

CULTURAL ARCHETYPES IN WILLIAM'S CAT ON A HOT TIN ROOF

ABSTRACT

Tennessee Williams in his plays explores the place one has; not just in the social, but also in the familial circles. As such, this lends his work as aspect of universality that enables readers to empathize with his characters, regardless of their socio-cultural background. This study aims to analyze the character types that Williams has presented in his play 'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' by utilizing the theoretical framework of Archetypal Analysis to ascertain if Williams' characters have any universal applicability within and beyond the age and culture of 1950s Southern America. The research is an analytical study as it deals with the concepts, symbols, and interpretation of the selected text; as such, it is primarily subjective in nature, with psychoanalytical undertones. The research concludes with the idea that the family dynamics in this play are of the sort that almost every audience member in virtually every time or space can easily relate to and conceive of; because every family has their own version of each of these characters and the conflicts that can arise within them.

1. Introduction

The study examines the portrayal of archetypal characters in Tennessee Williams play 'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' with reference to the role each family plays in terms of the family dynamic as depicted in the play. The topic of Family Issues is of universal interest because everyone can relate to them. They are a way to probe into the social psyche and explore the culture of a nation. To that end, the premise of the study is that a family, its members, and related concepts appeal to people all over the world, as aspects of the family unit are archetypal; positioned outside time and place.

Archetypal criticism was chosen for the purpose of analysis as this branch of criticism accounts for a universality in literature by pointing to recurring patterns and images that appear so deeply embedded in the human mind and culture that they strike a responsive chord in everyone. Also called Myth Criticism, it has roots in anthropological and psychological studies. It came into prominence in the late 19th and early 20th centuries through the work of Sir James Frazer who was a Cambridge anthropologist. Frazer examined primitive rituals that indicated similar patterns of behavior and belief among diverse and widely separated cultures in his book 'The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion' (1922).

It was with the work of Leslie Feidler that archetypes were linked with literary works themselves, rather than with universal patterns. He was concerned with defining unique cultural patterns within literature. In his seminal works 'An End to Innocence: Essays on Culture and Politics' (1955) and 'Love and Death in the American Novel' (1962), Fielder made extensive use of archetypal criticism to isolate patterns within literature of a given culture or author.

2. Jungian Theory of Archetypal Criticism

Archetypal criticism was given birth to by Carl Jung, who theorized that humankind has a "collective unconscious", a kind of universal psyche, which is manifested in dreams and myths and which harbors themes and images that we all inherit. His theories led to the creation of Literary Archetypes through which man shares knowledge, experiences and images with the entire human race. When these images are utilized in literature, as symbols for example, they call up programmed feelings and responses. Archetypal criticism argues that archetypes determine the form and function. Some common examples of archetypes include water, sun, moon, colors, circles, the Great Mother, Wise Old Man, etc. In terms of archetypal criticism, the color *white* might be associated with innocence or could signify death or the supernatural. (Felluga, 2008)

Jung divided all his archetypal images into two major areas, the Primordial, which are archetypal images ingrained in our understanding even before we are born; and the Universal: those archetypes that can be found all over the world and throughout history. The terms and concepts defined below make up only a small part of the ones described by Jung, as they have been limited to the needs of the study. Archetypes fall into two major categories: characters, situations/symbols. Some of the most common archetypes in each category are:

2.1 Characters

- The Hero - The courageous figure, the one who is always running in and saving the day.
- The Outcast - The outcast is just that. He or she has been cast out of society or has left it on a voluntary basis. The outcast figure can oftentimes also be considered as a Christ figure.
- The Scapegoat - The scapegoat figure is the one who is blamed for everything, regardless of whether he or she is actually at fault.
- The Star-crossed Lovers - This is the young couple joined by love but unexpectedly parted by fate.
- The Shrew - This is that nagging, bothersome wife always battering her husband with verbal abuse.

- The Shadow - The most basic potential for patterning is the Shadow Archetype. This is the potential of experiencing the unconscious side of our unique personalities.
- The Anima Or Animus - The second most prevalent potential patterning is that of the Soul (Anima is the male name for soul; Animus is the female name for soul). Here we meet our inner opposite. Males meet their Anima, females their Animus.
- The Child - The Child Archetype is a pattern related to the hope and promise for new beginnings. It promises that Paradise can be regained.
- The Family - Besides the Mother, there are other familial archetypes. The Father, who is often symbolized by a guide or an authority figure. There is also the archetypal family, which represents the idea of blood relationship and ties that run deeper than those based on conscious reasons do.

