

The Victorian Newsletter

Editor

Ward Hellstrom

Managing Editor

Louise R. Hellstrom

Number 94

Contents

Fall 1998

		Page		
Matthew Arnold's "Philistinism" and Charles Kingsley by <i>Tod E. Jones</i>	1	32	"A Sign-Seeker" and "Cleon": Hardy's Argument with Browning by <i>James Persoon</i>	
"Blighted" by a "Upas Shadow": Catholicism's Function for Kingsley in <i>Westward Ho!</i> by <i>Michael Schiefelbein</i>	10	36	"A Warning to the Curious": Victorian Science and the Awful Unconscious in M. R. James's Ghost Stories" by <i>Brian Cowlishaw</i>	
Sources and Outcomes of Adolescent Crises in <i>Wuthering Heights</i> by <i>Jacqueline Banerjee</i>	17	42	Mire, Bog, and Hell in <i>The Hound of the Baskervilles</i> by <i>Alan Smith</i>	
Collective Personification in Carlyle's <i>French Revolution</i> by <i>R. S. Edgcombe</i>	26	45	Books Received	
Star-Crossed Love: The Gravity of Science in Hardy's <i>Two on a Tower</i> by <i>Jim Barloon</i>	27			

The VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is sponsored for the Victorian Group of Modern Language Association by Western Kentucky University and is published twice annually. Editorial and business communications should be addressed to Ward Hellstrom, CH 106, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101. Please use *MLA Handbook*, 2nd Ed. for form of typescript. MSS cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription rates in the United States are \$5.00 for one year and \$9.00 for two years; foreign rates, including Canada, are \$6.00 per year. Checks should be made payable to *The Victorian Newsletter*.

Matthew Arnold's "Philistinism" and Charles Kingsley*

Tod E. Jones

When Arnold had his article "Heinrich Heine" published in *Cornhill Magazine* in August 1863, he introduced his readers to terms that were to become something of a trademark in his cultural criticism. The most important of these terms, "Hebraism" and "Hellenism," were of such breadth in their application that they can now almost stand alone as signifiers of the Arnoldian world-view. However, the term, together with its cognates, that was most noted by Arnold's contemporary audience is, understandably, that term which gave considerable offense: "*Philistinism!*—we have not the expression in English. Perhaps we have not the word because we have so much of the thing. At Soli, I imagine, they did not talk of solecisms; and here, at the very headquarters of Goliath, nobody talks of Philistinism" (111).

Whereas the metaphorical significance of "Hebraism" and "Hellenism" can, in part, be traced back to the popular anthropological understanding of the ancient Hebraic and Hellenic peoples, there is no anthropological significance to "Philistinism," except in the superficial fact of the Philistines' military resistance to the nation of Israel. The Philistines were a sea-going people from Crete, who had settled on the southern coast of Palestine and fought against the Hebrews' conquest of their territory. The "Philistines" are, therefore, those who resist "the chosen people."

But who, in the modern world, are "the chosen people"? When the metaphor *Philister* was first coined in the eighteenth century by German students, those students recognized themselves, of course, as God's chosen ones. A *Philister* was a "townsman," not a member of the university (Cuddon 706); as such, he stood in sharp contrast and even in opposition to those who pursued intellectual enlightenment. Heine, a fervent admirer of the democratic movement in France, designated the French as "the chosen people of the new religion" and Paris as "the new Jerusalem" ("Heine" 112). However, by Arnold's cultural diagnosis, the French are a people representative of Hellenism, not Hebraism ("La Reforme" 44-45). Thus, the "Philistines" turn out to be, by a confusing twist of metaphors, those who are the enemies of Hellenism, the cultural force that leads toward intellectual advancement; furthermore, they may even be the strongest advocates of Hebraism. Arnold explains, "*Philistine* must have originally meant, in the mind of those who invented the nickname, a strong, dogged, unenlightened opponent of the chosen people, of the children of light." The "Philistines" must have been regarded "as humdrum people, slaves to routine, enemies to light; stupid and oppressive, but at the same time very strong" ("Heine" 112).

The "Philistines" have so little to do with the anthropological Philistines that W. R. F. Browning, the editor of the recently published *Oxford Dictionary of the Bible*, finds the metaphor not only historically useless, but also misleading.

He points out that archaeological discoveries suggest that the Philistines were possessed of "an aesthetic appreciation richer than that of their Hebrew rivals" (294).

Arnold cannot be held accountable for the rhetorical twists that had determined the direction that the metaphor would take in his own cultural criticism. Yet, the method by which Arnold appropriated the term shows the critic at his worst. Arnold not only fails to recognize that the term "Philistine" had already been introduced into English usage, but he pointedly removes the credit from the very author who had introduced it: "Efforts have been made to obtain in English some term equivalent to *Philister* or *epicier* [grocer]; Mr. Carlyle has made several such efforts: 'respectability with its thousand gigs,' he says;—well, the occupant of every one of those gigs is, Mr. Carlyle means, a Philistine. . . . I think we had much better take the term *Philistine* itself" ("Heine" 111-12). David DeLaura has clearly shown that Carlyle had used the term repeatedly since 1824. In *Sartor Resartus* (1833-34) Carlyle speaks of a certain "Philistine, who even now, to the general weariness, was dominantly pouring forth Philistinism" (109). The *Oxford English Dictionary* notes that Coleridge had used the metaphor "Philistine" as early as 1817. Furthermore, DeLaura has convincingly argued that Arnold, while "deeply enmeshed in Carlylean terminology and ideas," holds toward Carlyle a "permanent conscious attitude . . . of rejection," based in part upon "an imperative need to dissociate his own ideas and practice" from Carlyle's ("Arnold and Carlyle" 107-108). When Carlyle, subsequent to the publication of "Heinrich Heine," stormed at Arnold for daring to place Goethe's mantle on the shoulders of Heine, Carlyle had, no doubt, more than this one reason to be angry with Arnold.

Carlyle was not the only one to be upset by the "Heinrich Heine" article. In a letter of November 14, 1863, Arnold wrote his sister Jane, Mrs. William E. Forster, of "the risk always before me, if I cannot charm the wild beast of Philistinism while I am trying to convert him, of being torn to pieces by him" (Russell 2: 240). Arnold was willing to take that risk. Within the next year he would continue to criticize his countrymen, publishing such works as "The Literary Influence of Academies" in June, 1864; and "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" in October, 1864. Finding that neither prophet nor critic is welcome in his own country, he appears to have taken some comfort in recognizing some similarity between Jesus's mission and his own. To the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* he wrote with tongue-in-cheek on March 19, 1866,

Sir,—

Although I certainly am rather pained to find myself, after my long and arduous labours for the deliverance from Philistinism of this nation in general, and the civilisation

*My apologies both to Mr. Jones and to our readers. In issue #93 we transposed a column in the printing and made his article unreadable. We here reprint the corrected article in its entirety.—Editor

and embellishment of our great middle class in particular, an object of aversion and mistrust to my countrymen, when I expected nothing from them but gratitude and love, still I have learnt to try and wrap myself on these occasions in my own virtue, knowing very well that the benefactors of mankind are seldom popular and that your public favourite is generally some Barabbas. (*Friendship's Garland* 32)

By this date, Arnold had been calling his countrymen "Philistines" for nearly three years, a period of time that must have reminded him of the duration of Jesus's career before he was crucified—an event immediately preceded in the four canonical Gospels by the mob's petition for the release, not of Jesus, but of the anarchist Barabbas. With a view toward consoling the "wild beast of Philistinism" Arnold had made a small compromise the month before, in February 1866, when he published "My Countrymen" in *Cornhill Magazine*: "I have got into much trouble for calling my countrymen Philistines, and all through these remarks I am determined never to use that word; but I wonder if there can be anything offensive in calling one's countrymen a young man from the country"—that is, one whose discourse, though "excellent in itself, is felt not to touch the crisis vitally," one who "talks on, serenely unconscious that he is not at the centre of the situation" (12). Though the compromise might have been too little and too late, Arnold's fate was not to be the same as Jesus's. A change was taking place in Arnold's public reception. It had been found that his kingdom, so to speak, really was not part of this world, after all. That is to say, Arnold was not an immediate threat to the *status quo*. Rather, he was quickly becoming a cultural icon, and by the time *Culture and Anarchy* was published, in 1867-68, Goliath himself had learned to talk about "Philistinism."

Well over a century has passed since "Philistine" entered the English vocabulary, and though popular usage may have simplified its definition, there remains the need for Victorianists to know what the term signified to Arnold and, consequently, what implications the term would have had for Arnold's contemporary readers. This need became most apparent to me while I was reading Sheila Smith's article on Charles Kingsley in *The Victorians*, a volume that remains in print as part of the Penguin History of Literature. Smith makes the assertion, "Kingsley had something of the Philistinism criticized by Arnold" (261). In this essay I propose, first, to identify the characteristics of the Arnoldian Philistine and, second, to ascertain Kingsley's position relative to each of these characteristics. In doing so, I hope to arrive at a determination—and to enable the reader to make a final determination—what sort of breed or hybrid creature a Philistine actually is and whether Kingsley might legitimately be identified as such.

