



---

## The Price of Giving: Narratives of Debt, Desire, Sacrifice, and Survival in Select Short Fiction

Suresh Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Govt. College Indora, 176401, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, India, Email: vijaysuresh8890@gmail.com

---

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18240628>

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 24-12-2025

**Published:** 10-01-2026

**Keywords:**

*Giving, Debt, Desire, Sacrifice, Survival, Short Fiction, Value, Human Relations, Obligation, Compassion.*

---

### ABSTRACT

Short fiction often condenses the complexities of human relationships into moments of profound moral choice, where the act of giving becomes both transformative and costly. This paper examines Guy de Maupassant's *The Debt*, Anton Chekhov's *The Beggar*, O. Henry's *The Last Leaf*, and Saki's *The Sex That Doesn't Shop* to explore how debt, desire, sacrifice, and survival function as recurring motifs in the economy of human interaction. Each story situates giving within a paradox: it uplifts yet burdens, redeems yet demands a price. In *The Debt*, repayment emerges as an obligation that binds memory and honor; in *The Beggar*, generosity redefines identity and dignity; in *The Last Leaf*, sacrifice transforms art into a life-saving act; and in *The Sex That Doesn't Shop*, Saki's wit exposes the commodification of gender and desire. Collectively, these texts highlight how acts of giving extend beyond material exchange to reshape emotional, ethical, and existential landscapes. The study argues that giving is never free—it carries with it an invisible cost measured in duty, loss, or transformation. By situating these narratives within broader debates on value and human relations, the paper uncovers how short fiction interrogates the unseen ledgers of compassion, obligation, and survival. Ultimately, the stories illuminate how fragile yet enduring the “price of giving” remains in the negotiation between self and other.

**Introduction:**

The act of giving is universally celebrated as a virtue, an affirmation of human empathy and generosity. Yet beneath its surface lies a complex set of obligations, expectations, and costs. Giving, whether material or emotional, is rarely free. It shapes relationships, enforces duties, and often reshapes identities in ways that complicate the seemingly simple exchange of gifts, favors, or sacrifices. Literature has long served as a medium for exploring these paradoxes, offering readers narratives where acts of giving reveal the deepest truths of human experience.

This paper examines the theme of giving in four short stories from distinct literary traditions: Guy de Maupassant's *The Debt*, Anton Chekhov's *The Beggar*, O. Henry's *The Last Leaf*, and Saki's *The Sex That Doesn't Shop*. Each story foregrounds giving as central to human interaction, but each frames it differently—through obligation, transformation, sacrifice, or satire. Collectively, they present that generosity is never a neutral act but one embedded in social, ethical, and emotional economies.

By bringing together these diverse texts, the study seeks to demonstrate how short fiction interrogates the “price of giving,” uncovering the invisible ledgers that measure generosity not in coins alone but in honour, dignity, survival, and irony. The discussion proceeds through thematic analyses of each story before moving toward a comparative reflection, underscoring the multifaceted nature of giving in literature and life.

Maupassant's realist fiction frequently reveals the hidden structures of social life, where material realities expose the fragility of human pretenses. **The Debt** is no exception. At its core, the story dramatizes the intertwining of giving with duty, suggesting that generosity often imposes debt and obligations as binding as contracts. The act of repayment is not merely transactional; rather, it becomes a moral act that enshrines honour. The story underscores how generosity is entangled with memory, as the debtor is bound not only by financial obligation but by the weight of gratitude. Maupassant illustrates that even kindness creates a ledger, invisible yet binding, that must eventually be balanced. Maupassant writes how Francois Guerland who was helped during his childhood by Miss. Fanny reacts:

“No, certainly not!” François Guerland, the painter, said to himself when he read the notice in the papers. “No, the great Fanny shall certainly not end like that.” For it was certainly she; there could be no doubt about it. For a long time after she had showered that act of charity, which he could never forget, the child had seen his benefactress again. But Paris is a very mysterious place, and he himself had many adventures before he grew up to be a man, and, eventually, almost somebody!



But he only found her in the distance; he had recognized her at the theater, or as she was getting into her carriage, which was fit for a princess. And how could he approach her then? Could he remind her of the time when her purse was five francs? No, assuredly not; and so he had followed her, thanked her, and blessed her, from a distance.

But now the time had come for him to pay his debt and he paid it. Although tolerably well known as a painter with a future in store for him, he was not rich. But what did that matter? He mortgaged that future which people prophesied for him, and gave himself over, hand and foot, to a picture-dealer. Then he had the poor woman taken to an excellent asylum where she could have not only every care, but every necessary comfort, and even luxury. Alas! however, general paralysis never forgives. (Maupassant 66-67)

Maupassant presents gratitude as a moral obligation that demands sacrifice rather than acknowledgment. This depiction challenges the ideal of altruism. Instead of portraying giving as free or unconditional, Maupassant insists that every act of generosity carries a cost, often borne in the form of duty, guilt, or loss of autonomy. Repayment, then, is less about money and more about restoring balance to a moral economy where honor is at stake. Through this lens, Maupassant critiques both the romanticization of generosity and the coercive weight of obligation, reminding readers that giving can entrap as much as it liberates. Guerland's repayment is silent and self-effacing, emphasizing that true gratitude seeks neither recognition nor reward but fulfils itself through selfless action.