2.2 Situations

- The Task - A situation in which a character, or group of characters, is driven to complete some duty of monstrous proportion.
- The Quest - Here, the character(s) are searching for something, whether consciously or unconsciously. Their actions, thoughts, and feelings center around the goal for completing this quest.

The general belief is that literature, and therefore drama, should hold up a mirror to real life. As such, the analysis of drama, particularly with regards to archetypal approach, should also examine the social and cultural background and the cultural scene of the writer's time and space.

“The stage reflects life, it doesn't invent it.....the change of codes, morals, manners that we found now shocking in the theater could not be there and world not be tolerated if it were not already a pervading thing in the world. The theater is made up of all of us. Everything we are and do and think and believe gets into the theater. It is the mirror of life.”
(Crothers, 1967 p. 133)

Each successive theorist in Archetypal Theory has reinforced the claim that archetypes functions as symbolic patterns in any literature and that the pattern is understandable to all readers because there is an element of universality to all societies and cultures of the world.

3. The South in America

As ‘Cat on a Hot Tin Roof’ is set in the Mississippi Delta, the Southern background is integral to the analysis of the play, as the tensions in the play emerge out of the cultural environment of the antebellum South. The values and attitudes epitomized by of some of

the characters are linked to the geographical and cultural background of the 1950's American South.

The culture of the South has its origins in British colonists of the 17th century. Later on, in the 18th century, the Scottish and Irish settlers arrived in the region. According to an 1860 census, "three-quarters of white Southerners had surnames that were Scottish, Irish or Welsh in origin" (Encyclopaedia Britannica Online, 2010).

Southern culture has been and remains generally more socially conservative than that of the rest of the country. This may be because of the central role of agriculture in the antebellum economy; society remained divided into classes on the basis of land ownership. In addition, churches often became the primary community institution. Wilbur Cash, himself a Southerner by birth, in his book 'The Mind of the South' uses historical, economic, social, and even environmental arguments to support the concept of his native region as 'a nation within a nation.' He presents the myth of the plantation as an integral part of understanding the Southern patterns of thought and behaviour (Campbell, 1997).

As "an independent social unit, a self-contained and largely self-sufficient world of its own" the plantation serves to represent the determination to preserve the old order and an instinctive rejection of any form of progress, automatically associated with the threatening North (Campbell, 1997).

Historians of the southern colonies initially became interested in family structures in the 1970s as part of their more general turn in the direction of social history. The first social histories of the southern colonies were in part responses studies that cast Puritan villages as archetypal early American communities (Kierner, n.d).

Southern Literature is now perceived as a subgenre of American literature. It differs only in terms of the fact that it explores the social issues and reveals the cultural character of the American South. It is from this literature that the antebellum stereotypes such as the contented slave, the demure Southern belle, the chivalrous gentleman, or the righteous Christian preacher have been popularized.

In terms of modern drama, these cultural stereotypes attain the status of archetypes because they are presented in a more realistic manner. This genre of writing is seen in the works of Southern writers such as William Faulkner, Flannery O'Connor, Tennessee Williams, Harper Lee, to name just a few.

4. Analysis

Tennessee Williams' family tragedy of greed, loyalty, and mendacity, 'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' (1955) explores the conflicts between parents and children, between husbands and wives, and between jealous siblings. Some of the other themes found in the play deal with the issues of homosexuality, greed, southern culture, the effects of alcoholism etc.

'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' presents the story of the Pollitt family and the struggles and rivalries between its various members for ownership the twenty-eight thousand acre

plantation. The play opens a birthday celebration being planned for Big Daddy. Though the story in actuality revolves around the characters of Margaret (Maggie) who is also referred to as the Cat in the play, and her efforts to engineer a reconciliation with her husband who is an alcoholic suffering from guilt and depression. Their story is paralleled by that of the elder son, Goober and his wife Mae, and their efforts to gain the ownership of the plantation.

The story offers many plot lines, which leaves the reader wondering if the play is about the marital troubles between Maggie and Brick, or the possibly homosexual relationship that Brick and Skipper may or may not have had, or is the play about a family's machinations to gain an inheritance.