According to Arnold, in *Culture and Anarchy*, "The term Philistine conveys a sense which makes it more peculiarly appropriate to our middle class" (140). However, Arnold elsewhere explains, the middle class is of two types, for it "divides itself into a serious portion and a gay or rowdy portion" ("Equality" 293). Arnold is not concerned with the latter group; it consists of those whose course in life he had previously described as sadly pathetic in "Rugby Chapel":

Most men eddy about
Here and there—eat and drink,
Chatter and love and hate,
Gather and squander, are raised
Aloft, or hurl'd in the dust
Striving blindly, achieving
Nothing; and then they die—
Perish;—and no one asks
Who or what they have been, . . . (60-68)

The "real strength of the English middle class," says Arnold, "is in its serious portion," the group that "deepened and fixed for this nation the sense of conduct" ("Equality" 294-95). The term "serious," as it is used here, has certain religious connotations to which we must return. At this point in our discussion, it is sufficient to note that the middle class is not essentially Philistine; that is, Philistinism is not an intrinsic attribute or set of attributes that pertains to an entire social class. Furthermore, it cannot be attributed to only one social class, for "That part of the working class . . . which does really seem to lend itself to these great aims [of 'our middle class Liberals'] may, with propriety, be numbered by us among the Philistines" (*C & A* 142). It is this part of the working class, the part that is "zealous about social and political questions," that, although not the largest part, is nevertheless "the living and leading part of the whole to which it belongs" ("Church of England" 71). Thus, it would appear, the most vital group among both the middle class and the working class are the Philistines. The upper class, the Barbarians, are not altogether free from Philistinism; in fact, they are largely responsible for it, for "our shortcomings in civilization are due to our inequality"—that is, the "great inequality of classes and property." It is this inequality, and this "religion of inequality" that persists among the upper class, that "has the natural and necessary effect of . . . vulgarising our middle class, and brutalising our lower class" ("Equality" 299).

The first real attribute of Philistinism, one that "the religion of inequality" fosters, is the equation of wealth with greatness. Arnold observes, "Never did people believe anything more firmly than nine Englishmen out of ten at the present day believe that our greatness and welfare are proved by our being so very rich" (*C & A* 97). It is this equation that Carlyle, in *Past and Present* (1843), had dubbed "the Gospel of Mammonism," noting that, for Englishmen, "Hell" is "the terror of 'Not succeeding,' of not making money, fame, or some other figure in the world,—chiefly of not making money!" (148). Arnold notes that the true believers of this so-called gospel, "who most give their lives and thought to becoming rich, are just the very people whom we call Philistines" (*C & A* 97).

As Carlyle had invented the character of Diogenes Teufelsdröckh to serve as his spokesman in *Sartor Resartus*, so Arnold gave life to Arminius Von Thunder-ten-Tronckh to utter his own criticism in *Friendship's Garland* (1871). In a dialogue between Arminius and the narrator, Arminius makes the observation that the typical English middle-class man regards a steady and punctual postal and railway operation as "the highest pitch of development and civilisation," regardless that "the trains only carry him from an illiberal, dismal life at

Islington to an illiberal, dismal life at Camberwell; and the letters only tell him that such is the life there" ("My Countrymen" 21-22). Success or greatness is measured by the Philistine in terms of material progress. This is the utilitarian viewpoint of Thomas, Lord Macaulay, whose *History of England* (1849-61) offers, perhaps, the clearest evidence that the Barbarians had not only fostered Philistinism, but that they were in training to be Philistines themselves. Both Arnold and Carlyle were fundamentally opposed to the whig-utilitarian historical thesis, "the thesis that the substance of history is material progress and that such progress can be attained through the application of particular political principles" (Trevor-Roper 35). For Carlyle, the thesis was a form of atheism (*P & P* 149); for Arnold it was an expression of "faith in machinery"—a concept that we will soon examine more closely. According to Arnold, Macaulay could never see "beyond the apparent rhetorical truth of things . . . ; for their vital truth . . . he had absolutely no organ" ("Joubert" 210).

Macaulay would have approved of Sir Daniel Gooch's mother, whose "Golden Rule" Arnold offers as an example of a pernicious Philistine materialism. Gooch, who became chairman of the board of directors of the Great Western Railway in 1865, the same year that he was elected M.P., had recalled in a public speech the advice his mother had given him as a young man: "Ever remember, my dear Dan, that you should look forward to being some day manager of that concern!" (*C & A* 122, 428). To Arnold, this "Golden Rule" was a recipe for anarchy. Was this not the very maxim that had motivated the French populace to topple the aristocracy and seize the government, and would it not have the same effect upon "the Hyde Park rough" (122)? The Philistine ethic bred envy in the hearts of the working class, and envy could be a dangerous thing.

The second characteristic of Philistinism, is, then, that it advocates individual liberty instead of the idea of "the State"—that is, "the nation in its collective and corporate character, entrusted with the stringent powers for the general advantage, and controlling individual wills in the name of an interest wider than that of individuals" (117). The working class, who have lost "the strong feudal habits of subordination and deference," and who, apparently, have the least sense of "the general advantage" of the State, have become "the very centre and stronghold of our national idea, that it is a man's right and felicity to do as he likes" (118). Yet, exercising one's right to do as one likes, says Arnold, "tends to anarchy" (119). Philistinism, the "stock maxim" of which is "Liberty is the law of human life" (207), strives to exercise its freedom not to affirm the collective and corporate good of the nation, but rather in order to affirm "its class and its class instinct" (143). Such an exercise of freedom is detrimental to the State and is, therefore, anarchy. "Anarchy," wrote Lytton Strachey, "is the most fashionable of creeds" (144). Arnold recognizes that the Philistine cherishes his ideals not as fashion, but as human "rights." However, "the only perfect freedom is, as our religion says, service; not a service to any stock maxim, but an elevation of our best self" (*C & A* 207).

These first two characteristics of the Philistine, his equation of wealth with greatness and his insistence on the right to exercise his liberty, are actually evidence of a more general

feature of Philistinism—its "blind faith in machinery," its want of sufficient light "to look beyond machinery to the end for which machinery is valuable" (119). A reliance on wealth, freedom, physical or numerical strength, or coal, is "mere belief in machinery, and unfruitful." Such things, Arnold reminds his readers, are not ends in themselves, but are simply means toward attaining the true goal of humanity—"a more complete, a harmonious perfection" (104). Culture, in fact, tends to be "rather indifferent" about machinery, knowing that what is most needed is "an inward working, and not machinery" (254). Here Arnold most obviously departs from the company of Carlyle, who emphasized the value of work to such an extent that it practically ceased to be a means and became instead an end in itself: "All work, even cotton-spinning, is noble; work is alone noble" (*P & P* 155). In fairness to Carlyle, I must add that, in *Sartor Resartus*, he had put forth the precept "Know what thou canst work at" as a necessary prerequisite to that greater precept, "Know thyself" (126). Yet, for Carlyle, so essential is the means that it is often presented as the end: "There is endless hope in work, were it even work at making money" (*P & P* 148).

This message of Carlyle's had been received by the Philistines as entirely orthodox; they were already converted. The counsel of Arnold, on the other hand, advises the Philistines to rearrange priorities—to have, for example, more regard for the quality of life at Islington and Camberwell and less regard for the English industry and technology that carries them and their mail from Islington to Camberwell;—to have, especially, more regard for the inherent freedom to inwardly cultivate sweetness and light and less regard for the political freedom to do as they like. In short, he counsels the Philistines to disentangle themselves from machinery and to become "aliens—if we may so call them,—persons who are mainly led, not by their class spirit, but by a general humane spirit, by the love of human perfection" (*C & A* 145-46).

A third characteristic of the Philistine is, however, "perfect self-satisfaction." He is, in fact, the last person to realize that he has not already attained human perfection. In attempting to establish this point with minimal offense, Arnold makes full use of his dry wit and facility with irony. Aristotle, in his *Ethics*, Book II, had noted that in every sphere of action or feeling there is an ideal as well as an excess and a defect. Not wanting to single out from the middle class a particular person to serve as an example, Arnold makes the "bitter and unpleasant" decision to offer himself "as an illustration of defect in those forces and qualities which make our middle class what it is":

This line . . . of a still unsatisfied seeker which I have followed, the idea of self-transformation, or growing towards some measure of sweetness and light not yet reached, is evidently at clean variance with the perfect self-satisfaction current in my class, the middle class, and may serve to indicate in me, therefore, the extreme defect of this feeling.

(138)

It is difficult to read this humble confession without detecting certain undertones of self-satisfaction. Yet, Arnold has made his point. The Philistines are determined to transform the

world in which they live, but they have not the inclination to transform themselves. In fact, when the individual's ability to transform and possess the world is perceived as decided by the power of resolve and the strength of mind and body, then an inward-seeking and an interior cultivation must be perceived as inimical to that ability. The Philistine divided against himself cannot stand, and so the very concept of "*Philistine* gives the notion of something particularly stiff-necked and perverse in the resistance to light and its children" (140). The self-satisfied Philistine, therefore, lacks "deference to a standard higher than [his] own habitual standard in intellectual matters." It is for this reason, says Arnold, that an Academy modeled on the Academy of France would never work in England ("Literary Influence of Academies" 237, 257).

A fourth attribute of Philistinism is that it follows its "natural taste for the bathos" (C & A 156). Its natural level is not at the heights of the sublime and the beautiful, but rather on the plateau of the trivial and the mundane, from which it occasionally descends to the depths of the ludicrous, the coarse, and the grotesque. It stands opposed to literary criticism, "a disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world" ("Function of Criticism" 282). The apostles of Culture, on the other hand, stand opposed to the bathos of the Philistines. For Arnold, John H. Newman's "urbanity," particularly as found within the pages of his *Apologia*, gives no place to bathos, but rather conveys "that same charm, that same ineffable sentiment" which Oxford itself conveys ("Literary Influence" 244). In fact, "Dr. Newman's movement" nourished in England a "keen desire for beauty and sweetness" and manifested a "deep aversion . . . to the hardness and vulgarity of middle-class liberalism" (C & A 107).

Closely associated with Philistinism's preference for bathos is its tendency toward provincialism. In the "Preface" to *Culture and Anarchy* Arnold defines "provincialism" as "narrowness, one-sidedness, and incompleteness" (237). As such, the provincial is clearly opposite to what is classical and catholic. In "The Literary Influence of Academies," he makes clear that provincialism can exist only where there is no high standard by which to test ideas. As a result of this fatal want, "it gives one idea too much prominence at the expense of others; it orders its ideas amiss; it is hurried away by fancies; it likes and dislikes too passionately, too exclusively." Thus, from provincialism springs "the *eruptive* and the *aggressive* manner in our literature." Yet, the "true literature" of provincialism is the newspaper, "with its party-spirit, its thoroughgoingness, its resolute avoidance of shades and distinctions, its short, highly-charged, heavy-shotted articles" (249). As this passage suggests, provincialism and sectarianism are mutually supportive and equally pernicious to the idea of the State. For the development of Culture, getting rid of provincialism is, therefore, "indispensable" (245).

