

The Reconciling of Two Forsters: *Maurice* and *A Passage to India* as Dynamic Dialogue

By Ashley Diedrich*

In 1885, the British Parliament passed the Labouchere Amendment, which criminalized unspecified acts of “gross indecency” between men. This was the law that, when E.M. Forster was sixteen, sent Oscar Wilde to prison. This situation had a profound impact upon Forster, leading him to conceal his sexual orientation for the remainder of his life. So, although Forster wrote Maurice, a novel about a romantic relationship between two men, in 1913, he withheld its publication until after his death. After abandoning Maurice, Forster—previously a prolific novelist—lapsed into a decade-long silence that finally ended with the publication of his final novel, A Passage to India, in 1924. Critics conventionally discuss A Passage to India in relation to such central and recurring themes in Forster’s canon as the tension between social classes, racial conflict under British Colonialism, and the limitations of conventional gender roles. Yet, A Passage to India also specially reimagines, reconfigures, and sublimates the overtly homosexual novel that Forster could not publish in his lifetime. The ghost of Maurice haunts A Passage to India, determining such elements as its portrayals of relationships (platonic, romantic, or merely complicated) between men and its depictions of women as upholders of social conventions, catalysts to the breakdown of male relationships, and secret keepers. A Passage to India, then, is a palimpsest of Maurice, a story of colonial India written over the erasure of an openly gay love story but with subtle traces of the original remaining.

Keywords: *E.M. Forster, palimpsest, intertextuality, homosexuality*

A significant and recurring theme in the fiction of E.M. Forster is, of course, people’s desire to establish connections—whether between individuals or races—by developing the heart. Forster coined the term “undeveloped heart” in his 1936 essay, “Notes on the English Character,” and Lionel Trilling observes that this theme is “almost obsessive with Forster. It is not the unfeeling or perverted heart that absorbs him, but the heart untrained and untutored, the heart checked too early in its natural possible growth. His whole literary effort is a research into this profound pathology” (Trilling 1942, p. 170). The developed heart allows Forster’s characters “to achieve some kind of ethical connection through personal salvation and not through worldly success . . . they project a vision of truth which is enjoyed only by those who trust their emotions and guard their inner integrity from the corrupting influences of convention” (Singh 1986, p. 7). This search for connection went beyond Forster’s literary works, also characterizing the author’s struggle with his sexual identity within the rigid confines of Edwardian England.

*Independent Scholar, USA.

In 1885, the Parliament passed the Labouchere Amendment, which “criminaliz[ed] unspecified acts of ‘gross indecency’ between men” (Moffat 2010, p. 33). This was the law that, when Forster was sixteen, sent Oscar Wilde to prison (Moffat 2010, pp. 33–34), leading Forster to conceal his sexual orientation for the remainder of his life. However, his inability to be open about himself did not stop him from discussing and contemplating issues personal to him through his fiction.

The unpublished novel *Maurice* provided safe expression for Forster’s homosexual thoughts and desires without fear of social or legal repercussions. He began the novel in 1913, eleven years prior to the publication of *A Passage to India*, when he visited the home of Edward Carpenter, the writer of *The Intermediate Sex* (1908) (Dettmar 2006, p. 351). During his lifetime, Forster only allowed other “like-minded individuals,” such as Christopher Isherwood, to read drafts of the novel. However, he permitted the work to be published upon his death. For both Forster’s generation of gay men and the contemporary LGBTQ+ community, *Maurice* stands as a “significant organizing narrative for homosexual experience” (Adair 2010, p. 51), as well as a plea by Forster to “‘only connect,’ to find the courage to understand and to love people different from ourselves” (Moffat 2010, p. 8). Marvin Mudrick even claims that *Maurice* is “Forster’s only truthful book, full of nerves, hysteria, infatuations, bitterness. . . . The ‘great novels’ are mirages” (Mudrick 1972, pp. 143–144). When writing *Maurice*, Forster believed a happy ending, an embracement of otherness, was vital to his personal well-being and to his writing. He said, “I shouldn’t have bothered to write otherwise. I was determined that in fiction anyway two men should fall in love and remain in it for the ever and ever that fiction allows” (qtd. in Moffat 2010, p. 7). The idea of a “happy ending” for a male homosexual couple was essential for Forster because most homosexual writings published during his time portrayed gay men either “converting” themselves to heterosexuality by getting married, committing suicide, or being killed because of their sexual orientation (Adair 2010, p. 53).