Big Daddy's character dominates the play. As the head of the family, his words are listened to and paid attention to by all the characters in the play. Being that the south was essentially a patriarchal society Big Daddy is seen as a figure of power, authority, and traditional masculinity. Being that the American Dream was alive, Big Daddy's claims rest on the fact that he is worth "close on ten million in cash an' blue chip stocks, outside, mind you, of twenty-eight thousand acres of the richest land this side of the valley Nile!"

In theory, the traditional family was a hierarchical unit, in which the father was invested with patriarchal authority. He alone sat in an armchair, his symbolic throne, while other household members sat on benches or stools. Legally, the father was the primary parent. Fathers, not mothers, received custody of children after divorce or separation. His control over inheritance kept his grown sons dependent upon him for years, while they waited for the landed property they needed to establish an independent household.

Big Daddy "was the biggest cotton planter in the Delta", a statement that leads the readers to believe that the Pollitt family is quite wealthy. However, he did not inherit this wealth. We learn from various references in the play, like the travelling salesman suitcase and hat that belonged to Big Daddy's father, that they belonged to the class that would have been referred to as the *nouveau riche* [the newly rich] in Southern culture. A not inconceivable fact, as the south had been initially populated by immigrant workers and farmers, and their successive generations could have gained in land, money, and prominence.

Big Daddy, we learn, is being forced to confront two ugly realities. The fact that he may be dying of cancer – an idea that he vehemently denounces till the end of the play; and the question of who will gain his property; something that he refuses to comment on or even give up his hold on. As he says to Brick, "You git a piece of land, by hook or crook, an' things start growin' on it, things accumulate on it, and the first thing you know it's completely out of hand!". For Big Daddy, his fortune and power become his greatest liability.

Though the personal preference may be for Brick to inherit the property, Big Daddy also feels that his younger son is not competent enough for the responsibility, while the elder

son he feels is weak – in masculine terms and expresses a strong dislike for Mae and their children. As Big Daddy explains to Brick:

A little while back when I thought my number was up - before I found out it was just this - spastic - colon, I thought about you. Should I or should I not, if the jig was up, give you this place when I go - since I hate Gooper an' Mae an' know that they hate me, and since all five same little monkeys are little Mae's an' Gooper's. - And I thought, No! - Then I thought, Yes! - I couldn't make up my mind. I hate Gooper and his five same little monkeys and that bitch Mae! Why should I turn over twenty-eight thousand acres of the richest land this side of the valley Nile to not my kind? - But why in hell, on the other hand, Brick - should I subsidize a goddamn fool on the bottle? - Liked or not liked, well, maybe even - *loved!* - Why should I do that? - Subsidize worthless behavior? Rot? Corruption?

In the course of the play, we learn that Big Daddy has suspected for three years that the pain in his gut may be cancer. In the morning preceding the play's action, the day of his sixty-fifth birthday, he has visited the Ochsner Clinic for a biopsy. Mae and Gooper have conspired to withhold the true diagnosis from him until after his birthday party, so for a brief moment Big Daddy believes that he suffers from nothing more than a spastic colon. He tells Brick that:

Ignorance - of mortality - is a comfort. A man don't have that comfort, he's the only living thing that conceives of death, that knows what it is. The others go without knowing which is the way that anything living should go, go without knowing, without any knowledge of it, and yet a pig squeals, but a man sometimes, he can keep a tight mouth about it. Sometimes he - [*there is a deep, smoldering ferocity in the old man.*] - can keep a tight mouth about it.

Big Daddy displays many of the stereotypical characteristics found in the men of a traditional patriarchal society. He does not like his authority being questioned. He believes that a man has to bear the burdens of pain and disappointments in his work, relationships, and life stoically. He like all fathers displays a certain favoritism towards his younger son, as he is more physically male than the elder one. He attempts to be a man who does not shirk from his responsibilities or the consequences of his action.

Much of the character traits that Big Mama displays are typical of a southern wife. She is depicted as a “gaudy woman” who wears jewels all the time to show her status, like a typical woman of the 1950's. She ostensibly appears to have all that she wants – in terms of wealth, status and a home of her own. Yet Big Mama's character is in reality an object of pity and dogged femininity. She is shown as being fanatically loyal to her husband, even in the face of Big Daddy's ridicule, she continues to show her faith and support in his love.

Big Daddy constantly abuses Big Mama, even telling her directly that he finds her repulsive. He even blames her of betrayal saying that "Ain't that so, Ida? Didn't you have an idea I was dying of cancer and now you could take control of this place and everything on it?" Big Daddy's indifference towards his wife, shown by his lack of concern when she runs sobbing from the room, is again typical of the marriages made in the 1950's south. The question can be raised at this point that if Big Daddy's hatred for Big Mama was so strong; why had he married her in the first place or why the marriage still endures.