For Arnold, the Englishmen who are most representative of Philistinism are the Protestant Dissenters, for "the body of British Protestant Dissenters is in the main . . . the Church of the middle-class Philistines" ("Modern Dissent" 138). Dissenters—whom Arnold also calls "Puritans," regardless of the historical fact that Puritans were so-called because they aimed to purify the Church of England without leaving it—had,

generally, adopted John Calvin's doctrines regarding salvation and believed in a presbyterian system of church government. Lionel Trilling observes that "the profound unintellectuality of the middle class surely had its roots deep in religious doctrine." The religion of the middle class was uniquely capable of breeding Philistinism: "Calvinism and the business activities of the middle class complemented each other with a gratifying neatness; the Economic Man and the Calvinist Christian sing to each other like voices in a fugue" (227). To the Calvinist religious doubt was, in itself, evidence of a lack of confidence in God's saving grace, and was, therefore, a possible indication of a state of damnation. Work, however, was not only an evidence of faith (Jas. 2:17-18); it was also a means of escape from the questioning mind. In this aspect of their religion, the Dissenters were not different from the Evangelicals—those who had adopted Calvinistic doctrines but still remained within the Church of England. Ian Bradley notes, "It was only by leading a useful life, filled with good works and application to occupy every minute, that [the Evangelicals] could hope to escape from the promptings of their restless consciences and the dread of being found wanting. Ceaseless activity provided the only refuge from the horrors of self-examination" (25). Carlyle, in fact, as Trilling points out, had been "perfectly consistent with his Calvinist training" in telling his readers "that only in work—almost any work—lies their hope of salvation from the transcendentalized fear of damnation" (227).

Despite their similarities in points of religious doctrine and social activity, the Dissenters differ from the Evangelicals in one fact of immense importance: they had divorced themselves "from the main current of the national life." Through the Church of England flows the stream of Culture, and so the result of disestablishment is obvious: "A generation or two outside the Establishment, and Puritanism produces men of national mark no more" (C & A 238-39). It is the Catholic aspect of the Established Church that has enabled it to produce a few men of genuinely classical merit; but Dissent is thoroughly Protestant, sectarian, and as a result, provincial. Even the settings and outward circumstances of Catholicism and Protestantism betray this vital difference. Whereas in connection with Catholicism they are seen to have "something European, august, and imaginative," when connected with Protestantism they have something "provincial, mean, and prosaic." The town of Margate, for example, is the very "brick-and-mortar image of English Protestantism, representing it in all its prose, all its uncomeliness,—let me add, all its sulubrity" ("Eugenie de Guerin" (96-98). The "serious" portion of the English have, in fact, created for England "a type of life and manners . . . which is fatally condemned by its hideousness, its immense ennui, and against which the instinct of self-preservation in humanity rebels" ("Equality" 295).

Protestantism, however "serious" in regard to conduct, yet shares with Catholicism "the same want of intellectual seriousness." Its advantage over Catholicism lies in its potential, in that it "possesses in itself the means of deliverance"; that is, it upholds the priesthood of every believer and every believer's freedom to interpret the Scriptures (*God and the Bible* 389). Arnold clearly recognizes that Protestantism can attain a position of intellectual seriousness. This potential has

profound significance for Arnold. Whether England will deliver itself out of the hands of the Philistines, and whether the Church of England will be rescued from the threat of disestablishment—these issues of national weight will be determined by the future course of British Protestantism. Neither Dwight L. Moody (1837-1899) nor Charles H. Spurgeon (1834-1892) are fit to lead the middle class into the promised land of Culture (G & B 384-85, 388-89; Russell 2: 398-99), and so Arnold takes up the task himself, writing *St. Paul and Protestantism* (1870), *Literature and Dogma* (1873), and its sequel, *God and the Bible* (1875). Motivating this literary performance is the knowledge that "he who most seizes the real significance of the Bible and of Jesus, will be least disposed to cut himself off in religion from his fellow-men" (G & B 396). In short, in his opposition to Philistinism, Arnold saw himself as standing in the gap between Culture and Anarchy.

If Kingsley was a Philistine, then Arnold must surely have recognized him as one of the enemies of Culture. That much is certain. But, whether Kingsley actually was a Philistine it is now our effort to ascertain. Sheila Smith, as I have already noted, suggests that he was. Walter E. Houghton makes the same suggestion when, in *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, he places Kingsley in the company of Macaulay, identifying them as "apostles of anti-intellectualism" (118). Nevertheless, having before us a clear definition of what a Philistine is, and allowing Kingsley, wherever we can, to speak for himself, we are, perhaps, in a better position than Smith and Houghton from which to make a determination.

We should begin by noting that Kingsley was of the upper class, or—as he states in his 1870 letter to Arnold—that he was "born a Barbarian" (*Letters and Memories* 2: 338). Thomas Hughes remarks, in his "Prefatory Memoir," "He was by nature and education an aristocrat in the best sense of the word, believed that a landed aristocracy was a blessing to the country, and that no country would gain the highest liberty without such a class, holding its own position firmly, but in sympathy with the people" (xxiv-xxv). Kingsley had learned from reading Carlyle what it meant to be an aristocrat in the era of Chartism. He had learned that the "Working Classes cannot any longer go on without government; without being *actually* guided and governed" ("Chartism" 187), that it was the responsibility of the aristocracy to provide this government, and that "Whatsoever Aristocracy is still a corporation of the Best, is safe from peril, and the land it rules is a safe and blessed land" (191). He had learned from Carlyle that, as a clergyman in the era of Chartism, his purpose was to educate, for "The world asks of its Church in these times, more passionately than of any other Institution the question: 'Canst thou teach us or not?'" (192).

Kingsley recognized that the cultural advancement of the working class depended on inter-class association. In his novel *Yeast* (1848) he has the laborer Tregarva remark plaintively to the upper-class Lancelot Smith, "If a few of you would be like the blessed Lord, and stoop to go out of the road, just behind the hedge, for once, among the publicans and harlots!" (71-72). Later, Tregarva asks, "Why should not the workman be a gentleman, and a workman still? Why are they to be shut out from all that is beautiful, and delicate, and winning, and stately?" (253). During his first years at Eversley

Kingsley taught evening classes for his adult parishioners who could not read (Chitty 96). In 1848, determined to bring an element of culture into the lives of the working class, he wrote a series of articles on the National Gallery for the Christian Socialist periodical *Politics for the People*. In brief, he did what he could to participate in what he calls "the general increase of civilisation throughout the country" and to end "that hateful severance between the classes," which had been rife during the 1820s ("Preface: To the Undergraduates of Cambridge," *Alton Locke* xci). Kingsley's frequent association with the Populace and Philistines of the working class was, however, atypical of the Barbarians and resulted in alienating him from his own class (Chitty 145).

Kingsley had no interest in obliterating the class system, and he was no friend of democracy; but he did advocate that "the rich help and defend the poor, and the poor respect and love the rich," and pleaded that "all ranks bear each other's burdens" ("Association" 151). He preached that God "has knit the great family of man in one blessed bond of mutual need and usefulness," and that "wealth and comfort ought to increase year by year among the whole family of man, ay, and would increase, if it were not for sin" ("Providence" 176-77). According to Susan Chitty, Kingsley was the first Anglican clergyman to issue a Socialist manifesto, which he hastily wrote during the night following the Chartists' uprising of April 10, 1848 (109). This broadsheet addressed to the "Workmen of England" formally launched the Christian Socialist movement, a movement led by John Ludlow (1821-1911) and F. D. Maurice (1805-1872).

The "Socialism" of the Christian Socialists, it must be emphasized, is not the same as, say, that of William Morris (1834-1896)—who, incidentally, was reading Kingsley in the early 1850s. Alexander Vidler explains, "Socialism to Maurice meant an order of society which encourages and enables men to co-operate with one another instead of competing against one another; that is, it meant the opposite of individualism and *laissez faire*" (231-32). In this sense of the word, Kingsley could be a "Socialist" and still proclaim that personal property is "sacred" and that "It is a holy feeling which makes a man cling to the bit of land which he has inherited from his parents" ("Ahab and Naboth" 147, 151). The wealthy aristocrat could do little good in England by dividing his property with his laborer tenants and abjuring his title of distinction. Rather, he should see to it that his tenants receive adequate wages, are properly educated and housed, and have medical attention when it is needed. He should treat the laborer with respect, and he will then find that he is respected and loved in return. In this advocacy of a ideal feudalism, Kingsley in no way differed from Carlyle. The novelty of Christian Socialism was in its message to the industrialized worker, who had neither master nor patron to whom he might appeal for deliverance from poverty and squalor. For their benefit, the Christian Socialists helped establish "Co-operation Societies." Kingsley advised every journeyman to say to his fellow workman, "It is competition that is ruining us, and competition is division, disunion, every man for himself, every man against his brother. The remedy must be in association, co-operation, self-sacrifice for the sake of one another" ("Cheap Clothes and Nasty" lxxxv).

Kingsley's attitude toward wealth is complex. England is wealthy because she leads the world in the natural sciences and because, through "inventing, producing, exporting, importing," she has left her "indelible impress" upon every nation ("How to Study Natural History" 308). Furthermore, England's progress in the natural sciences can be directly related to her interest in natural theology, in the idea that, because God is "the Lord of Order" and "the Lord of Law," the evidences of nature support a faith in God ("The Hearing Ear and the Seeing Eye" 229; "The Natural Theology of the Future" 315-16). However, England's interest in natural theology began to decline with the advent of Evangelicalism or "personal religion," a departure from Anglican orthodoxy ("Natural Theology" 316). Thus, England's wealth is not her greatness, but may be considered a symbol of her greatness, which takes its origin in the orthodox faith of her Established Church.

