Hemingway as important to the narrative techniques, which she employed once the two initial chapters had been discarded (Bair, 1990, pp. 228–229). Faulkner and Dos Passos are renowned for their utilisation of stream of consciousness fictional techniques, and Lawrence is also sometimes located in this tradition (Fernihough, 2007, pp. 74, 76–77). What Hemingway contributed to Beauvoir's second draft was the need for “a certain simplicity” both in the dialogue and in the description of “ordinary things”. By contrast, Faulkner's “ability to manipulate time” was what most interested Beauvoir, and from Lawrence she took the necessity of rooting a narrator in “a family, a history, a heritage”. Above all, Dos Passos was key to Beauvoir's adopted narrative techniques, especially what she calls his “camera eye”. This allows the author to direct what the reader “should think and know” about a character and his or her surroundings and also opens up the possibility of switching between multiple viewpoints or “camera eyes” (p. 229). As such, the second draft of *She Came to Stay* seems to have been strongly influenced by English-language and modernist narrative strategies, including those adopted by a variety of stream of consciousness writers. However, most of the second draft was discarded, and the manuscript of this second version has vanished. The two deleted chapters, which are the focus of my analysis, belong to the first, 1938, draft.

Several of the literary techniques derived from these four authors are also evident in the published novel although—as Fallaize (1998) laments—the extensive use of interior monologue is interrupted by the voice of an external narrator. As such, the development of the narrative plot of the published novel can no longer be identified with stream of consciousness methods. The published version of *She Came to Stay* is often read as a kind of *roman à clef*, with the novel's main character, Françoise—a 30-year-old writer of fiction—being based on Simone. The second main character, Pierre, is a playwright, theatre director and actor, and seems a thinly disguised substitute for Sartre who had been in a non-monogamous relationship with Beauvoir since 1929. The third main character is Xavière, a young woman based on Olga Kosakiewicz—a young woman of 19 who did, indeed, come to stay in the same hotel as Beauvoir—but incorporating some features of her younger sister, Wanda, with whom Sartre started an affair after his sexual advances were rejected by Olga. The older sister, Olga, was sexually involved with Beauvoir, as well as being the focus of Sartre's sexual obsessions and jealousies. As in real life, there is also a fourth (male) figure, who further complicates the intense relationships between Françoise, Pierre, and Xavière. In the novel, this second male character is named Gerbert; in reality, his name was Jacques-Laurent Bost. In both the novel and real life, Bost also had a sexual relationship with Beauvoir. Where the differences between the novel and actuality lie is that Olga did not know that Beauvoir was also sleeping with her boyfriend, Bost. Furthermore, in the novel, Xavière and Françoise are merely emotionally, but not also sexually, involved (Kirkpatrick, 2019, pp. 137ff., 149). And, as certainly was not the case in the real-life situation, the published novel ends with Françoise murdering Xavière.

2 | A KIND OF PREQUEL

In the published version of the novel, the story starts in Paris with the narrator, Françoise, as a young woman, caught up in the bohemian whirl of café and theatre society. The two deleted chapters offer a kind of prequel: the opening of the first chapter is set not in Paris but in the French countryside, in the interior and grounds of Françoise's grandmother's house. Later in the chapter, the location shifts between Paris—in term time—and summer in the countryside of Provence, where Françoise experiences “A pure and bright joy” and where “Time had stopped” (Beauvoir, 2004, p. 48). In the second deleted chapter, the location has moved definitively to Paris, and Françoise is in her senior-year philosophy class at school. Much of the chapter is taken up with an exploration of Françoise's infatuation with a new girl at school, Élisabeth. As Françoise observes the newcomer's passions and her behaviour—along with her “white, delicious and cruel flesh” (p. 58)—she allows her own tastes and ideals to be displaced by those of Élisabeth. It is ironical that Françoise sums up this stage of her development as a self with a quotation from Nietzsche written on the cover of a new notebook: “You must become what you are” (p. 68), since it is Élisabeth who introduces Françoise to Nietzsche. It is also through Élisabeth that Françoise encounters modernist art and decadent poets, along with the rehearsal spaces of Left-Bank theatre, where she meets Élisabeth's brother, the budding dramatist and young “genius,” Pierre (pp. 62, 73). In the published version, the narrative is structured round Françoise's gradual recognition that other consciousnesses exist and that, as Hegel suggests in the quotation that Beauvoir uses as the epigraph to the French version of *L'Invitée*, “Each consciousness pursues the death of the other” (Barnes, 1998, p. 159).¹ The two deleted chapters are just as philosophical but in a much less oppositional (Hegelian, and Sartrean) way. Nietzsche is the philosophical *leitmotif* that runs through the second of the two chapters (Beauvoir, 2004, pp. 56, 59, 60, 63, 65, 68), and Schopenhauer is a hidden presence behind the first deleted chapter.