One reason for this could be the social and cultural background of the play. Coming from practically no social status, perhaps theirs was a marriage of convenience. Added to this was the fact that divorce was not considered acceptable at that time.

Big Mama is a woman who places all of her hopes for the future of her family in Brick. When Gooper presents his dummy trust, Big Mama refuses him, saying "CRAP", just as Big Daddy would. Instead, she begs Brick to have a child who will continue Big Daddy's legacy, leading Maggie to announce her pregnancy prematurely.

During the 1950s, women were conditioned to find their worth in marriage and creating a sound family structure. Women were to marry, and no matter how miserable they were treated, they were to please their husbands. In the case of Maggie and Brick, he reminds her they are simply living together and married only by name. She seems to be in constant torture because she cannot experience intimacy (physical or emotional) with the man in which she has vowed the rest of her life to.

The ideal 1950s wife was a woman who was pregnant within her first year of marriage. The marriage has produced no children, therefore she is an outcast to society; her status of woman and wife is called into question and abused by other female characters, especially Mae, who is hostile towards Maggie as she is also a threat to Mae and Gooper's plans for the ownership of the plantation.

In a desperate effort to explain to Brick, her husband, the material situation in which they find themselves, Maggie refers to the family's

Constant little remarks and innuendos about the fact that you and I have not produced any children, are totally childless and therefore totally useless! - Of course it's comical but it's also disgusting since it's so obvious what they're up to! ... They're up to cutting you out of your father's estate

Maggie assumes the role of a strong, determined and aggressive individual. She—more than anyone—is aware of what she has become. She says,

Don't you think I know that ... That I've gone through this - hideous! - transformation, become hard! Frantic! ... That's what you've been observing in me lately. How could y' help but observe it? That's all right. I'm not thin-skinned anymore

WHY! - Am I so catty? - Cause I'm consumed with envy an' eaten up with longing?... I feel all the time like a cat on a hot tin roof.

At the end, she succeeds admirably in manipulating her husband, Brick, who is shown as a man nearly broken under the pressure of life and his own mental trauma. He is dependent of alcohol and the elusive “click” he longs for is the metaphorical escape from the reality he finds himself in.

Brick, we are told, is estranged from his wife at the beginning of the play. Their marriage has degenerated into a sham that Maggie tries her best to remove in the course of the play. As the action continues, we learn that it is the suspicious circumstances behind the death of Brick’s best friend, Skipper, which is the root cause for their marital problems. Yet that is only one aspect of the story. We learn as the play goes on that Brick uses alcohol to block out his affections for Skipper, to avoid his father, and to ignore Maggie.

Ironically it also Brick who serves as the catalyst for the action of the play. Brick does desire his father’s affection, and his attempt to find common ground between them leads to the plays most climactic scene – where Brick inadvertently reveals the truth of Big Daddy’s illness.

The relationship between father and younger son, as depicted through the characters of Brick and Big Daddy fits the concept of the traditional male in Southern society. Big Daddy’s actions are reminiscent of a father’s dominance on his family and the refusal to accept any challenges to his authority. Like his repeated orders to Brick

No, I won’t excuse you.

You set there and listen till I tell you this conversation is over

Don’t you move from that chair

Do what I tell you! I’m the boss here now!

Brick on the other hand, is the classic younger son who is shown as irresponsible and a degenerate – e.g. his alcoholism, reticence within the family, lack of participation in the birthday party, the rebellion of going into professional football rather than learning the trade of a plantation owner. Yet he is also the favoured son – for both Big Daddy and Big Mama.

Big Mama, for example at the start of the play consistently asks, “Where’s Brick? Where’s my son” even though Gooper is standing right in front of her. She further tells Brick that Big Daddy dotes on him and that only he could continue the family legacy. She says,

Oh, Brick, son of Big Daddy! Big Daddy does so love you! Y'know what would be his fondest dream come true? If before he passed on, if Big Daddy has to pass on, you gave him a child of yours, a grandson as much like his son as his son is like Big Daddy!

The classic struggle between a father's expectations and a son's desires is also a theme found in this play too. This too fits in with the traditional depiction of a nuclear family. The climactic conversation between Father and Son is also in true Southern fashion. They both avoid talking about the subject directly; both offer no possible solution to the dilemma – perhaps because the answer each offers is not acceptable to the other.