Wealth can be a blessing, if it is used for philanthropic purposes. When wealth is accumulated or hoarded, it "is far more dangerous to human nature" than poverty. "Bear in mind," he tells the London Diocesan Board of Education, "that the period during which the middle and lower classes of England were most brutalized, was that of their greatest material prosperity, the latter half of the eighteenth century" ("Religious Dangers" 251, 253). To a younger audience, he lectures, "Being quite comfortable is a very good thing, but it does not make people good. Indeed, it sometimes makes them naughty, as it has made the people of America" (*Water Babies* 115).

Clearly, for Kingsley, wealth is not to be regarded as an end in itself; neither is the English right to do as one pleases. In June 1851, when London was crowded with visitors who had come to see the Great Exhibition, Kingsley was invited to contribute to a series of evening sermons entitled "The Message of the Church to the Labouring Man." Hughes summarizes Kingsley's message:

There are two freedoms—the false, where a man is free to do what he likes; the true, where a man is free to do what he ought. Two equalities—the false, which reduces all intellects and all characters to a dead level . . . ; the true, wherein each man has equal power to educate and use whatever faculties or talents God has given him, . . . Two brotherhoods—the false, where a man chooses who shall be his brothers, and whom he will treat as such; the true, in which a man believes that all are his brothers.

("Prefatory Memoir" xxxii-xxxiii)

The vicar in charge, G. S. Drew, responded by immediately denouncing Kingsley in public, charging him with equating Christianity with Socialism. The charge helped Kingsley's reputation among the Chartists, but probably did much to hinder an early advancement within the Establishment, despite the fact that Kingsley ultimately vindicated himself before Bishop Blomfield of London (Chadwick 2: 358-62).

The "spirit of Protestantism" is, for Kingsley "free inquiry" and "religious as well as civil liberty" ("The Light of God" 170); yet, the "freedom" of Protestantism is not the sort of freedom that is popularly extolled: "Some may say, It is our

freedom which makes us strong. My friends, believe it not. . . . True freedom can only live with true loyalty and obedience" ("England's Strength" 192-93). Kingsley's definition of true freedom suggests that the false freedom is that which Arnold identifies as anarchy, a disloyalty and disobedience to the governing power of the State. To resist those in authority is to resist ourselves, for "what they are we are; we choose them, Englishmen like ourselves, and they truly represent us" ("Providence" 183). Anarchy is ultimately self-defeating, since the State, like the Church, is a single body with diverse parts. St. Paul reasoned, "If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? . . . But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him" (I Cor. 12.15, 18). In *Two Years Ago* (1857) Kingsley described the saintly attitude of Grace Harvey: "She found lord and ladies on earth, and seeing no open sin in the fact of their being richer or more powerful than she was, she supposed that God had put them where they were. . . . Of course they had their duties, as every one has: but what they were she did not know or care to know. To their own master they stood or fell" (278). Knowledge of the divine order enables Grace to exercise her freedom to do the duty that belongs to her social position, without protesting against or envying the positions of others.

Furthermore, Kingsley was ready to remind the working man that, when the foot serves the hand, it is in the hand's interest to care for and protect the foot. Therefore, if the worker would only acquire the character of a gentleman rather than protest with the spirit of a ruffian, then the lords and ladies in power would be more inclined, if not to broaden the worker's legislative rights, at least to pass certain reform bills in his favor. Kingsley was always ready to remind his hearers that all good things ultimately come to the people who seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness ("Abraham's Faith" 97).

The State is, for Kingsley, both a civilizing influence and the end result of civilization. He illustrates this point by appealing to his audience's familiarity with "some country lad, both before and after he has become a soldier." Before his enlistment he is, perhaps, "one of the worst and idlest lads, . . . hardly able to give an intelligible, certainly not a civil answer." After a year or two in a regiment, "he walks erect, he speaks clearly, he looks you boldly in the face, with eyes full of intelligence and self-respect. . . . His nature is not changed, but the thought that he is the member of an honourable body has raised him above his nature" ("Public Spirit" 296-98). The soldier has obtained the idea of the State and, through a commitment to loyalty and obedience, has gained true freedom. The State, Kingsley explains, is not made by "constitutions, and acts of parliament, and social contracts, and rights of the people," but rather it is made by "law, and order, and spiritual energy, and loving fellow-feeling, and patriotism, the spirit of wisdom, and understanding, and prudence" ("Abraham's Faith" 93). England's constitution—to which Macaulay attributes the nation's wealth, and to which nine out of ten Englishmen attribute their liberty—is but a product of that which has made England great, and Kingsley reminds his audience wherein that greatness lies.

Along a similar line of thought, Kingsley distinguishes

means from ends: "All the talents, gifts, understanding, power, money, which God has bestowed on you, He has given you only that you may help your neighbours with them" ("The True Gentleman" 265). In striving to adjust working-class values, Kingsley sought to persuade his audience not only that what they already possessed was but a means and not an end, but also that what they sought to possess by way of political reform was but a means as well. Owen Chadwick observes that the Christian Socialists' "finest writing sought to convince the working man that the machinery of government was but a means" (1: 352). An example of this can be found in Kingsley's "Letters to the Chartists.—No. 1," which he signed by his pseudonym, "Parson Lot":

My only quarrel with the Charter is, that it does not go far enough in reform. I want to see you free; but I do not see how what you ask for, will give you what you want. I think you have fallen into just the same mistake as the rich of whom you complain—the very mistake which has been our curse and our nightmare—I mean, the mistake of fancying that legislative reform is social reform, or that men's hearts can be changed by act of parliament.

(*Politics for the People* 28)

For Kingsley, as with Arnold, the outward reform of the nation must begin with the inward reform of the individual. The first-person narrator of *Alton Locke*, the eponymous character, confesses, "True, I desired the Charter at first (as I do, indeed, at this moment), as a means to glorious ends. . . . But soon, with me, and I am afraid with many, many more, the means became, by the frailty of poor human nature, an end, an idol in itself. . . . Fool that I was! It was within, rather than without, that I needed reform" (118-19).

The ends for which the Chartists argue are, when "spiritually" interpreted, good; freedom, equality, and brotherhood are Christian values when understood in their biblical context. Therefore, Kingsley could argue, "Christ is the ground of the Charter" (AL 403) and the Bible is "the only ground of all charters" (405). It might be said that Kingsley's mission among the Chartists was the task of redefinition. His triumph would be to redefine Chartism itself. Although he was never completely successful, his early attempts in this direction include his startling proclamation at a Chartist meeting on June 4, 1849, "I am a Church of England parson. . . . and a Chartist" (Hughes xix). It is safe to say that what Kingsley meant in calling himself a Chartist is not what Walter Cooper, the atheist and leading Chartist present at the meeting, understood by the designation.

Although Kingsley called himself a Chartist, he did not call himself a "muscular Christian." As Leslie Stephen notes, "He protested, fruitlessly enough, against the nickname." Kingsley rightly perceived that the term "suggested that he used Christian phraseology to consecrate a blind admiration for physical prowess and excess of animal vigour" (38). Yet, the term was applied not only to Kingsley and the fictional heroes of his novels, but also to the followers of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Arnold, who, without detracting from the virtue of Rugby athleticism, had supplemented it with the ideal of the Christian gentleman. When Matthew Arnold lists "our

reliance on . . . muscular Christianity" as one of the forms of "mere belief in machinery" (C & A 104), he is not necessarily referring to Kingsley's doctrine. More likely, he is speaking of the popular faith in health and vigor that receives sanction from a misunderstanding of Kingsley or Dr. Arnold—a misunderstanding that places the emphasis not on what is central in their teaching, but rather on what is incidental. It needs also to be noted that Arnold is not finding fault with the "muscular Christian," but only with the popular "reliance on muscular Christianity." Whereas the former may be aptly regarded as a form of Barbarianism—since the Barbarians, Arnold tells us, have "the passion for field-sports" and a care "for the body, and for all manly exercises" (141)—the latter is appropriately identified as a form of Philistinism.

Unlike the Barbarian class in general, Kingsley was never self-satisfied. Stephen conceded of Kingsley, "We must admit him to be excellent within his limits" (41), and no one was more aware than Kingsley just what those limits were. In a letter of 1855 to John Ludlow, he remarked, "Surely the wiser, the humbler path, is to give men credit for as much wisdom and rightness as possible, and to believe that when one is found fault with, one is probably in the wrong" (Hughes liii). He was adamant and uncompromising in following the light that he had, while maintaining a certain humble awareness that not all that he had was light. His vocation as a clergyman not only placed him in contact with the illiterate and the vulgar, but also kept him in contact with the intellectual and the spiritual. From his own experience he could say, "If there is a noble, if there is a holy, if there is a spiritual feeling in man, it is the feeling which bows him down before those who are greater, and wiser, and holier than himself" ("The Transfiguration" 116). Thus, he humbly referred to Maurice as "Master" (Tulloch 288).

When speaking of self-satisfaction, we are, perhaps, speaking less about intellectual perspective than we are about personal character. In Arnold's letter of condolence to Mary, Kingsley's daughter, after her father's death, he makes these remarks about Kingsley:

I think he was the most generous man I have ever known; the most forward to praise what he thought good, the most willing to admire, the most free from all thought of himself in praising or admiring, and the most incapable of being made ill-natured, or even indifferent, by having to support ill-natured attacks himself.

(Kingsley, *Letters and Memories* 2: 471)

If I am right in generalizing that those who are most self-satisfied tend to be those who are most indignant when others do not find equal satisfaction in them, then Kingsley's "incapability" of taking offense speaks strongly in his defense. Arnold possibly recognized in Kingsley a kindred spirit, a fellow "still unsatisfied seeker."

No one can read Kingsley for long without being struck with the fact that here is a man who, when he is not concerned with principles and ideals, it is only because his affections have momentarily led him into an idyll or a eulogy or a passage aimed to evoke horror at social conditions or sympathy with the impoverished and oppressed. If, in his writings, he

does not quite reach the sublime and the beautiful, it is not because his thoughts are common or ignoble, but rather because he is so impatient with the message he has to express that he fails to take sufficient thought about the art of expression. No fair critic can place Kingsley among those who have a "natural taste for bathos." George Eliot had complained, in her review of *Westward Ho* (1855), of Kingsley's natural taste for sermonizing, his "parsonic habit," by which he "drops into the homily as readily as if he had been 'to the manner born'" (153). Yet, if I may anticipate the argument, a "parsonic habit" can hardly be equated with a "taste for bathos." One of the defining characteristics of the sermon—and probably the very characteristic that Eliot had in mind—is its appeal to the audience to escape from the mundane sphere of the ordinary self and to rise to the sphere of the best self. Arnold, we should bear in mind, had acquired from his father a considerable portion of the "parsonic habit" himself.