Even though *Maurice* upheld Forster’s personal wishes and beliefs, he put the novel aside and continued to develop another work of fiction, *A Passage to India*, which would be more “appropriate” for the general public. His final two novels share a particularly strong connection. At first view, *A Passage to India* appears to be a palimpsest of *Maurice* or a novel haunted by the ghost of its predecessor. George Steiner (1971) argues that Forster “saw that sexual eccentricity could be isolated in racial or caste terms,” adding that encounters between white and native in *A Passage to India* “are a brilliant projection of the confrontations between society and the homosexual in *Maurice*” (Forster 1971, p. 158).

The situation, however, is rather more complicated than *A Passage to India* merely transforming and translating *Maurice*’s account of sexuality into a narrative about colonialism. Forster began writing *A Passage to India* during a visit to India in 1912-1913, around the same time that he started writing *Maurice*, and did not return to it until 1921 (Stone 1966, p. 281). After the publication of *A Passage to India* in 1924, Forster continued to revise *Maurice* until his death in 1970, thus offering *A Passage to India* the opportunity to influence the other novel. Upon reading the last draft of *Maurice*, Isherwood was delighted to

discover that Forster's final version was "much more forthright" than the earlier draft he had seen many years before, and the "gauzy, sexless version was invigorated with an entirely new, and frank, sex scene" (Moffat 2010, p. 8). In addition, the resolution for some key characters drastically changed. In an early draft, "Alec emigrated to South America, leaving Maurice only to hope for a reunion" (Moffat 2010, p. 8). The revised ending was "firmer" with Maurice and Alec "end[ing] up in each other's arms—in England, of all places and, of all times, before the First World War," claiming ". . . we shan't be parted no more" (Moffat 2010, p. 8).

The 1971 publication of *Maurice* established for many scholars and readers a profound disconnection between traditional notions of Forster and the now openly gay Forster. For many years, Forster had been "a giant of twentieth-century literature," a key writer of the British literary canon, and "father of liberal humanism" (Forster 1971, p. 20). Readers had become accustomed to Forster as a sensitive writer who discussed the plights of human nature and attempts for connection, most famously in *A Passage to India*. Now, *Maurice* abruptly made him something entirely different: an explicitly "queer" novelist. For many, Forster became either one or the other—venerable modernist author or radical gay writer—but not both.

It is then not surprising that literary criticism about *Maurice* predominately focuses on homosexuality and this new Forster. After its publication, a number of critics had hostile responses. Jeffery Meyers claimed "there are no interesting characters, the bad drains in Clive's *mother's* house are an 'anal symbol,' Maurice is attracted to a lower-class lover 'with whom sex replaces shit'" (qtd. in Martin and Piggford 1997, pp. 19–20). However, there were also many positive views of the text by those who "felt compelled to write positive assessments of Forster's work and to argue for the validity of his homosexual themes" (Martin and Piggford 1997, p. 18). Anne Hartee discusses Forster's attempt to reconcile homosexuality, in addition to other forms of identity, such as race and class, with Englishness, arguing that it is "tempting to read the totality of Forster's work as a prolonged circling around the subject of homosexuality, which lurks as the unspoken of, or is obliquely encoded in, each text" (Hartee 1996, p. 128). She adds that the "crisis of each text is provoked by desire for an object deemed 'inappropriate' by dominant society, and what is ultimately at stake in such crises is Englishness" (Hartee 1996, p. 128).