In this opening chapter, we enter a realm in which the “I” of the narrator is often barely present, instead dispersing into a multiplicity of impressions, scents, tastes, and feelings, as Beauvoir explores the consciousness of Françoise whilst still a young child. As such, Beauvoir is joining the tradition of female authors who set out to appropriate the *Bildungsroman*, or novel of cultural development and maturation, for women: a tradition that Varsamopoulou (2002) traces back to 1807 when Germaine de Staël's *Corinne ou L'Italie* was published in Paris. In terms of stream of consciousness women writers who belong in this tradition, there are some striking similarities between Beauvoir's opening chapters and May Sinclair's novel, *Mary Olivier* (1919/1980), which has been read as reworking the stream of consciousness narrative techniques of James Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (Joyce, 1916) (Battersby, 2002). May Sinclair is perhaps now best known for having introduced the phrase “stream of consciousness” into literary criticism (see Section 1 of this Special Issue). However, in the first quarter of the 20th century, Sinclair was a best-selling novelist who fitted within a number of categories which were extremely unusual for the period, and which would also later come to embrace Beauvoir: woman philosopher; woman writer of metaphysical novels and short stories; also a woman writer of *Bildungsromanen* in which a surrogate for the female author takes centre stage. Not only does *Mary Olivier* offer a narrative in which Schopenhauer is explicitly referenced as key to the heroine's philosophical and self-development, it is also the first of Sinclair's novels to rely on experimental stream of consciousness narrative techniques.

And here I should note that several novels and books by May Sinclair were translated into French by Marc Logé (Mary-Cécile Logé) from 1922 onwards (starting with *The Romantic*, translated as *Le Romanesque*), but *Mary Olivier* does not seem to have been translated before 1949. Beauvoir could, however, have known about *Mary Olivier*, as well as other key novels written by Sinclair, since as Michele K. Troy (2016) has demonstrated, her writings attracted a considerable amount of attention—and also praise—in France during the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, a popular book by Abel Chevalley on contemporary British fiction—published simultaneously in France and England, and also in two different (French and English) versions—scatters mentions of Sinclair throughout the text, as well as dedicating a complete sub-chapter to the topic of “Miss May Sinclair” (Chevalley, 1921, pp. 193–201). Of the nine pages in the section on Sinclair, the final two are devoted to *Mary Olivier*, which

is described as providing an outstanding “dissection” of middle-class England, analogous to that provided for France by Flaubert, Zola, and Maupassant. Chevalley also treats Sinclair as a novelist of ideas, as well as one of the most important writers of her generation. Given Beauvoir’s own teenage ambitions to introduce philosophical themes into her fiction (Beauvoir, 2006, pp. 66–67, 87–89, 258), it’s hard to believe that Beauvoir would not have tried to track down this novel had she picked up this book by Chevalley, which was, in France, published in the prestigious “*Collection blanche*” by Gallimard—a paperback series favoured by left-wing Parisian students and intellectuals, including Beauvoir herself.