A more common error might be to confuse Kingsley's patriotism with provincialism. Although his reverence for England stirred his imagination as much as it did his historical curiosity, leading to inspired novels but dubious scholarship, it was the sort of reverence that, by Kingsley's estimation, made "poetic license" a virtue. To modern readers, such license must often seem mere narrowness of perspective, but we moderns have, for the most part, lost the Victorian sentiment of patriotism. Nevertheless, we allow parents to stretch the truth when boasting of their children; in fact, we might consider such boasting as evidence of praiseworthy parental affection, even though the parents' perspective may seem rather narrow. Furthermore, the parents themselves would probably have some tolerance for other parents' boasting, even when the differing perspectives are rival. Kingsley's patriotism is very much like the boasting of a parent; it requires our indulgence.

Two examples of Kingsley's patriotic license and zeal may be helpful at this point. In the manner of the *Beowulf* poet, Kingsley invests the Germanic history of English ancestry with Christian significance. It was "God's will" that the Romans "could never conquer our forefathers," although it was for that reason that they were not converted to Christianity until the fifth century. Yet, while "the light of the gospel . . . has died out" among the nations converted earlier, it has continued to shine from England. "So that our Lord's words have been fulfilled, that many that are last shall be first, and those that are first shall be last" ("A People Prepared for the Lord" 440-41). Kingsley not only saw the providence of God at work in the history of England, but he thought of England as a chosen instrument for God's purposes in the world. In reference to the Crimean War (1854-1856), Kingsley remarks, "I thank God from the bottom of my heart for this great and glorious victory. . . . If we cannot reach the Devil and his works by any other means, we must reach them as we are doing now, by sharp shot and cold steel" ("Providence" 178). Kingsley's "Devil" in this passage is Russia, and England is fighting not for self-interest, but for the kingdom of God, having been forced to fight "simply because these Russian rulers have chosen to seek first, not God's kingdom, but their own" (180).

Obviously, Kingsley indulges his native instinct for

national pride; yet, he preaches that such pride can be justified only by national righteousness ("A People Prepared" 443). Arnold shares this perspective, although he expresses his own patriotism with a severe criticism that, perhaps, is aimed at compensating for the excess of praise that had come from Kingsley and many others. In an 1866 letter to his mother, Arnold writes, "I should be sorry to be a Frenchman, German, or American, or anything but an Englishman; but I know that this native instinct which other nations, too, have does not prove one's superiority, but that one has to achieve this by undeniable excellent performance" (Russell 2: 372).

Although Kingsley was patriotic, he was not provincial. In his 1848 lecture "On English Literature" he made these remarks:

To strive after any national exclusiveness, or mere John-Bullism of mind, in an age of railroads and free press, would be simply absurd—and more, it would be fighting against the will of God revealed in events. . . . This age is craving for what it calls catholicity; for more complete interchange and brotherhood of thought between all the nations of the earth. (260)

To young clergyman Kingsley recommends Johann Gottfried Herder's *Ideen* (1784-1791) as a work "full of sound and precious wisdom" ("Natural Theology" 315), and in a lecture presented at the Royal Institution, he states, "I believe that we are not yet fully aware how much we owe to the Jewish mind, in the gradual emancipation of the human intellect" ("Science" 239). Thus, along with his national pride, there was not only an awareness of the intellectual accomplishments of other nations, but also a readiness to learn from and publicly recognize those achievements.

As with Arnold, Kingsley recognizes provincialism and anti-intellectualism as attributes of Dissent. In *Alton Locke* the narrator observes of the Methodist Rev. Bowyer, "Had his head been equal to his heart!—but . . . the dissenting clergy, with a few noble exceptions among the independents, are not the strong men of the day—none know that better than the workmen" (12). It is the workman Tregarva who, in *Yeast*, declares, "I sometimes think that there must be more good in that human wisdom and philosophy so called, than we Wesleyans hold" (70). Not all of Kingsley's Dissenters are provincial or anti-intellectual, however. Major Campbell in *Two Year's Ago* (1857), a Methodist who "loved and honoured his Bible" too much to deny fact, reason, common justice, and "the voice of God in his own moral sense," silences a few Dissenting preachers who were attempting to enlarge their flocks and make a profit out of a cholera epidemic. Of course, Major Campbell, although a Dissenter, is still vitally connected to the State, being a member of a regiment.

Both Kingsley and Arnold complain that the religion of Dissent breeds an un-Christian spirit. In "Modern Dissent" Arnold, in his characteristic manner of selecting a phrase loosely spoken and turning it to his own use, quotes Mr. Winterbotham: "There was a spirit of watchful jealousy on the part of the Dissenters, which made them prone to take offence." Arnold then responds to Winterbotham, quoting

from 2 Cor. 12:20: "'Strife, jealousy, wrath, contentions, backbitings,'—we know the catalogue. And the Dissenters are, by their confession, . . . full of these, and the very existence of an organisation of Dissent . . . makes them a necessity" (133). Kingsley might well have been thinking of the latter half of the catalogue—"whisperings, swellings, tumults"—when he described Alton Locke's relationship with his mother, a brutally unaffectionate Calvinist, who can find in her son nothing more than a depraved, unregenerate nature. Locke, in turn, can see in his mother nothing less than an apology for Agnosticism (AL 9).

Kingsley and Arnold were not, of course, the only Victorian authors who presented Calvinists, whether Dissenters or Evangelicals, in a most unattractive light; other prominent authors who participated in the vilification include Charles Dickens, Charlotte Brontë, Samuel Butler, and to a lesser degree, George Eliot, Anthony Trollope, and William Hale White. Partially responsible for Kingsley's stance against Calvinism may be his unpleasant memories of childhood. Like the Brontës, Butler, and Eliot, Kingsley had been raised by Evangelical parents, and his father was a remote and stern figure. Susan Chitty suggests that the stutter that affected Kingsley's speech throughout life was acquired during his early years, when he had to stand before his birch-bearing father and recite his lessons (31). Arnold had the privilege of growing up in a home that was both emotionally and intellectually nurturing; but, as a result, he may have found his vocational contacts with the Dissenters all the more unpleasant. As an Inspector of Schools, Arnold spied out the land of the Dissenting Philistines and brought back a bad report.

Given the evidence before us, Kingsley cannot be fairly regarded as a Philistine or even as an anti-intellectual. This is not to say that he never displayed a characteristic that is typically Philistine or that he never took an anti-intellectual position, but rather it is to affirm that in Kingsley not one of the attributes of Philistinism was prevalent. The vicar of Eversley was an intense, excitable, and impatient man, who had not the temperament of the detached and impersonal critic, but in what he believed, taught, and fought for, he had much in agreement with Arnold. Both were liberal Anglicans who contributed to the progress of the Broad Church movement, and both made the Philistine tremble.

Works Cited

- Arnold, Matthew. "The Church of England." 1876. *Essays Religious and Mixed*. Ed. R. H. Super. 8: 63-68.
 _____. *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*. Ed. R. H. Super. 11 vols. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1970-72.
 _____. *Culture and Anarchy*. 1868. *Culture and Anarchy with Friendship's Garland and Some Literary Essays*. Ed. R. H. Super. 5: 87-256.
 _____. "Equality." 1878. *Essays Religious and Mixed*. Ed. R. H. Super. 8: 277-305.
 _____. "Eugenie de Guerin." 1863. *Lectures and Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. H. Super. 3: 83-106.
 _____. *Friendship's Garland*. 1871. *Culture and Anarchy with Friendship's Garland and Some Literary Essays*. Ed. R. H.

- Super. 5: 1-84.
 _____. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time." 1864. *Lectures and Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. H. Super. 3: 258-85.
 _____. *God and the Bible*. 1875. Ed. R. H. Super. 7: 139-398.
 _____. "Heinrich Heine." 1863. *Lectures and Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. H. Super. 3: 107-32.
 _____. "Joubert." 1864. *Lectures and Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. H. Super. 3: 183-211.
 _____. "The Literary Influence of the Academies." 1864. *Lectures and Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. H. Super. 3: 232-57.
 _____. "Modern Dissent." *St. Paul and Protestantism*. 1870. London: Smith, Elder, 1887. 123-46.
 _____. "My Countrymen." *Friendship's Garland*. 1-31.
 _____. "La Reforme intellectuelle et morale de la France: Par Ernest Renan. Paris: 1871." *God and Bible*. Ed. R. H. Super. 7: 40-50.
 Bradley, Ian C. *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
 Browning, W. R. F. *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Oxford, 1996.
 Carlyle, Thomas. "Chartism." 1839. *Selected Writings*. Ed. Alan Shelston. New York: Penguin, 1971. 149-232.
 _____. *Past and Present*. 1843. New York: New York UP, 1965.
 _____. *Sartor Resartus*. 1833. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
 Chadwick, Owen. *The Victorian Church*. 2 vols. New York: Oxford UP, 1966-70.
 Chitty, Susan. *The Beast and the Monk: A Life of Charles Kingsley*. New York: Mason & Charter, 1975.
 Cuddon, J. A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 3rd ed. New York: Penguin, 1991.
 DeLaura, David. "Arnold and Carlyle." *PMLA* 79 (March 1964): 104-29.
 Eliot, George. Review of *Westward Ho!* by Charles Kingsley. *Westminster Review* (American ed.) 64 (July 1855): 151-54.
 Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957.
 Hughes, Thomas. "Prefatory Memoir." 1884. *The Works of Charles Kingsley*. 3: ix-lxi.
 Kingsley, Charles. "Abraham's Faith." *Village Sermons*. 1848. *Works* 21: 89-98.
 _____. "Ahab and Naboth." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 146-59.
 _____. *Alton Locke*. 1849. *Works* vol. 3.
 _____. "Association." *Village Sermons*. 1848. *Works* 21: 149-54.
 _____. "Cheap Clothes and Nasty." 1848. *Works* 3: lxxiv-lxxxvi.
 _____. "England's Strength." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 188-97.
 _____. "The Hearing Ear and the Seeing Eye." *Town and Country Sermons*. 1861. *Works* 21: 224-33.
 _____. "How to Study Natural History." 1846. *Scientific Lectures and Essays*. *Works* 19: 289-312.
 _____. *Letters and Memories*. Ed. Francis Kingsley. 2 vols. New York: Co-Operative Publication Society, 1899.
 _____. "The Light of God." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 160-71.