When not merely praising, lambasting, or casting its homosexuality as a symbol of something else, scholarship tends to marginalize *Maurice*. Forster's earlier works are canonical texts and "panoramic studies surveying Forster's oeuvre build a narrative to the apex that is *A Passage to India*" (Bailey 2002, p. 324). Yet, most critics classify *Maurice* as queer literature or minor fiction, emphasizing its lack of significance compared to Forster's other works (Bailey 2002, p. 325). Wendy Moffat explains that *A Passage to India*, in both India and England, was "recognized as something greater and deeper than a work in the universally admired vein of Forster-the-sensitive-novelist. It was a masterpiece" (Moffat 2010, p. 195). Forster's theme of connection is ever present, but the novel emphasizes the limitations rather than the promotion of human connection (Moffat

2010, p. 190). Fredrick Karl and Marvin Magalaner add that Forster's purpose is to present a mystical, highly symbolic view of life, death, and human relationships (Karl and Magalaner 1959, p. 120). Instead of gender and class, the novel addresses colonialism and race relations, and many scholars consider the significance of Forster's continued discussion of otherness, where "matters of human conduct and especially with the dark places in the human heart . . . make for unhappiness and confusion not only between individuals but between races and nations" (Karl and Magalaner 1959, p. 120).

Critics tend to see the relationship between *Maurice* and *A Passage to India* as an act of repression or sublimation of the former into the latter. But, it is not simply a case of projection or transferal. Instead, the two works together constitute a dynamic dialogue *about* the interrelationship and disjunctions between them--a dialogue about the subjects that one (unpublished) presents overtly and which the other (published) transforms into subtext, a dialogue about reconciling various tensions between them.

One of the dynamic dialogues between the two novels concerns the potential for relationships between men—platonic or romantic—and the contexts in which such relationships have the capacity to flourish. In both *Maurice* and *A Passage to India*, men must engage with each other in intimate spaces in order to evade the social taboos, whether of race or sexuality, that divide them elsewhere.

In *Maurice*, the two important bonds in the novel commence in private rooms. Clive Durham and Maurice Hall's friendship begins within the safety of their Cambridge dorms rooms by day, but their intimacy radically develops when Maurice sneaks into Clive's room through the window one evening. Later, Clive reminisces that "their love belonged to [Cambridge], and particularly to their rooms" (Forster 1971, p. 80). Later, Alec Scudder, Clive's under-gamekeeper, parallels Maurice's actions by entering Maurice's private room at Penge, Clive's home. Alec, having sensed—and heard—Maurice reaching out for someone, slips in through the window and moves toward Maurice, whispering, "'sir, was you calling out for me? Sir, I know, I know,' and touched him" (Forster 1971, p. 192).

In *A Passage to India*, Dr. Aziz and Cyril Fielding also begin their relationship in intimate spaces. Their first encounter takes place in Fielding's bedroom, where Aziz offers his collar stud to Fielding who is missing his. Intimacy develops surprisingly quickly, as the two shake hands and smile, while Aziz "began to look round, as he would have with any old friend" (Forster 1952, p. 65). Shortly after, Fielding visits the ailing Aziz in his own bedroom. The close quarters allow the friendship to flourish to the extent that Aziz even takes the unconventional step of showing a private photograph of his wife to the white European. Aziz states, "'she was my wife. You are the first Englishman she has ever come before'" (Forster 1952, p. 116). After this meeting, "they were friends, brothers. That part was settled, their compact had been subscribed by the photograph, they trusted one another, affection had triumphed for once in a way" (Forster 1952, p. 122).

Beyond their evident parallels, the disjunctions between the two stories clearly demonstrate that the friendship between men of two races is more socially acceptable than romance between two men of the same race. Where the Indian and British male characters of *A Passage to India* begin their friendship in a private

space but subsequently continue it openly, the homoerotic love in *Maurice* must remain—for much of the narrative, at least—private and secretive. The subversion of racial conventions in the former, however, paves the way for the climactic rejection of more contentious sexual taboos in the latter, when Maurice and Alec finally choose to pursue their togetherness beyond the confines of an intimate space.