Big Daddy: I've lived with mendacity! – why can't you live with it?
Hell, you got to live with it, there's nothing else to live with except mendacity, is there?

Brick: Yes, sir. Yes, sir there is something else that you can live with!

Big Daddy: What?

Brick: This! – Liquor...

Big Daddy: That's not living, that's dodging away from life.

Brick: I want to dodge away from it.

Big Daddy: Then why don't you kill yourself, man?

Brick: I like to Drink ...

Big Daddy: Oh, God, I can't talk to you ...

The play concludes with Brick being caught in a trap the Maggie has laid. She announces that she is pregnant with Brick's child. This news gives the hope of continued happiness to Big Mama and Big Daddy. Brick finds himself caught between two extremes – he can either expose Maggie's lie, or destroy whatever understanding he has created with his father; or he can remain silent and ensure that the lie becomes a truth.

Gooper, Brick's older brother, is a man who tries to copy the style and mannerisms of his father in hopes of impressing him. His wish to be viewed as the better son is doomed from the beginning because he recognizes that Big Daddy has always favored Brick, and he hopes to take advantage of Brick's alcoholism to stake his own claim on the plantation.

Gooper and Brick's relationship demonstrates a treacherous family dynamic. The siblings' rivalry contributes to the dramatic action. We learn in the course of the play that Mae and Gooper had come to the plantation with their five "no-neck" children, ostensibly for Big Daddy's birthday party, but in reality, it was gain control of the plantation.

They are the ones who convince the doctor not to tell the truth about Big Daddy's illness. The reason for the delay becomes clear when Gooper informs Big Mama of the truth and presents her with a dummy trust, which he demands that she have Big Daddy sign. The couple's plan is to gain control of the plantation, by any means. Yet, this plan was foiled by Big Mama, who says

You jest won't let me do this in a nice way, will yah? . . . I am asking for a square deal, and I expect to get one. But if I don't get one, if there's any peculiar shenanigans going on around here behind my back, or before me, well, I'm not a corporation lawyer for nothing, I know how to protect my own interests

Gooper, in a bid to win his father's approval if not affection, has tried to do what he felt was wanted by his father. From becoming a lawyer, to marrying and having a number of children to continue the Pollitt family name. Yet the fact remains that his jealousy and basic greed for his father's money, position, and power lead him to spread rumors about his brother's sexual orientation and to constantly point out the lacks he perceives in Brick's character and life. These make it convenient to cast Gooper as the antagonist in the story, ably seconded by his wife.

Mae's character presents a strong contrast to that of Maggie. Though she fits into the mould of a typical southern wife and mother, her "avarice" and "greed" makes her an unlikable character in the play. Her role in prompting her husband's plans, and even masterminding some of them, makes her as culpable as Gooper in developing the dysfunctional family dynamic that the Pollitt family represents. For example, the birthday party and the various 'entertainments' put up by their children is an apparent bid to snare Big Daddy's wealth for themselves.

Mae's methods are much more unscrupulous than the ones that Maggie utilizes, though their aims are similar – to gain the ownership of the plantation for their respective husbands. This similarity is pointed out in the course of a conversation between Big Daddy and Brick who both realize that "there is something similar about them.... Especially in the look in their eyes" and that they are both like a "couple of nervous cats on a hot tin roof".

Yet Mae's behaviour inspires no sympathy from the readers. Her constant digs at Maggie's inability to have children, her "sneakin' and spyin'" on them only make her appear malicious and immoral. Though the expectation may have been that as women, Mae and Maggie may have joined forces, or at least been sympathetic towards each other, it is clearly not so. Instead, we see her trying to twist the facts in order to gain sympathy from others.

6. Conclusion

Williams' personal experiences with his family had given him ample sources of inspiration for his characters. For example, his mother's need for and manner of living as a genteel Southern lady is expressed in the values and actions of Big Mamma and Mae. His father was always distant from his sons and Tennessee may have modeled the relationship between Big Daddy and Brick on this pattern. He was also not very close to his brother, Dakin, who was an attorney like Gooper in the play. Additionally Tennessee Williams own experience with homosexuality had left him feeling alienated and lonely, an emotion that is shared by many of the characters.