- _____. "The Natural Theology of the Future." 1871. *Scientific Lectures and Essays. Works* 19: 313-36.
- _____. "On English Literature." 1848. *Literary and General Lectures and Essays. Works* 20: 243-65.
- _____. "A People Prepared for the Lord." *Town and Country Sermons*. 1861. *Works* 21: 438-45.
- _____. "Providence." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 172-87.
- _____. "Public Spirit." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 295-311.
- _____. "Religious Dangers." *Town and Country Sermons*. 1861. *Works* 21: 250-61.
- _____. "Science." *Scientific Lectures and Essays. Works* 19: 229-57.
- _____. "The True Gentleman." *Sermons for the Times*. 1856. *Works* 23: 262-77.
- _____. "The Transfiguration." *Village Sermons*. 1848. *Works* 21: 114-22.
- _____. *Two Years Ago*. 1857. *Works* vol. 8.
- _____. *The Water Babies*. 1863. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
- _____. *The Works of Charles Kingsley*. 28 vols.

London: Macmillan, 1880-85.

- _____. *Yeast*. 1848. *Works*. vol. 2.
- _____. *Politics for the People*. London: John W. Parker, 1848.
- Russell, George W. E., ed. *The Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1896.
- Smith, Sheila. "Mid-Victorian Novelists: Kingsley." *The Victorians*. Ed. Arthur Pollard. 1969. In *The Penguin History of Literature*. 10 vols. New York: Penguin, 1993. 6: 252-62.
- Stephen, Leslie. "Charles Kingsley." *Hours in a Library*. 1874-1879. 3 vols. London: Folio Society, 1991. 3: 29-57.
- Strachey, Lytton. "The Poetry of Blake." 1906. *Literary Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, n.d. 139-50.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "Introduction." *The History of England*. by Thomas Babington Macaulay. New York: Penguin, 1968.
- Trilling, Lionel. *Matthew Arnold*. 1939. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1954.
- Tulloch, John. *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century*. 1885. New York: Humanities P, 1971.
- Vidler, Alexander Roper. *F. D. Maurice and Company: Nineteenth-Century Studies*. London: SCM, 1966.

University of Maryland

"Blighted" by a "Upas-Shadow": Catholicism's Function for Kingsley in *Westward Ho!*

Michael Schiefelbein

In "What, Then, Does Doctor Newman Mean?" the Reverend Charles Kingsley lambastes John Henry Newman, defector to Rome, for promoting "priestcraft" and "chicanery" practiced in "the Medieval Church" (Kauvar 199).¹ Kingsley's deeply felt anti-Catholicism, vented on no individual as much as on Newman, suffuses his sermons, correspondence, and fiction, as well as essays like the one above.² His most sustained and vivid attack on the "Romish" Church is his novel *Westward Ho!*³ More than any other work by Kingsley, this novel is packed with distorted characterizations of Catholics. In this essay, I will not be concerned with correcting these distortions but with identifying in them clear patterns that reveal both the creativity and complexity of their author.

Published in 1855 and intended as an instrument to rally patriotism during the Crimean War, *Westward Ho!* recounts the battle of Elizabethan England against Spain for dominion

in the New World and its defense of English shores against the attack of the Spanish Armada. The novel's narrator presents this conflict as a religious war between the Protestant angel of truth and justice and the Catholic pawn of Satan, spewing a number of epithets at the Church of Rome: "cruel," "heathen," "devilish" (1: 3); "blighted" by a "Upas-shadow" (1: 82). He characterizes the Pope as a tyrant and the Jesuits as perverse and conniving "rogues" (1: 92) who corrupt youths with "base and vulgar . . . teaching" (1: 97) and transport cargoes of "bulls, dispensations, secret correspondences, seditious tracts, and so forth" (1: 93) across England, bastion of Protestant liberty. He defends the Catholic penal laws, which "never troubled any one who did not make conspiracy and rebellion an integral doctrine of his religious creed" and troubled not even such traitors "unless, fired with the glory of martyrdom, they bullied the long-suffering of Elizabeth and her council into giving them their deserts, and, like poor Father Southwell

he wrote to discourage correspondents from converting to the "Romish" religion. See, for example, a letter written in 1849 in which he rails against Catholicism's "anile sophistry," "inferior deities," and "prurient celibates" (*Letters* 1: 175-78). Creative works permeated by anti-Catholic sentiment include the play *The Saint's Tragedy* (1848) and the novel *Hypatia* (1852).

³Robert Martin calls *Westward Ho!* Kingsley's "most vehemently anti-Roman novel" (174).

in after years, insisted on being hanged, whether Burleigh liked or not" (1: 77).

The novel reserves its most venomous attacks for Spaniards, who are, after all, the concrete representatives of Romish tyranny, the flesh-and-blood antagonists of *Westward Ho!* In the mind of the admirable character Sir Richard Grenville, the "devilries of the Spaniards . . . enemies of God and man" (1: 18) justify England's plunder of Spain's West Indian booty. Sir Richard declares to Devon's brave men that the treasure will be used in "building up the weal of the Reformed Churches throughout the world, and the liberties of all nations, against a tyranny more foul and rapacious than that of Nero or Caligula" (1: 19). The foulness of the Spanish is expressed in their demonic rituals and relics, in their idolatrous worship of saints. Their rapaciousness extends beyond pillaging villages and enslaving Indians to the slaughter of native infants in the name of faith. Salvation Yeo, faithful servant of the novel's hero, Amyas Leigh, provides a graphic account of a West Indian massacre:

"[O]ne [Spaniard], catching the pretty babe out of my arms, calls for water and a priest (for they had their shavelings with them), and no sooner was it christened than, catching the babe by the heels, he dashed out its brains,—oh! gentlemen, gentlemen!—against the ground, as if it had been a kitten; and so did they to several more innocents that night, after they had christened them; saying it was best for them to go to heaven while they were still sure thereof: . . ." (1: 231)

In this fiendishness the Spanish soldiers only follow the example of their ecclesiastical leaders, the bloodthirsty inquisitors who torture and kill the hero's brother, Frank Leigh, as well as Rose Salterne, the Devon maid who has eloped to South

⁴One of the first of these is Una Pope-Hennessy, who confirms *Westward Ho!*'s anti-Catholic bias in her discussion of Kingsley's review of *History of England*, by Froude: "So accustomed had he become in *Westward Ho!* to using violent and depreciatory language about them [Catholic priests] and to coupling the profession of Catholicism with squalor of conduct and ferocious cruelty, that it must have seemed a very harmless thing to him to say in his review that Romish priests in general disregarded truth" (212-13).

A more recent biographer, Susan Chitty, identifies Kingsley's views on Catholicism as one of the many biases that make *Westward Ho!* unappealing to adults today: "Lacking as we do Kingsley's conviction that England alone has the privilege of 'replenishing the earth and subduing it for God and the Queen,' and that all Catholics are 'Jesuitical plotters' and all negroes 'ant-eating apes,' we cannot view their slaughter with the enthusiasm expected of us. To us, but evidently not to Kingsley, the extermination of seven hundred Spaniards in Ireland [depicted in the novel] is somewhat repugnant" (171).

A noteworthy apologist for Kingsley's treatment of Catholics in *Westward Ho!* is Allan Hartley. Hartley admits that "*Westward Ho!* teems with defamatory remarks about Roman Catholics," that "They are accused of casuistry and vilified as liars and schemers," but insists that "theological polemic is not Kingsley's concern in this novel. The circumstances in which he wrote it were such as to enable him to rise above personal animosity" (114). The logic of such argument puzzles me. On the basis of the examples I've cited from Kingsley's writings, I would also take issue with Hartley's conclusion that "Kingsley was less opposed to Roman Catholicism than to that which had come to represent it: Jesuitry and the Spanish Inquisition" (114).

⁵According to Robert Martin, "If the Crimean War was the immediate stimulus to writing the book, surely a secondary one was the fright England had taken in 1850 over 'Papal Aggression' when Wiseman was named Archbishop of Westminster by the Pope. In 1851 the 'Ecclesiastical Titles

America with the Spanish aristocrat Don Guzman.

Undoubtedly, Kingsley accurately represents both the sentiments of many English patriots living during Elizabeth's reign and the heinous nature of the Spanish Inquisition, but *Westward Ho!*'s portrayal of Catholics and Catholicism in general is undeniably skewed, as several Kingsley scholars attest.⁴ These biases were encouraged by an anti-Catholic public. If the Catholic Emancipation bill of 1829 had not aroused enough indignation in England by allowing Catholics to vote and run for political office, the reestablishment of the Catholic Church in 1850 finished the task.⁵ The so-called "Papal Aggression" raised the cry of "No Popery" throughout the land and inspired a number of authors to write novels decrying Catholicism.⁶

Like many of these novels, *Westward Ho!* derides a standard list of Catholic features, seen in the above examples: the Pope and blind obedience to him, religious scrupulosity, the use of relics and other forms of superstition, and perhaps the favorite target—Jesuits.⁷ But of all the Catholic evils depicted by Kingsley, two especially engage his imagination: the Marian cult and the Roman Church's attitude toward carnal pleasures. The following discussion will focus on these.