It is, furthermore, entirely possible that Beauvoir might have read Sinclair’s *Mary Olivier* in English. She has, after all, remarked in an interview, “The study of English has been one of my passions ever since childhood,” adding that she usually preferred to read books in English, rather than in translation: “I read English better than I speak it” (Beauvoir, 1965b). However, I have come across no evidence that proves that Beauvoir was acquainted with Sinclair’s novels. It is, nevertheless, clear that she was familiar with other English women stream of consciousness writers. Thus, in the same interview, Beauvoir (1965b) picks out Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs Dalloway* and *Orlando* as English-language favourites. Elsewhere, Beauvoir (1960/1976, p. 46) also claims to have read—but without any pleasure—the whole of Dorothy Richardson’s *Pilgrimage* novel series, accessing it through Sylvia Beach’s bookshop-cum-library (*Shakespeare and Company*) which made a huge selection of English-language texts available to its subscribers.

3 | MODES OF MYSTICISM

What Sinclair privileges—both in her works of philosophy and in also in the account of female creativity that we find in *Mary Olivier*—is a pre-individual reality which is accessed in ecstatic episodes, triggered by beauty and also by light. In Sinclair’s novel, Spinoza, Shelley, and Plato are all important in allowing Mary access to this realm in which the “I” disappears, and a “queer white light” leads the teenage narrator towards a reality in which the divisions between self and not-self fade away (Sinclair, 1919/1980, pp. 48, 99, 129, 131). As Sinclair’s narrator grows older, it is Schopenhauer who becomes associated with this experience of pantheistic beauty:

There was Schopenhauer, though. *He* didn’t cheat you. There was “*reine Anschauung*,” pure perception; it happened when you looked at beautiful things. Beautiful things were crystal; you looked through them and saw Reality. You saw God. While the crystal flash lasted “*Wille und Vorstellung*,” the Will and the Idea, were not divided as they are in life; they were one. That was why beautiful things made you happy. (p. 254)²

What Mary Olivier is describing here is a moment of ecstasy when the individual’s own desires are subsumed into a more universal and impersonal force—what Schopenhauer calls *Wille* [Will]—which provides access to a reality which is beyond space and time: a reality in which there is no “I.” A similar thematics is evident in Beauvoir’s two deleted chapters, which start by exploring the relation between the ego and those objects which are sensed but which cannot themselves say “I exist.”

The narrative voice in Beauvoir’s first discarded chapter starts by describing the sounds and shadows of the empty house, and as the young child, Françoise, muses about what it means to exist:

Françoise tried to imagine what she would feel like if she could not say: “I am Françoise, I am six years old, I am in Grandma’s house”; if she could not say anything at all to herself. She closed her eyes. It was as if you did not exist, and yet other people could come here; they could see me and talk about me. She opened her eyes; she could see the jacket; it did exist but was not aware of it: this was both irritating and slightly frightening. (2004, p. 42.)

The chapter continues, describing a kind of mystical experience in which the “I” spasmodically dissolves into a metamorphic medley of sense impressions and Françoise enters into a kind of joyous trance. For example, when visiting her grandmother, the young Françoise would go each day to sit in a favourite nook in the garden. There she felt as alone as in the empty house:

The image of her mother came to her and she dismissed it without shame; it was like another existence where one had no more parents, no future, no longer even a name. There was a scent of scrub; there were pine needles, a taste of apple, a gentle and mysterious sensation that turned the whole body, from head to toe, into a shivering piece of tissue paper; and all this was neither good nor bad. It existed, indifferent, and Françoise no longer existed anywhere. (pp. 44–45)

As such, these chapters feel much closer to Schopenhauer than to Hegel and fit with his privilege of the mystic who accesses a reality in which there is no “I.”

Another thread that links Beauvoir’s first chapter to Schopenhauer involves an extended meditation on whether the “I” can be said to exist before it is born into a body. Six-year-old Françoise wonders what it might be like to be a mere thing—a worn jacket which is unable to say “I exist”—and that triggers a series of questions which make her head spin:

did she not also exist somewhere else without knowing it, like the old jacket? This was like a pitch-dark night that was terrible to imagine. I cannot remember anything from before I was born; this is exactly what it must have been like; it is the same for the little children who have not been born yet: they do not know, they will not remember anything; what if one of them happened to be myself? She stood stock still in the middle of the lawn, trying to catch one of these opaque little souls as they flew by in the air in order to illumine it from inside briefly, so that it might at least remember something later on. There was no use; all she could do was say “I am Françoise” and that was all; she could say “I” for no one else. (p. 42)