Besides the significance of secluded rooms, the men in *Maurice* and *A Passage to India* struggle with multiple social obstacles that threaten to stifle their relationships. After two years together, Clive decides he would rather be with women and “the change won’t spoil anything in [their] friendship that is real” (Forster 1971, p. 128). Clive’s determination to embrace this change leaves Maurice unable to overcome this obstacle, and they are left looking “at one another for a moment before beginning new lives” (Forster 1971, p. 129). Maurice’s relationship with Alec involves “a tense confrontation that addresses one of the central facts of English homosexual life, the attraction between men of different classes” (Fone 1998, p. 351). The upper-middle-class Maurice fears that the lower-class Alec is attempting to blackmail him. An intense confrontation between the two takes place, but it quickly becomes clear that both men actually care for one another. Maurice states, “I should have known by that time that I love you” (Forster 1971, p. 225), and then, “they were in love with one another consciously” (Forster 1971, p. 227). Alec and Maurice overcome the challenge of differing social classes when Maurice gives up his social standing to be with Alec, demolishing any barriers remaining between the two men.

While the men of *Maurice* deal with changing sexual preferences and social class, Aziz and Fielding struggle with race relations in India at the time of British Colonialism. The British in India generally keep to themselves and likewise do not befriend the indigenous people, but Fielding and Aziz break those impediments quickly. Fielding, even at the expense of his own reputation, defends Aziz against the British when Adela Quested accuses him of sexual assault during a trip to the Marabar Caves. At the same time, Aziz battles with his Indian identity and his role in British India. Martin Price (1975) explains that “Aziz is most steadily consumed by anxiety, aware of how he is regarded by others, needing confirmation in his own identity” (Forster 1971, p. 613). Even though both men are concerned with each other’s well-being, they must deal with ever-present racial tensions, which escalates with the fallout from Adela’s accusation.

The discussion between both texts shows the men attempt to overcome obstacles in order to gain something they want, to be who they truly are, and/or to obtain an authentic connection, but every situation and each choice comes with some form of potential displacement. *Maurice*’s main hindrance stems from homosexuality and those willing to accept it or not. Clive refuses any possible otherness within himself; instead, he chooses to be a proper Englishman. Initially, Maurice also struggles to accept who he truly is and fears displacement, but through the love he shares with Alec, Maurice recognizes that he no longer is willing to conform to society’s expectations. Unlike Clive, Aziz and Fielding wish to surpass the cultural tension building around them and appear willing to face possible displacement, especially Fielding, who does not feel comfortable with the

closed-minded views of the Englishmen. But, Aziz and Fielding, dissimilar to Maurice and Alec, cannot overcome the insurmountable racial issues that ultimately thwart their friendship.

In addition to the relevance of private spaces and obstacles, the multiple resolutions to Clive and Maurice's relationship in *Maurice* prefigure the ambiguous ending of Aziz and Fielding's connection. Yet, the unclear conclusion of *A Passage to India* leaves both men, as well as the reader, with the possibility of hope, the confidence that one day, an Indian and Englishman can be friends. Maurice and Alec embrace this potential for a happier ending when they head into the greenwood, further emphasizing the cyclical nature of influence and dialogue between the two novels.

In *Maurice*, Clive and Maurice's relationship suffers from two conclusions – the one ends their romantic connection and the other their friendship. Clive and Maurice's amorous bond expires when Clive seeks a relationship with a woman and is further solidified when Clive becomes engaged to Anne Woods, which leads to infrequent and superficial interactions between Maurice and Clive. When Maurice finally confesses to Clive that “I'm in love with your gamekeeper” (Forster 1971, p. 242), Clive's “whimper of disgust” and declaration that Maurice's news is “a grotesque announcement” formally ends their friendship (Forster 1971, p. 243).

While Maurice and Clive end their relationship owing to differing perspectives on homosexuality, Aziz and Fielding break apart because of racial tensions. Aziz and Fielding's exchange at the end expresses a desire by both to be together, regardless of race or nationalities. They embrace and half kiss one another, while asking, “why can't we be friends now?” (Forster 1952, p. 322). But, shortly after, the men depart, recognizing that their friendship cannot be. Moffat argues that “despite their intentions to connect in spite of barriers of race and culture,” Fielding and Aziz “faced a world that seemed destined to break their wills and their hearts” (Forster 1952, p. 5). Until British rule has been removed from India, Fielding and Aziz cannot be together on any level.