The Representation of the Marian Cult in *Westward Ho!*

Over and over again in *Westward Ho!* English heroes and the narrator himself condemn Catholics for their worship of the Virgin Mary. In the novel's opening chapter, John Oxenham ends his account of English bravery with a diatribe against the Virgin cult of the Spaniards: "They pray to a woman, the idolatrous rascals! and no wonder they fight like women" (1: 6). When a friar credits "'Mary, the fount of mercies'" with Amyas's successful trip down the Magdalena

Bill' was passed, forbidding Roman Catholics to establish bishoprics in England. The bill was never enforced, but it was evidence of the hysterical fear felt by some English Protestants, among them, of course, Kingsley" (175).

⁶Such authors include William Sewell, Catherine Sinclair, Mrs. Trollope, Jemima Luke, Elizabeth Harris, Mary Sherwood, and Emma Worboise. See Margaret Maison's categorization of religious novels during the Victorian period in *The Victorian Vision*. For discussions of anti-Catholicism in major Victorian novelists, see my articles on Charles Dickens, George Eliot, and Charlotte Brontë.

⁷According to Margaret Maison, "Few modern horror comics could equal in crudity, sadism, hysteria and blood-curdling violence the story of Jesuits in popular Victorian fiction. From the best-selling literature of the day we see that the Jesuit loomed large in Protestant imagination as a villain of the blackest dye, a spy, a secret agent, suave, supercilious and satanically unscrupulous, laying his cunning plots for the submission of England to 'Jesuitocracy,' wheedling rich widows, forcing his converts to change their wills in favour of his Order, to kneel in penitence almost naked for hours through chilly winter nights and to leave their families for life at a minute's notice" (169).

Concerning *Westward Ho!* specifically, Maison's view drastically opposes that of Allan Hartley, who claims that Kingsley accurately represents "Jesuitry" in the Elizabethan period (114). According to Maison, Kingsley's "picture of the Jesuits . . . is as unsympathetic as it is inaccurate. We are invited to believe that Jesuit missionaries in the West Indies deliberately baptized and then murdered savages, that both Father Campion and Father Parsons were bullies and rogues, and that the Penal Laws were never intended to be effective, with the 'English martyrs' just skulking around in hiding places for the fun of it. Both Kingsley's descriptions and his comments seem unworthy of one who held a University Chair of History" (173-74).

¹The full title of the article, which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine*, is "What, Then, Does Dr. Newman Mean? A Reply to a Pamphlet Lately Published by Dr. Newman." The essay prompted the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, in which Newman explains his reasons for converting to Roman Catholicism.

²In a village sermon which shares its subject with *Westward Ho!*, for example, he praised English heroes of Elizabethan days who defended "the Gospel and the Bible against the Pope of Rome" (qtd. in Hartley 111). Some of Kingsley's harshest judgments on Roman Catholicism can be found in letters

River, the hero "bluntly" replies: "We have done well enough without her as yet" (2: 274). The narrator mocks the boasting servants of Mary as they prepare the Armada: "[B]lessed by the pope, and sanctified with holy water and prayer to the service of 'God and his Mother.' Yes, they [English commanders] would fall, and England with them. The proud islanders, who had dared to rebel against St. Peter, and to cast off the worship of 'Mary,' should bow their necks once more under the yoke of the Gospel" (2: 343).

As Oxenham indicates, in the novel English scorn for the Marian cult is inspired as much—if not more—by the inferiority of a female deity and her womanish worshipers as by idolatry itself. In *Westward Ho!* a man can possess no quality worse than womanishness. A case in point is Eustace Leigh, whose lack of virility renders him the most despicable character in the novel. When the athletic Amyas offers his "lion's paw" to his cousin, "gripping [his hand] with a great round fist," Eustace responds by "pinching hard" Amyas's hand "with white, straight fingers." He counters Amyas's direct gaze and "heartiest of smiles" with an obsequious glance and handshake (1: 80). Eustace fears his cousin because "he knew Amyas could have killed him with a blow; and there are natures, who, instead of rejoicing in the strength of men of greater prowess than themselves, look at such with irritation, dread, at last, spite; expecting, perhaps, that the stronger will do to them what they feel they might have done in his place" (1: 80-81). While such sentiments are crushed by "brave men, though they be very sparrows," they thrive in the heart of "cowards" like Eustace. Only such a craven weakling could prey on the fair Rose Salterne, as Eustace does, causing her final destruction when he plants seeds of suspicion in the mind of her husband, Don Guzman.

Jesuit tutors Campion and Parsons bear the blame for Eustace's effete character, yet all the novel's celibates are "vowed not to be men" (2: 44).⁸ In a passage describing Frank's character, the narrator goes so far as to suggest that womanishness is inherent in Catholic sensibility itself. Though ultimately a noble martyr of the Inquisition, Frank pales beside his strapping brother. He is a sensitive scholar, whose complexion "shamed with its whiteness that of all fair ladies around" (1: 58), one "as delicately beautiful as his brother was huge and strong" (1: 38). Not only does Frank find the romantic Philip Sidney "lovely and loving as ever" (1: 38), but he falls under the spell of "the frescoes of the Vatican" and "the luscious strains" of Palestrino's music "beneath the dome of St. Peter's" (1: 36). His effeminate qualities seem to explain Frank's sickness and even the weakness revealed in his pathetic sobbing on his mother's lap when he learns that Amyas, too, loves Rose Salterne.

Naturally, Amyas's primary rival, Don Guzman Maria Magdalena de Soto, is himself contaminated by the womanishness contaminating his name. He is introduced as "tall and graceful . . . golden-haired and fair-skinned, with hands as small and white as a woman's" (1: 296). Manly Amyas's ini-

tial reaction to Guzman is predictable: "In spite of his beauty and his carriage, Amyas shrank from him instinctively." As the narrator ironically notes, a man marked by such effeminate traits champions "our Lady and the choir of saints . . . [whose] divine protection . . . enables the Catholic cavalier single-handed to chase a thousand Paynims" (1: 318). He does his best to make good this claim, finally threatening England's sacred shores in the Spanish Armada—and only after stealing away Devon's most precious possession, Rose Salterne herself, to whom the town's men have pledged their devotion.

The novel's assault on the Marian cult and the womanishness it encourages echoes sentiments Kingsley expressed throughout his life. In an 1851 letter, he denounced Rome for robbing its faithful of manly qualities "by substituting a Virgin Mary, who is to nurse them like infants, for a Father in whom they are men and brothers" (*Letters* 1: 221). Kingsley emphasized the need for Christian men to be strong, morally and physically, a belief central to what came to be called "muscular Christianity."⁹ He elaborated on his belief in a letter written to his future wife, Fanny, during their engagement:

There has always seemed to me something impious in the neglect of personal health, strength, and beauty, which the religious, and sometimes clergymen of this day affect. . . . I could not do half the little good I do do here, if it were not for that strength and activity which some consider coarse and degrading. . . . How merciful God has been in turning all the strength and hardihood I gained in snipe shooting and hunting, and rowing, and jack-fishing in those magnificent fens to His work. . . . Is it not an awful proof that matter is not necessarily evil, that we shall be clothed in bodies even in our perfect state? (*Letters* 1: 63)

He ends his letter by decrying "effeminate ascetics" and exhorting the virile priest whom men can "look up to" as "their superior, if he chose to exert his power, in physical as well as intellectual skill" (1: 64). Indeed, he declares Christ himself a "strong man" in a later letter meant to dissuade a youth from converting to Catholicism: in contrast to the "indulgent virgin," Christ is "stem because loving" and punishes "as a man would do it, 'mighty' to save" (1: 228).

To some extent, Kingsley might have seen muscular Christianity as an aspect of Christian Socialism, which he strongly advocated as a young clergyman. His deep concern for the plight of the poor and factory laborers precipitated his brave, if somewhat rash, declaration: "I am a Church of England parson . . . and a Chartist!"¹⁰ He believed a minister must roll up his sleeves and fight for the humane treatment of those on the lowest rung of the ladder. At the same time, his grave aversion to effeminate portrayals of God and his near fanatical zeal in deriding "Mariolatry"¹¹ suggest that Kingsley is driven by his insecurities as much as by his vision of

Christian activism. We can gain insight into these insecurities by considering the woman worship practiced by Kingsley's heroes in *Westward Ho!*

For the most part, the role of the novel's English women is the fairly nominal one of "angel in the house"—a Victorian conceptualization that both deifies women and renders them ineffectual in matters of the world.¹² This kind of woman worship is consistent with the perimeters Kingsley earnestly drew around manly romantic love and around gender roles.¹³ However, *Westward Ho!*'s heroic Leigh brothers practice a form of woman worship incongruent with Kingsley's ideals. Desiring to join Amyas's crusade to rescue Rose, Frank "looked forward to asking the queen's permission for his voyage with the most abject despondency and terror" (2: 13). When Amyas grows irritated with him, Frank retorts, "you cannot comprehend the pain of parting from her." In his interview with the queen, he demonstrates the extent of his anxiety, weeping and falling to his knees to ask for mercy when the jealous Elizabeth upbraids him for wanting to desert her for another woman. Since Kingsley presents England's struggle against Spain as a high moral cause, Elizabeth seems less concerned about inspiring manly virtue than servile devotion to her. Faced with her jealousy and pettiness (she withholds knighthood from Frank because of his decision), Frank only increases his obeisance. "Had I my will," he announces to Amyas, "there should be in every realm not a salique, but an anti-salique law: whereby no kings, but only queens should rule mankind" (2: 15). Though his own feelings for Elizabeth do not run so deep, Amyas concedes: "There's some sense in that . . . I'd run a mile for a woman when I would not walk a yard for a man" (1: 15).

Amyas lives up to this claim, not so much in his final surrender to Ayacanora, daughter of John Oxenham and a Spanish woman, as in his total submission to the woman who wills this capitulation, his mother. When Frank tells Amyas he wishes to accompany him on his voyage west, Amyas is less concerned about encouraging Frank's manly duties than avoiding his mother's disapproval. He constantly keeps Mrs. Leigh before his mind's eye during his three-year sojourn and, on returning to Bideford, submits himself to her will rather than pursuing England's interests in America. When she blesses his union with Ayacanora, forged at her direction, one gets the feeling that Mrs. Leigh will act as the third and most powerful party within it: "fear not to take her to your heart again; for it is your mother who has laid her there" (2: 455).