In terms of western philosophy, Plato is the philosopher most associated with the doctrine of the reincarnation of souls, and the positing of a realm of pure being that pre-exists birth (Plato, c.370 BC/1972, pp. 78–93 [247c–250d]). Plato, however, stresses the role of the individual’s memory in re-accessing this realm of pure being, prior to the individual soul falling into the space–time world of becoming. Instead, the young Beauvoir seems closer to Schopenhauer who downplays the role of memory in accessing this unindividuated realm. In *The World as Will and Representation*, Schopenhauer had argued that it’s the simple fact of being born that forces us to think of an infinite time in which, metaphysically speaking, my “I” did not exist or, alternatively, to contemplate a time when “I was always I” (Schopenhauer, 2018, p. 484). Schopenhauer solves this conundrum by arguing that life is but an “ephemeral life-dream,” and he draws on myths of the re-incarnation of souls in Eastern religions, and makes reference also to Plato, in order to support this claim (pp. 518–521).

Schopenhauer lapses into mysticism as he writes about this non-individuated realm—where pre-existent species or souls are waiting to be born into this world of spatio-temporal illusion via the act of sexual reproduction and erotic desire. Thus, in an extraordinary chapter on “Metaphysics of Sexual Love,” Schopenhauer outlines the processes whereby the conflicting and surging tendencies that make up the underlying will as thing-in-itself dictate the sexual preferences of existing human individuals in the spatio-temporal world (which he calls “the world of appearances”). His claim is that although an individual might believe that he or she is freely choosing his or her partner, what is in fact going on is that the couple’s sexual desires are being manipulated by “the urge of the future individual (who has only just become possible) to enter into being” (p. 566). For Schopenhauer, then, there are latent children waiting to come into existence—in much the same way that Françoise imagines “opaque little souls” of unborn children flying by in her grandmother’s garden.

4 | QUESTIONS OF SEX

Schopenhauer was famously misogynistic. Thus, for example, in his essay “On Women,” he argues that women cannot be geniuses or attain intellectual, artistic, or literary distinction; that women are not even aesthetically pleasing; and that it is appropriate that their choices and their education should be restricted in ways that would be entirely inappropriate for males:

Because at bottom women exist solely for the propagation of the species and their destiny is absorbed by this, they live generally more in the species than in the individuals, and in their hearts they take more seriously the affairs of the species than those of individuals. (Schopenhauer, 2015, p. 554 [§367]).

For Schopenhauer, women are more caught up with questions of erotic love than are males, and he also goes on to suggest that although the empirical character of male human beings might have developed into individuality, women are basically all the same. In this essay, Schopenhauer (2015) explicitly refers to women as

the “inferior sex” [*sexus sequior*], the second sex that lags behind in every respect, whose weakness we should therefore accommodate, but it is ridiculous beyond all measure to show reverence for them and it lowers us in their own eyes. (p. 556 [§369])

Schopenhauer is the probable source for the title of Beauvoir's 1949 book, *The Second Sex*, where his views on the sexual drive and prostitution are quoted with approval (Beauvoir, 1949b/2011, pp. 116, 185). He is also extensively referenced in her book on old age (Beauvoir, 1970/1996). However, Beauvoir's fascination with Schopenhauer is longstanding, and predates the first draft of *She Came to Stay* by more than a decade, as is evident in her diary entry for May 9, 1927 (Beauvoir, 2006, pp. 252–254). This comprises 13—sometimes quite lengthy—quotations from *The World as Will and Representation* on the nature of character; the narrowing of choice as the child becomes an adult; change; time; friendship; the self–other relation, and the changing moods of life at this moment of the “now.”³ Although the quotations are provided without comment, 4 days later the young Beauvoir sets out her determination to “Write ‘essays [*essais*] on life’ that would not be novelistic, but rather philosophical, by linking them vaguely with fiction” (p. 258). She is clearly still thinking of Schopenhauer at this point, since she adds: “Schopenhauer's fourth book contains the most beautiful pages that I have ever read! The definition of time, of the present is splendid, and problems are posed in such a direct and human way!” (p. 258). That entry is then immediately followed by a quotation from Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past* on the way in which the love of another human being can open up “an unknown life” and a type of “being,” which would otherwise be closed off to us (p. 258). Proust is widely recognised to have been influenced by Schopenhauer (Beistegui, 2012) and is also often positioned as a stream of consciousness author. Beauvoir's seamless move from expressing her admiration for Schopenhauer to quoting Proust indicates that she is thinking about the illusory nature of time, mood, memory, erotic love, and alternative modes of being-in-time in terms of a project to become a writer of essays that have philosophical import.