Family composition was far more elastic than in later American families. Family size and composition also varied according to the household's economic needs. Many children left their parents homes before puberty to work as servants or apprentices in other households. (Mintz, 2007). The family that makes up the core of the cast members is structured as a typical 'nuclear family' – comprising of a Father, Mother and two children – in this case sons. The analysis of the characters serves to establish their personalities and how they fit into the cultural context as depicted in the play. It is the flashes of realism in the play that leads to the creation of archetypal figures; that function as universal symbols not just in their own cultural and historical context, but also outside of it.

Many of the character types that Jung mentions are found in the play as well. For example The Hero (Brick), The Outcast (Skipper, Maggie), The Scapegoat (Big Mama), The Star-crossed lovers (Brick and Maggie), The Shrew (Maggie, Mae), The Child (Maggie's unborn child as the hope for the future). In the course of the play, the Male characters meet their Anima. That is they reveal their emotional needs, like Big Daddy's from his Father, Gooper and Brick's from Big Daddy. The females in the play reveal their Animus in their voracious desire for material assets, something traditionally attributed to the men. Even the names used for the characters – Big Daddy, Big Mama, Brother Man, Sister Woman – are reminiscent of the *Everyman* terminology that makes it not only easy but also imperative for the readers to associate themselves with the characters.

There is something unchanging, something quickly identifiable about a Father, a Mother, The Degenerate Younger Son, the disputes about Money, the quest for Ownership and the resultant Sibling Rivalry which indicates a further substantiation of C. G. Jung's theory of the collective unconscious and its archetypal patterns. Such character types and the easy acceptance the readers feel towards them regardless of the cultural context, leads to the conclusion that there is something universal in the comprehension of a type by the artist and by his audience.

Though at times it may seem that some of the situations in the play and the subsequent actions of the characters are exaggerated, we also cannot fail to recognize the element of truth in the conflicts of the play. Especially as pertaining to how families can be torn apart by disputes over property rights at the death of a patriarch and the universally recognizable emotions of Betrayal, Greed, Rivalry, Survival, Life etc.

We can identify with a character in a literary work because we already have somewhere deep in our unconsciousness a vague image of that character. Thus, we gain a more comprehensive understanding of all human nature by understanding the motivations and systems of thought in any archetypal character. Williams may have exploited the family dynamics for his own purposes, but the extreme relationships in this family have their own seminal value, and almost every audience member in virtually every time, can relate to or conceive of these archetypal characters because every family has its own sense of tragedy.

REFERENCES

Primary Text

Williams, T. (1955). *Cat on a hot tin roof*. New York: Signet.

Secondary Texts

“United States”. (2010). *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. Retrieved October 03, 2010. From: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/616563/United-States>.

Barbara, P. G. (2007). “Tennessee Williams’ *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* or the dramatic aptitudes of the goddess Diana”. In Pages, L. (Ed.) *Greek Theatre: Contemporary Perspectives*. (University of Barcelona: pp. 293-320). Retrieved October 04, 2010. From: [http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/12182/7/Diana% 20ang.pdf](http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/12182/7/Diana%20ang.pdf).

Campbell, N., & Kean, A. (Eds.). (1997). *American cultural studies*. London & New York: Routledge.

Dumbrava, G. (2008). “From Archetype to Stereotype: a Postmodern Re-reading of the American South”. *European journal of American studies* (document 7). Retrieved October 09, 2010. From: <http://ejas.revues.org/index1693.html>.

Felluga, D. (2008). “Introductory Guide to Critical Theory”. *Purdue University*. Retrieved September 19, 2010. From: <http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/newhistoricism/modules/introduction.html>.

Holditch, K., & Leavitt, R. F. (2002). *Tennessee Williams and the south*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Jacobson, T. (1992). *The Heritage of the South*. New York: Crescent.

Kierner, C. A. (n.d). “Women, gender, families, and households in the southern colonies”. In *Journal of Southern History*. Retrieved October 03, 2010. From: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb6532/is_3_73/ai_n29369474/.

Kolin, P. C. (1998). *Tennessee Williams: A guide to research and performance*. Westport: Greenwood, 1998.

Krasner, D. (2005). *A companion to twentieth-century american drama*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Mintz, S. (2007). “Private Life”. In *Digital History*. Retrieved October 05, 2010. From: http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/historyonline/private_life.cfm.

Paglia, C. “Tennessee Williams”. In Marcus, G. & Sollors, W (Eds.). (n.d). *A New Literary History of America*. Retrieved October 03, 2010. From: <http://www.newliteraryhistory.com/tennesseewilliams.html>.