



PROJECT MUSE®

---

## Editor's Note

Mississippi Quarterly, Volume 64, Numbers 3-4, Summer-Fall 2011, (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/mss.2011.0007>

The cover of the journal 'Mississippi Quarterly'. The title is in a serif font. Below it, the subtitle 'The Journal of Southern Culture' is in a smaller font. There is a small logo in the center. At the bottom, it says 'Vol. 64, Nos. 3-4 Summer-Fall 2011'.

Mississippi  
Quarterly

The Journal  
Of Southern Culture  
  
JHU Press  
Johns Hopkins University Press  
Baltimore, MD and London, UK

Vol. 64, Nos. 3-4 Summer-Fall  
2011

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/740983/summary>



“A Rose for Emily”:  
A Roundtable

Thomas Robert Argiro  
Richard Godden  
John T. Matthews  
Donald M. Kartiganer  
Scott Romine  
Thomas Bonner, Jr.



## Editor's Note

My first reaction to Thomas Argiro's essay on "A Rose for Emily" when it came in over my computer's transom was to moan a bit; after all, Faulkner studies had pretty much given up on it, conceding that its atypicality in the Faulkner canon and its popularity had exhausted its meanings long ago and that there was little more to say about it. Some of us had even declared an unofficial moratorium on discussing it at the annual Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha Conference at the University of Mississippi. Argiro's essay convinced me that that moratorium's time had run out, that we had not at all exhausted it, and that indeed the story asked questions that twenty years ago we were not ready to ask. It also seemed clear that though the essay's publication might occasion some controversy, controversy might actually kickstart some new discussion of Faulkner's warhorse. To that end, I circulated the essay to several Faulknerians and *Sudists*, who read and commented on that early version; with their permission, I sent their comments to Professor Argiro for his consideration, then sent his revisions back to the commentators. Five of the original commentators returned further considerations on the questions Professor Argiro has raised; these are printed here following Argiro's essay. To be sure, not all of the commentators agree with Professor Argiro's readings; but believing the nature of the critical enterprise is to spark discussion, I am confident this roundtable will do so.

NP