In the first draft of *She Came to Stay* Beauvoir, like Proust before her, explores how the horizons of one's mode of being in the world can be transformed by falling in love. For Proust, the love object of his male narrator, Marcel, was a young woman, Albertine, although Proust's novel has often been read as a disguise for his own homosexuality and, even more recently, as structurally aligning with lesbianism (Ladenson, 1999). In Beauvoir's second deleted chapter, the theme of lesbianism is hard to miss, since what is explored is the transformative nature of Françoise's passion for Élisabeth. In this respect, however, Beauvoir has clearly moved away from Schopenhauer, for whom women were “the *unaesthetic*” sex: “undersized, narrow-shouldered, wide-hipped and short-legged,” which “could only be called the fair sex by a male intellect clouded by its sexual drive” (Schopenhauer, 2015, p. 555 [§369]). For

Françoise, by contrast, Élisabeth is beautiful and the object of erotic desire. Watching through a glass door, Françoise is hypnotised by the image of Élisabeth standing before a mirror, combing her red and silky hair with regular movements of her hand: “It was fascinating. Françoise did not feel her body anymore; she felt only the silky caress brushing against a flesh that was not hers. ... Françoise had ceased existing” (Beauvoir, 2004, p. 58). Françoise moves away and finds herself standing in front of a butcher’s shop, contemplating the objects on display, but these objects no longer seem present to her:

somewhere else, where she was not, there were other things. A white skin felt the touch of a silky dress against it, the back of the neck felt the shiver of red hair. One could no longer say: all this does not know it exists, it is as if it did not know it exists. It knew. It felt itself existing from inside; it had no need of Françoise in order to be felt; she could only go around it like a stranger. She went on her way. She no longer looked at anything. Things felt themselves existing without her; another thought, other eyes than hers cast a melancholy shadow onto the surface of the sky. It was almost intolerable. “Of course,” she murmured, irritated, “I’m aware that I’m not the only person in the world.” But with other people it was so different! When one parted with Marthe at a street corner, she faded into nothingness. Élisabeth was real. (p. 58)

As the other’s embodied consciousness becomes an object of longing, the centrality of the “I” is displaced, and we see Beauvoir giving her young narrator an altogether Proustian experience—as Françoise allows love to open up a world that was previously unknown to her.

In 1927, Beauvoir’s teenage diaries slid between Schopenhauer and Proust; but the deleted second chapter links more closely with Proust than with Schopenhauer with respect to the theme of lesbianism. Élisabeth’s desire to be an artist also fits awkwardly with the theories of Schopenhauer, as well as with aphorisms by Élisabeth’s own philosophical hero, Nietzsche: both of whom regarded female geniuses as a contradiction in terms (Nietzsche, 1968, pp. 432–433 [§ 817]; Battersby, 1994, pp. 154–160, 173–178). Thus, we learn that Élisabeth wants to be a painter, and that her favourite artists are van Gogh and Gauguin, and also that she models herself on Marie Bashkircheff (1858–1884), the painter and sculptor whose celebrated journals and self-portraits present an image of an “interesting” young woman whose genius places her outside the norms of the female sex (Beauvoir, 2004, pp. 59–60; Schiff, 2017). By contrast, Élisabeth is scornful about the overly “feminine” painter, Marie Laurencin (1883–1956), whose talents do not fit the Romantic model of creative genius (p. 67). Later in her life, Beauvoir (1966/2015) would argue that it is unlikely that women can fulfil their potential as geniuses, but here, at least, female genius is presented as an attractive ideal and as one of the triggers for Françoise’s infatuation with Élisabeth.