While Aziz and Fielding recognize their inability to remain friends at the conclusion of *A Passage to India*, Maurice and Alec leave social conventions behind and head into the greenwood, an ambiguous but potentially happy ending. Maurice and Alec are no longer willing to deal with possible negative consequences of their homosexuality and acknowledge “they must live outside class, without relations or money; they must work and stick to each other till death” (Forster 1971, p. 239). Krzysztof Fordonski explains that Maurice and Alec's decision to go into the greenwood shows the “heroes['] reject[ion of] a world they both felt at home with as they are aware that they are breaking the rules of it” (Fordonski 2003, p. 129). Jon Harned further adds that “it is only by breaking with society as cleanly as possible that Maurice can find any escape from the tightly woven discursive oppositions that prevent him from connecting with someone else” (Harned 1993, p. 64).

While the portrayal of male characters displays the interrelationship and disjunctions between the novels, the depiction of the women contributes to the dynamic dialogue as well. In both works, the female characters, particularly in

their roles as wives and mothers, are the primary instigators and upholders of social conventions.

In *Maurice*, the female characters sustain social norms by properly raising their children within the confines of English standards and by being suitable and demure wives. Mrs. Hall hopes to provide Maurice with motherly love while trying to mold him into a proper Englishman, so he “may grow up like [his] dear father in every way” (Forster 1971, p. 17). Mrs. Durham is “looking out wives for Clive” to make sure he is properly matched (Forster 1971, p. 101). Also, Anne Woods, Clive’s wife, is a sexually naïve and inexperienced woman. After they are married, Anne “did not know what [Clive] wanted” because “no one had told her about sex” (Forster 1971, p. 164). Jane Eldridge Miller (1997) argues that Anne’s primness and ignorance, the norm for many Edwardian wives, emphasizes that “the physical relationship between Clive and his wife Anne is . . . a failure . . . [and] Forster . . . condemns their marriage as emblematic of the shallow and dishonest nature of heterosexual relations” (Forster 1971, p. 53). Outside the bedroom, Anne focuses on being a proper housewife by organizing the household and acting as hostess at Penge.

Where the female characters in *Maurice* uphold Edwardian social expectations within the confines of England, Mrs. Moore and the British wives demonstrate similar conventions in India. Mrs. Moore comes to India to escort Adela, a prospective wife for her son, Ronny. Once Ronny and Adela become engaged, Mrs. Moore feels like her “duties here are evidently finished,” and now that Ronny is properly matched, “she must go home and help the others [Stella and Ralph], if they wished . . . [because] her function was to help others” (Forster 1952, p. 95). As Mrs. Moore focuses on taking care of her family, the British wives bring England and all its social norms to India, demonstrated through their separate housing area and the exclusive English-only club. The English wives, when in large numbers, create exclusive groups, which “socially distance” the British from the indigenous peoples (Strobel 1991, pp. 1–2). When the British “attempt” to bridge the cultural gap through a party, the British wives show no real effort in getting to know their Indian counterparts, who are left feeling ostracized and uncomfortable.

The dialogue between both novels stresses the significance of the female characters to the plot, but they remain static figures. In *Maurice*, none of the women have real agency; they focus exclusively on proper upbringings, motherly love, or being a fit wife. Most of the female characters do not develop much more in *A Passage to India*. Yet, the British wives strive for more power and control in India and, to some degree, obtain it. By maintaining conventions, they continue to wield the authority to widen the divide between the British and the Indians, emphasizing that “friendship between Indian and English men is impossible mostly because Englishwomen prevent it” (Sainsbury 2009, p. 61). And, by the end of *Maurice*, the need to uphold social expectations disappears, along with mother and wife figures, once Maurice and Alec decide to be together.

In *Maurice*, the male characters use the female characters as pawns to end or negatively alter significant male connections. First, Ada, Maurice’s sister, finds herself unintentionally drawn into the breakup of Clive and Maurice when Clive

claims “if I love anyone it’s Ada” (Forster 1971, p. 128). Anne further symbolizes the end of Maurice and Clive’s relationship when Clive makes Anne “the centre of his life” by marrying her, which results in fewer visits, fewer phone calls, and fewer letters between Clive and Maurice (Forster 1971, p. 164).