Chekhov's **The Beggar** approaches giving from a different angle—less as repayment of a debt than as a process of moral transformation and dignity. The story centers on a beggar who is confronted with his own deception when a lawyer refuses to give him money but instead offers him work. Here, giving is redefined: it is not the easy charity of a coin but the difficult gift of responsibility. The lawyer's refusal to indulge the beggar's falsehood forces the latter into confrontation with his own degraded self-image. What seems at first a denial of generosity becomes, in truth, a deeper and more enduring form of giving—the opportunity to reclaim dignity.

Chekhov's narrative unfolds that giving is not only material but existential. The beggar receives not just food or money but the chance to restore his humanity through labour and honesty. Yet this transformation is costly: it demands humility, self-awareness, and the courage to rebuild one's life. The "price" of this gift is nothing less than a reckoning with shame and the painful work of change. Chekhov writes expressing the beggar's confession:



I am grateful to you and to your cook. God bless that kind, noble-hearted woman. What you said that day was excellent. I am indebted to you as long as I live, of course, but it was your cook, Olga, who really saved me.”

“How was that?”

“Why, it was like this. I used to come to you to chop wood and she would begin: ‘Ah, you drunkard! You god-forsaken man! And yet death does not take you!’ and then she would sit opposite me, lamenting, looking into my face and wailing: ‘You unlucky fellow! You have no gladness in this world, and in the next you will burn in hell, poor drunkard! You poor sorrowful creature!’ and she always went on in that style, you know. How often she upset herself, and how many tears she shed over me I can’t tell you. But what affected me most-she chopped the wood for me! Do you know, sir, I never chopped a single log for you-she did it all! How it was she saved me, how it was I changed, looking at her, and gave up drinking, I can’t explain. I only know that what she said and the noble way she behaved brought about a change in my soul, and I shall never forget it. It’s time to go up, though, they are just going to ring the bell.” (Chekhov 160)

The Beggar showcase that the transformation does not arise from material charity but from humane moral engagement. Lushkov’s confession foregrounds Olga’s role as the true reformer, challenging conventional hierarchies of power and benevolence. While Skvortsov represents institutional charity and authority, Olga embodies ethical labour-combining rebuke, emotional investment, and self-sacrifice. Her act of chopping wood herself is symbolically powerful: it exposes Lushkov’s degradation, awakens shame, and restores his sense of human dignity. Chekhov suggests that reform is born through conscience rather than coercion, and through compassion that demands responsibility. The paragraph critiques superficial philanthropy and affirms Chekhov’s humanist belief that moral regeneration requires empathy, labour, and personal involvement rather than mere alms. Thus, in *The Beggar*, giving emerges not as indulgence but as challenge, not as pity but as responsibility. Chekhov insists that true charity involves more than comfort-it requires the courage to reshape another’s existence, even when it entails suffering.

If Maupassant and Chekhov emphasize obligation and transformation, O. Henry’s **The Last Leaf** presents giving as sacrifice-the ultimate exchange where life itself becomes the currency of generosity. Set against the backdrop of illness and despair, the story tells of Johnsy, a young woman who believes her life is tied to the falling of leaves outside her window. Behrman, an elderly artist, paints a final leaf



that never falls, instilling in her the will to live. His gift, however, comes at the cost of his own life, as he contracts pneumonia while painting in the storm.

Here, giving transcends materiality as Behrman's sacrifice transforms art into salvation, making his final creation both his masterpiece and his death sentence. The story dramatizes the paradox of generosity: that survival may depend on another's destruction, that hope may require someone else's despair. O Henry writes:

The next day the doctor said to Sue: "She's out of danger. You've won. Nutrition and care now... that's all." And that afternoon Sue came to the bed where Johnsy lay, contentedly knitting a very blue and very useless woolen shoulder scarf, and put one arm around her, pillows and all.

"I have something to tell you, white mouse," she said. "Mr. Behrman died of pneumonia today in the hospital. He was ill only two days. The janitor found him on the morning of the first day in his room downstairs, helpless with pain. His shoes and clothing were wet through and icy cold. They couldn't imagine where he had been on such a dreadful night. And then they found a lantern, still lighted, and a ladder that had been dragged from its place, and some scattered brushes, and a palette with green and yellow colors mixed on it, and... look out the window, dear, at the last ivy leaf on the wall. Didn't you wonder why it never fluttered or moved when the wind blew? Ah, darling, it's Behrman's masterpiece, He painted it there the night that the last leaf fell."

The poignancy of *The Last Leaf* lies in its insistence that the greatest gifts are often invisible. Johnsy never knows the price of the painted leaf, and Behrman dies unrecognized. In this way, O. Henry elevates sacrifice as the most profound form of giving-one where recognition is denied, yet the gift endures.