Disappointingly, however, in the published version of *She Came to Stay*, the character and appearance of Elisabeth have changed. No longer particularly attractive or talented as an artist, she is also now no longer an object of desire. Aged 30 and in a state of emotional turmoil, she is primarily used as a foil to the young Xavière, who has now acquired the youth, grace, and waywardness (but also no aspects of creativity or genius) that was ascribed to Élisabeth as a schoolgirl in the 1938 text.

5 | NEW DIRECTIONS

In the published version of *She Came to Stay*, the thoughts and responses of Françoise are still privileged, but other characters—including Elisabeth (1949a/2006, pp. 213–224, 380–384)—also occasionally carry the narrative forward, in part through the use of interior monologue. Beauvoir’s technique here has moved away from drifting stream of consciousness soliloquies to using interior monologue as a pointed, and indeed rather cruel, means of highlighting self-deception. There are just enough counter-narratives to enable the reader to see that Françoise’s version of events is not to be trusted, but Beauvoir does not offer the reader a more reliable first-person perspective. Indeed,

the overall narrative is now guided by reported dialogue, directed by an external voice that negotiates the complexities of the savage struggle for recognition and for dominance in the various love triangles. In the 1943 text, we move into an altogether darker Hegelian—and also Sartrean—world. Here, we discover modes of consciousness which are alien to the kind of swooning mysticism that characterised the climactic declaration of infatuation in the 1938 text: “Françoise had ceased existing” (Beauvoir, 2004, p. 58).

So why had Beauvoir already begun to move away from stream of consciousness writing techniques by 1941, which was, according to Moi (2013), when the final draft was completed? A short preface to a book of photographs of James Joyce provides a clue. The photos were taken in Paris in the 1930s, and in this Preface Beauvoir is looking back from the perspective of 1965. She portrays this period as a lost epoch, full of literary excitement:

In spite of the heavy clouds that were gathering over Europe and the world, literature remained the sparkling, brilliant guide star of our lives. After the monumental *Ulysses* appeared in French, a door was opened for us to a new world of foreign writers—D. H. Lawrence, Virginia Woolf, the great American Hemingway, Dos Passos; Faulkner, who totally transformed our concept of what a novel should be ... (Beauvoir 1965a/2011, p. 316).

However, Beauvoir also then goes on to remark that, despite the monumental achievements of this generation of writers, their novels involved a kind of self deception:

Most of the books were written under a cloud of illusion. The authors tried to escape the limits of time by following a tradition that one might call individualistic, psychological, or poetic. Man was pinpointed against his vast solitude or in his singular relationship with those around him. This was the path we all trod. (p. 317)

According to Beauvoir, World War II and the rise of fascism meant that the subjective writing techniques of the pre-war years were no longer adequate. What was required instead was “A literature that was committed, *engagée*.” Instead of psychological and subjective perspectives, the best post-war novelists needed to place their heroes “firmly within the economic and political atmosphere of their times” (p. 317).

Beauvoir’s first novel started out as one of those “individualistic, psychological, or poetic” texts that must have already started to seem dated to Beauvoir by the time the novel was published in the middle years of the war. It’s surely no accident that the list of “sparkling, brilliant” authors provided in the “Preface to James Joyce” matches very closely the inventory of authors that Beauvoir cites as helping shape the second draft of *She Came to Stay*. Magnificent, but deluded: Beauvoir’s verdict on her predecessors embraces her own text: “This was the path we all trod.” And perhaps that is why the second draft of the novel was conveniently “lost.” Fortunately, these two original chapters from the 1938 draft survive, allowing us to better understand the intersection between the stream of consciousness literary tradition and Beauvoir’s own later choices about the type of self—and the type of author—that she would choose to become.

ORCID

Christine Battersby  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4834-1915>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ The French text reads: “*Chaque conscience poursuit la mort de l’autre*” (Beauvoir, 1943, p. 1). The epigraph is missing from the English translation.
- ² The German title of Schopenhauer’s major work is *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Since there is no exact translation of the German term “*Vorstellung*,” the title has been variously translated. The first English translation from 1883 opted for

The World as Will and Idea. Mary Olivier is clearly referring to this translation in making these remarks. (See Schopenhauer, 2018, "Notes on Text and Translation", pp. xxxviii–xxxix.)