Adela, in *A Passage to India*, who initially helps bring Aziz and Fielding together, provokes the downfall of their friendship. Fielding disappoints Aziz by aiding Adela after she retracts her accusation against Aziz. Fielding explains, “in the course of a long talk with Miss Quested I have begun to understand her character. It’s not an easy one, she being a prig. But she is perfectly genuine and very brave. When she saw she was wrong she pulled herself up with a jerk and said so. I want you to realize what that means” (Forster 1952, p. 252). When Aziz demands an apology and makes rude comments about Adela, Fielding comes to her defense, causing a larger riff between himself and Aziz. Shortly after, “the trouble rose to the surface” because Aziz believes his friend intends “to marry Miss Quested for the sake of her money” (Forster 1952, p. 279).

The dynamic dialogue between the two novels emphasizes the men’s *need* to use female characters to end significant male connections. Even though homosexuality and race are the underlying matters, the male characters appear unwilling to acknowledge either issue. Instead, it is easier for them to utilize and blame the women for the downfall of relationships. Clive is disinclined to just end his romance with Maurice; rather, he brings Ada into the situation, even though “he would not marry Ada” because “she had been transitional” (Forster 1971, p. 130). Maurice also refuses to simply accept that Clive no longer wants to be with him; instead, Maurice must put the blame on someone other than himself, or even Clive, so he accuses “his sister of corrupting his friend” (Forster 1971, p. 134). For Aziz and Fielding, the concern is not if Aziz actually committed the assault against Adela, nor is it Fielding’s defense of Adela. Neither one is willing to recognize their racial differences are the genuine cause of the tension between them. Even though Fielding is quite sympathetic towards the Indians and their plight, he cannot stop being an Englishman; Fielding feels the need to help one of his own. And, Aziz cannot rid himself of his suspicions about the British, even Fielding. He is constantly on guard against another threat to him or his fellow Indians. Unlike the two previous examples, it is Maurice and Alec’s relationship, that does not use women at all, which is the strongest and, potentially, the happiest.

Besides upholding social conventions and breaking apart male relationships, the female characters in *Maurice* act—whether consciously or not—as keepers of secrets, specifically sexual ones. Mrs. Hall and Anne unintentionally help hide the sexuality of some male characters. Maurice tells his mother that “you needn’t tell the others I kissed Durham” because “he wouldn’t like it” and “I was rather upset and did it without thinking” (Forster 1971, pp. 104–105). Whether Mrs. Hall consciously grasps that her son is asking her to conceal a homosexual encounter remains ambiguous, but she consents immediately to this proposition because she “liked to have little secrets with her son; it reminded her of the time when she had been so much to him” (Forster 1971, pp. 104–105). Similarly, although Clive never explicitly confides in Anne about his sexuality, her very act of marrying him protects his secret, allowing him to feel “safe from intimacy”

(Forster 1971, p. 163) within the façade of an “ideal” marriage to “a fit helpmate” (Forster 1971, p. 165). The dialogue stresses the importance of secrets and their keepers in maintaining social conventions in England. Homosexuality must be kept a secret due to moral and legal repercussions. Mrs. Hall and Anne do not force Maurice or Clive to acknowledge or deal with their real or potential homosexual tendencies, but the issue still lingers. The women help Clive keep his secret, while he attempts to push the concern out of his life, but Maurice chooses to face the reality of his homosexuality.