Saki (H.H. Munro) offers yet another perspective on giving, using satire to expose its entanglement with consumerism and gender. In ***The Sex That Doesn't Shop***, he parodies the assumption that women are naturally inclined to shop, turning the cliché on its head to reveal the absurdity of reducing desire to consumption. Here, giving is framed not as obligation or sacrifice but as performance. The act of purchasing or gifting becomes a ritual that defines social and gender identities. Saki's irony lies in demonstrating that even the seemingly trivial act of shopping is a form of giving-one where objects, money, and social expectations circulate in ways that parody deeper forms of generosity.

Saki satirically reveal how desire, rather than necessity, governs consumer behavior. The story opens with the ironic question, "Do women ever really shop?" (Saki 250), immediately establishing a tone of mockery and exaggeration. Desire is depicted as restless and indulgent when women are



compared to “a bee going flower-visiting” (Saki 250), suggesting aimless pleasure instead of purposeful buying. This craving for novelty is further exposed in the observation that a woman rarely deals with shops in her immediate vicinity, ridiculing the preference for fashionable distance over practicality (Saki 251). The blotting-paper episode sharpens the satire when Agatha exclaims, “You’re surely not buying blotting-paper HERE?”, and admires “such lovely shades of blotting-paper,” transforming a trivial object into an object of aesthetic desire (Saki 252). The narrator’s simple insistence, “I want ordinary white blotting-paper,” is ultimately defeated, ending with the ironic admission, “I didn’t get the blotting-paper,” which underscores how desire delays action and empties shopping of its purpose (Saki 253).

The story thus critiques the commodification of desire. By linking shopping to gender stereotypes, Saki reveals how giving can be reduced to absurd exchanges that perpetuate social roles rather than transform them. Unlike the solemnity of O. Henry or the moral earnestness of Chekhov, Saki destabilizes the discourse of generosity, exposing its hypocrisies and laughter.

In conclusion, the four stories examined in this study—Maupassant’s *The Debt*, Chekhov’s *The Beggar*, O. Henry’s *The Last Leaf*, and Saki’s *The Sex That Doesn’t Shop*—demonstrate how the act of giving, often assumed to be a simple or virtuous gesture, is in fact fraught with paradoxes, obligations, and hidden costs. Each narrative, in its unique way, dramatizes that giving is never neutral. It shapes identities, enforces duties, creates vulnerabilities, and even dismantles cultural assumptions. Through obligation, transformation, sacrifice, and satire, these writers reveal that giving is a profoundly human act—one that binds individuals to one another while simultaneously unsettling the boundaries between freedom and dependence, survival and loss, generosity and absurdity.

Maupassant, through his realist lens, insists that giving is inseparable from duty. In *The Debt*, repayment affirms honour but strips the act of freedom, reminding us that generosity can carry the coercive weight of obligation. Chekhov’s *The Beggar*, on the other hand, redefines giving as moral engagement, highlighting how true charity demands responsibility from both giver and receiver. The transformation of the beggar showcases that the price of charity is not material but existential—the courage to confront shame and reclaim dignity. O. Henry’s *The Last Leaf* pushes the theme to its most poignant extreme, where giving becomes synonymous with sacrifice. Behrman’s death ensures Johnsy’s survival, showing that life itself can be the currency of giving. Finally, Saki disrupts the solemnity of these treatments by injecting satire into the discussion. *The Sex That Doesn’t Shop* exposes the performative and commodified dimensions of giving within gendered and consumerist frameworks, mocking the absurdity of reducing desire to transactions of consumption.



The broader implication of this study is that short fiction functions as a moral and cultural laboratory. By condensing complex ethical dilemmas into concise, powerful narratives, these stories allow readers to grapple with the hidden dimensions of generosity, obligation, and survival. They remind us that behind every act of giving lies an invisible ledger—one that measures costs in honor, dignity, sacrifice, or irony. Literature thus reveals the fragile yet enduring truth that giving, though often celebrated as virtuous, is rarely free. It demands something of both giver and receiver, reshaping the contours of human interaction.

Therefore, The Price of Giving as revealed in these four works is not only a matter of what is given but of what is lost, gained, or transformed in the process. Whether through duty, charity, sacrifice, or satire, these stories illuminate the paradox at the heart of generosity: that every gift carries a price, and it is in paying that price that individuals and societies come to understand the true weight of human connection.

## References

- Chekhov, A. (2020). The Beggar.” *World’s Most Popular Short Stories* (pp. 154–160). Srishti Publishers and Distributors.
- Henry, O. (2020). The Last Leaf.” *World’s Most Popular Short Stories* (pp. 219–226). Srishti Publishers and Distributors.
- Maupassant, G. (2020). The Debt.” *World’s Most Popular Short Stories* (pp. 62–68). Srishti Publishers and Distributors.
- Saki. (2020). The Sex That Doesn’t Shop.” *World’s Most Popular Short Stories* (pp. 250–253). Srishti Publishers and Distributors.