³ In the French edition, the quotations from Schopenhauer are differently placed and are ascribed to May 11, 1927 (Beauvoir, 2008, pp. 339–341). The enthusiastic comments on Schopenhauer's fourth book (on May 13) are, in the French edition, part of the very next entry (2008, p. 344). Since the diary includes notes written in the margin and also overleaf, the variation between the first (English, 2006) edition of Beauvoir's diaries and the subsequent (French, 2008) edition is understandable.

REFERENCES

- Bair, D. (1990). *Simone de Beauvoir: A biography*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Barnes, H. (1998). Self-encounter in *She came to stay*. In E. Fallaize (Ed.), *Simone de Beauvoir: A critical reader* (pp. 157–170). London and New York: Routledge.
- Battersby, C. (1994). *Gender and genius: Towards a feminist aesthetics* (2nd ed.). London: The Women's Press.
- Battersby, C. (1995). "I am not a philosopher": Simone de Beauvoir and the delirium of genius. *Women's Philosophy Review*, no 12, 36–42. Retrieved from <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/people/battersby/>
- Battersby, C. (2002). "In the shadow of his language": May Sinclair's portrait of the artist as daughter. *New Comparison: A Journal of Comparative and General Literary Studies*, 33(4), 102–20. Retrieved from <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/philosophy/people/battersby/>
- Beauvoir, S. de (1943). *L'invitée*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Beauvoir, S. de (1949a/2006). *She came to stay* (Y. Moyses and R. Senhouse, Trans.). London and New York: Harper Perennial. (Translation originally published 1949).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1949b/2011). *The second sex* (C. Borde and S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). London: Vintage. (French edition first published 1949).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1960/1976). *The prime of life* (P. Green, Trans.). New York: Harper and Row. (French edition first published 1960).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1965a/2011). Preface to James Joyce in Paris: His final years. In M. A. Simons, & M. Timmerman (Eds.), "*The useless mouths*" and other literary writings (pp. 149–169). Urbana, Chicago and Springfield, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2011. (Preface to book of photographs edited by G. Freund and V. B. Carleton).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1965b). The art of fiction, no. 35: An interview with Madeleine Gobeil (B. Frechtman, Trans.). *Paris Review*, 34(22, 4 June), 22–40. Retrieved from <https://articulosparapensar.wordpress.com>
- Beauvoir, S. de (1966/2015). Women and creativity (M. Timmerman, Trans.). In M. A. Simons, & M. Timmerman (Eds.), *Simone de Beauvoir: Feminist writings* (pp. 149–169). Urbana, Chicago and Springfield, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2015. (This is the text of a lecture given in Japan in 1966).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1970/1996). *The coming of age* (P. O'Brian, Trans.). New York and London: W.W. Norton. (French original first published 1970).
- Beauvoir, S. de (1979a). *Deux chapitres inédits de L'invitée*. In C. Francis, & F. Gautier (Eds.), *Les écrits de Simone de Beauvoir* (pp. 275–331). Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Beauvoir, S. de (1979b/1982). *When things of the spirit come first: Five early tales* (P. O'Brian, Trans.). London: Fontana. (Original first published by Editions Gallimard as *Quand prime le spiritual* in 1979, but completed in 1937).
- Beauvoir, S. de (2004). Two unpublished chapters from *She came to stay* (S. Gautheron, Trans.). In M. A. Simons (Ed.), *Simone de Beauvoir: Philosophical writings* (pp. 31–75). Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Beauvoir, S. de (2006). *Diary of a philosophy student volume 1, 1926–1927* (B. Klaw, Trans. & B. Klaw, S. Le Bon de Beauvoir, & M. A. Simons, Eds.). Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press. (First published in English. French original with additional material first published as Beauvoir [2008]).
- Beauvoir, S. de (2008). *Cahiers de jeunesse, 1926–1930*. (S. Le Bon de Beauvoir, Ed.). Paris: Gallimard.