Where the female characters in *Maurice* help men conceal their homosexuality, Adela, in *A Passage to India*, helps conceal the *text's* potentially homoerotic implications, at least initially. Besides not wanting to face the reality of whatever occurred in the Marabar Caves, Adela is also “desirous of being amiable” and consents to a trial that constructs Aziz as an Indian rapist of white women (Forster 1952, p. 148), thus cementing not only racist stereotypes but also heteronormativity: if Aziz has sexually assaulted Adela, this implicitly disavows the significance of any potentially homoerotic tensions between the Indian doctor and Fielding. Ultimately, however, Adela acknowledges that she has been mistaken in her accusations and that Aziz did her no harm (Forster 1952, p. 229). In the process, she recasts her experience in the Marabar caves in terms of inexpressible ambiguity. She “didn’t think what had happened, or even remember in the ordinary way of memory, but she returned to the Marabar Hills, and spoke from them across a sort of darkness” (Forster 1952, p. 227). Adela never explicitly resolves the enigma of what transpired in the caves, keeping her secret either out of choice or her inability to comprehend what happened. The caves thus become symbolic of human experience broadly and sexuality specifically: a murky subconscious landscape that defies precise categorization or certainty. What is more, with Aziz now acquitted of assaulting Adela, the narrative reinstates his interactions with Fielding as the central and climactic relationship. Just as the women in *Maurice* conceal the homosexuality of men, so does Adela seem to repress the potentially homoerotic connotations of *A Passage to India*—only to then very subtly re-enable them by asserting the inherent ambiguity of human sexual experience.

The dynamic dialogue between *Maurice* and *A Passage to India* explores, interrogates, dismantles, and/or transcends ever present tensions, resolving or bridging the gulf between binary oppositions (center/margins, white/black, male/female, gay/straight), and, in the process—not coincidentally—aiding the resolution between what scholars now see as the division of Forster himself into two. Through the connection between *Maurice* and *A Passage to India*, we reconcile the two different images of Forster, which were created with the publication of *Maurice*. Just as the two texts work together, the two Forsters must as well. We cannot recognize, appreciate, or understand one Forster without the other because he created all of his works as one man—the canonical writer and the gay man. None of his novels would be as rich or significant without the influence of both Forsters and his continual encouragement to “only connect.”

References

- Adair J (2010) A love that cares not speak its name: Clive Durham as narrative guide in E.M. Forster's *Maurice*. *SKASE Journal of Literary Studies* 2(2): 51–66.
- Bailey Q (2002) Heroes and homosexuals: education and empire in E.M. Forster. *Twentieth Century Literature* 48(3): 324–347.
- Dettmar KJH (2006) E.M. Forster. In DS Kastan (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*, 346–351. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Fone BRS (Ed.) (1998) *The Columbia anthology of gay literature: readings from western antiquity to the present day*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Fordonski K (2003) Self-imposed exile as a happy ending: a study in the fiction of E.M. Forster. In *PASE: Papers in Literature and Culture. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the PASE Gdansk 26-28 April 2000*, 123–127. Gdansk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego.
- Forster EM (1936) Notes on the English character. In *Abinger Harvest*, 3–20. San Diego: Harcourt.
- Forster EM (1952) *A passage to India*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Forster EM (1971) *Maurice*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Harned J (1993) Becoming gay in Forster's *Maurice*. *Papers on Language and Literature* 29(1): 49–66.
- Hartee A (1996) 'A passion that few English minds have admitted': homosexuality and Englishness in E.M. Forster's *Maurice*. *Paragraph: A Journal of Modern Critical Theory* 19(2): 127–138.
- Karl FR, Magalaner M (1959) *A reader's guide to great twentieth-century English novels*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy.
- Martin RK, Piggford G (Eds.) (1997) *Queer Forster*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller JE (1997) *Rebel women: feminism, modernism and the Edwardian novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moffat W (2010) *A great unrecorded history: a new life of E.M. Forster*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Mudrick M (1972) Fiction and truth. *Hudson Review* 25(1): 142–156.
- Price M (1975) People of the book: character in Forster's *A Passage to India*. *Critical Inquiry* 1(3): 605–622.
- Sainsbury A (2009) 'Not yet . . . not there': breaking the bonds of marriage in Forster's *A Passage to India*. *Critical Survey* 21(1): 59–73.
- Singh A (1986) *The novels of E.M. Forster*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors.
- Steiner G (1971) Under the greenwood tree. *The New Yorker* no. 47: 158.
- Stone W (1966) *The cave and the mountain: a study of E.M. Forster*. Palo Alto: Stanford UP.
- Strobel M (1991) *European women in the Second British Empire*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Trilling L (1942) E.M. Forster. *The Kenyon Review* 4(2): 160–173.