- Beistegui, M. de (2012). *Proust as philosopher: The art of metaphor* (D. B. Katz, S. Sparks and M. de Beistegui, Trans.). New York and Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Chevalley, A. (1921). *Le roman anglais de notre temps*. London: Humphrey Milford. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/leromananglaisd00chevgoog/page/n9>
- Cohen-Solal, A. (1987). *Sartre: A life*. London: William Heinemann.
- Fallaize, E. (1998). Narrative strategies and sexual politics in Beauvoir's fiction. In E. Fallaize (Ed.), *Simone de Beauvoir: A critical reader* (pp. 193–202). London and New York: Routledge.
- Fernihough, A. (2007). Consciousness as a stream. In M. Shiach (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Modernist Novel* (pp. 65–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL052185444X.005>
- Fullbrook, E. (2004). Introduction to two unpublished chapters. In M. A. Simons (Ed.), *Simone de Beauvoir: Philosophical writings* (pp. 33–40). Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Joyce, J. (1916). *Portrait of the artist as a young man*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.
- Kirkpatrick, K. (2019). *Becoming Beauvoir: A life*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Klaw, B. (1995). *L'invitée castrated: Sex, Simone de Beauvoir and getting published or why must a woman hide her sexuality? Simone de Beauvoir Studies*, 12, 126–138.
- Ladenson, E. (1999). *Proust's lesbianism*. Ithaca, IL: Cornell University Press.
- Moi, T. (2013, March). Simone de Beauvoir and the metaphysical novel: Literature, philosophy, and the question of the other in *L'Invitée (She Came to Stay)*. University of London: Malcolm Bowie Memorial Lecture [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.sas.ac.uk/videos-and-podcasts/culture-language-and-literature/simone-de-beauvoir-and-metaphysical-novel>.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968). In W. Kaufmann (Ed.), and W. Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, Trans. *The will to power*. New York: Vintage. (The text includes material from Nietzsche's notebooks between 1863–88).
- Plato (c.370 BC/1972). *Phaedrus*. (R. Hackforth, Ed. and Trans.). London and New York: Cambridge University Press. (Greek original composed c.370 BC.).
- Potter, R. (2013). *Obscene modernism: Literary censorship and experiment 1900-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schiff, J. L. (2017). *Portrait of young genius: The mind and art of Marie Bashkirtseff*. Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2015). *Parerga and paralipomena: Short philosophical essays, volume 2*. (A. del Caro & C. Janaway, Trans. and Eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (German original first published 1851, with posthumous revisions and additions in 1873 and 1988).
- Schopenhauer, A. (2018). *The world as will and representation: Volume 2*. (J. Norman & A. Welchman, Trans., & C. Janaway, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (German original first published 1844, with revisions 1859, and posthumous revisions 1988).
- Sinclair, M. (1919/1980). *Mary Olivier: A life*. London: Virago. (First published by The Macmillan Co., 1919.).
- Troy, M. K. (2016). A very “un-English” English writer: May Sinclair's early reception in Europe. In M. K. Troy, & A. J. Kunka (Eds.), *May Sinclair: Moving towards the modern* (pp. 23–47). Abingdon, UK and New York: Routledge.
- Varsanopoulou, E. (2002). *The poetics of the Künstlerinroman and the aesthetics of the sublime*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Christine Battersby is Reader Emerita in the Department of Philosophy and an Associate Fellow of the Centre for Research in Philosophy, Literature and the Arts at the University of Warwick, United Kingdom. Publications include *Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics* (1989, 1994); *The Phenomenal Woman: Feminist Metaphysics and the Patterns of Identity* (1998); and *The Sublime, Terror and Human Difference* (2007), as well as numerous articles on feminist philosophy and on the place of women writers, artists, and philosophers in cultural history. She is on the Advisory Board for The Edinburgh Critical Editions of the Works of May Sinclair.

How to cite this article: Battersby C. Simone de Beauvoir, stream of consciousness and philosophical fiction: ecoming a self in the first draft of *She Came to Stay*. *Literature Compass*. 2020;17:e12553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12553>