Perhaps more telling than the submission of Kingsley's heroes to women is the narrator's fascination with the way in which the chief antagonist combines feminine and manly qualities without surrendering his nobleness. Pretty courtier Don Guzman, the enemy of England and abductor of Rose Salterne, is both graceful and strong, eloquent and outspoken, schooled and experienced in battle, beautiful and athletic, refined and daring. As a character who incorporates traits identified by Kingsley as womanish and manly he attracts both women and men. He captures the hearts of the country

maidens, especially that of Rose, who finds him a mixture of Frank and Amyas in his graceful manliness. He is admired by his captors, including Amyas, who is intrigued by the Don's charms and stories of El Dorado. The narrator himself defends Guzman, emphasizing the sincerity of his love for Rose and the injustice of Amyas's demonization of him after the Spanish Inquisition executes Frank. Kingsley goes so far as to open his hero's eyes in the end of the tale (ironically by blinding him) so that Amyas can see Guzman as a spiritual brother whom he has wronged.

What does this vindication of Guzman—at odds with his role as villain—suggest about Kingsley's own struggles, and what purpose does Catholicism serve in his effort to resolve them? Kingsley lived up to his own standards of manliness as a husband and father, a sportsman, and a lover of hiking and the outdoors. He also resisted the sort of emotionalism and introspection which he believed to be not only unmanly but threatening to faith. However, resistance does not change one's nature, in his case "delicate, nervous, and painfully sensitive" (*Letters* 1: 6), according to Fanny, qualities aggravated by his awkwardness and severe stammering. Nor can it eliminate chronic depression and nervous breakdowns or recurring religious doubts—Kingsley's lifelong vulnerabilities. Certainly futile would have been any effort to resist his emotional dependency on Fanny, which at times approached the kind of woman worship ascribed to Frank and Amyas Leigh. Justin McCarthy, a student at Cambridge during Kingsley's appointment there, attributed the professor's temperamental nature to the strong feminine element of his character: "despite his rough voice and vigorous manner he was as feminine in his likes and dislikes, his impulses and prejudices, as Harriet Martineau was masculine in her intellect and George Sand in her emotions" (qtd. in Pope-Hennessy 3). Another student of Kingsley's, John Martineau, noted, "For all his man's strength there was a deep vein of the woman in him" (qtd. in Chitty 124). And John Blackwood, editor of *Blackwood Magazine* once remarked, "With all his blustering, would-be manliness, I do not look upon Kingsley as a man of power and substance at all" (qtd. in Martin 181).

In *Westward Ho!* Kingsley safely projects the "womanishness" in himself onto outsider, Catholic characters and then derides them. As the novel's chief Catholic, Don Guzman shares in this derision. However, in his case, it is perfunctory, emphasizing his status as outsider so that Kingsley can project onto him qualities that he dares not aspire to himself. Guzman allows Kingsley to explore the possibility of combining masculine and feminine traits in a man, rather than stubbornly clinging to his facile notion that they must be mutually exclusive. By ultimately vindicating Guzman in the novel, Kingsley suggests fictively a model that could ameliorate his own insecurities. And by making Guzman the defeated enemy, he ensures that his readers—and, perhaps, he himself—do not take such a model too seriously.

Specifically in terms of Catholicism, Guzman also allows Kingsley to provide a fairer, more reasonable picture of

⁸These words belong to Frank Leigh but reflect the sentiments of the narrator.

⁹According to Susan Chitty, this term was probably first used in reference to Kingsley by a writer for the *Saturday Review* in 1858.

¹⁰As quoted in Colloms 116. Colloms describes here the Chartist meeting in

which Kingsley made this declaration.

¹¹Kingsley uses this term, presumably coined by him, on several occasions. See, for example, his letter of February 5, 1851 (1: 28).

¹²The epithet is taken from the title of the popular Victorian poem by Coventry Patmore, glorifying the role of women in domestic affairs.

¹³Kingsley sees "woman worship" along with "Christian art" and "chivalry"

as "witnesses" or symbols of spiritual reality (*Letters* 1: 162). Assigning women a spiritual role, for Kingsley, meant elevating conjugal relations to the level of sacrament.

the Roman Church. Catholicism as embodied in Guzman belies its effete portrayal in the novel's other Catholic characters and makes explicit what Kingsley suggests at the margins of his tale: the Church in general possesses both masculine and feminine attributes. Catholicism incorporates patriarchy and a frequently nurturing priesthood, dogma and mysticism, military assertion and ascetic withdrawal from the world. Kingsley's dogmatism will not permit such an admission, probably not even to himself, but what he cannot do in terms of an institution he scorns, he can in terms of an individual. Just as he has his narrator acknowledge, in passing, the patriotism and virtue of many of England's Catholics during Elizabethan times, Kingsley can also present a noble picture of a very Catholic individual. Taking the next rational step, admitting the complexity of the Catholic Church, is beyond him. As Margaret Thorpe concludes, "Kingsley's was an immature, a boy's imagination. He did not recreate for himself scenes in a past age, he pictured Charles Kingsley moving in those scenes and wrote accordingly" (121). No wonder George Eliot said of *Westward Ho!*, "Kingsley sees, feels, and paints vividly, but he theorizes illogically and moralises absurdly" (qtd. in Chitty 173). To Kingsley's credit, however, Don Guzman represents a step toward objectivity.

Catholicism and the Flesh

A related conflict that finds expression in *Westward Ho!* is between spirit and flesh. As we have seen, Kingsley derides the asceticism practiced by Jesuits Parsons and Campion; it is a sort of unmanly rejection of natural, i.e. God-given, impulses to live fully, to love, and, if need be, to fight passionately for the glory of God. His play *The Saint's Tragedy*, begun as a biography of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, was an attack on such asceticism. The play recounts the story of a thirteenth-century woman, naturally good and full of life, who comes under the control of a fiendish monk after the death of her husband and begins a life of morbid, self-inflicted penances. In his letters as well as this drama, Kingsley not only scorns mawkish self-denial but celebrates what he calls a "healthy materialism":

Oh! will it not be better thus to wait for The Renewal, and learn to love all things, all men—not as spirits only, not with "a love for poor souls" as the cant saying is (that unappreciable, loveless abstraction), but—as men and women, of body, soul, and spirit, each being made one, and therefore all to be loved? Is it not better thus to love intellect as well as spirit, and matter as well as intellect, and dumb animals, and trees, and rocks, and sun, and stars, that our joy and glory may be fuller, more all-embracing, when they are restored, and the moan which the earth makes day and night to God, has ceased for ever? Better far, than to make ourselves sham wings, and try to fly, and drop fluttering down, disgusted with our proper element, yet bound to it, poor selfish isolated mystics!

(*Letters* 1: 89)

Long before writing this advice to a young man considering a conversion to Roman Catholicism, Kingsley offered similar counsel to his then fiancée, Fanny, whom he believed suffered from a morbid temperament encouraged by Puseyite asceticism.¹⁴ He urged her to "Study Nature" and "extract every line of beauty, every association, every moral reflection, every inexpressible feeling from it" (*Letters* 1: 68). Such study includes "the human figure, both as intrinsically beautiful and as expressing mind." Though perhaps surprisingly bold, his view on marriage is a natural extension of such thinking: "these desires, which men call carnal, are truly most spiritual, most beloved by Him [the Lord], and . . . He Himself, when we are fit for our bliss, will work what the world might call a miracle, if necessary, to join us and those whom we love" (*Letters* 1: 71). In a letter to Fanny, Kingsley goes so far as to say, "When you go to bed tonight, forget that you ever wore a garment, and open your lips for my kisses and spread out each limb that I may lie between your breasts all night (Canticles I, 13)" and "At a quarter past eleven lie down, clasp your arms and every limb around me, and with me repeat the *Te Deum* aloud" (qtd. in Chitty 80). He saw in "those thrilling writhings" of sexual union a foreshadowing of "a union which shall be perfect" in heaven (qtd. in Chitty 81).

Needless to say, nothing so erotic finds a place in a Victorian adventure tale like *Westward Ho!*. The closest the novel comes to sensuality can be found in suggestive descriptions of Ayacanora, the half-clad "nymph" whose fiery beauty tempts Amyas to abandon civilization and escape with her to the exotic forests of South America. However, *Westward Ho!* does convey Kingsley's delight in the sensuousness of creation. Lush descriptions of the New World abound, one of the most tantalizing appearing in the chapter on Barbados. It is dawn and "the level rays glittered on smooth stems of the palm-trees, and threw rainbows across the foam upon the coral-reefs, and gilded lonely uplands far away" (2: 28). In this "primeval orchard" Amyas's men

crawled from place to place plucking greedily the violet grapes of the creeping shore vine, and staining their mouths and blistering their lips with the prickly pears. . . . [They retrieved] acid junipa-apples, luscious guavas, and crowned ananas, queen of all the fruits, which they had found by hundreds on the broiling ledges of the low tufa-cliffs; and then all, sitting on the sandy turf, defiant of galliwasp and jacksparniards, and all the weapons of the insect host, partook of the equal banquet, while old blue land-crabs sat in their house-doors and brandished their fists in defiance at the invaders, and solemn cranes stood in the water on the shoals with their heads on one side, and meditated how long it was since they had seen bipeds without feathers breaking the solitude of their isle. (2: 29)

While such feasts for the senses recur throughout *Westward Ho!*, the novel, paradoxically, also suggests Kingsley's attraction to sensibilities he deems "monkish."

prose version of *The Saint's Tragedy*, was planned to be a wedding gift for Fanny.

One example is the affectionate portrayal of Frank, whose ascetic leanings make him see the beauties of nature as "phantoms" reflecting the "real world" of heaven (2: 30). At times Frank's contemplative Christianity—as "bloodless" as the "delicate fingers of the courtier" (2: 7)—even appears to be a viable alternative to Amyas's muscular Christianity. Mrs. Leigh herself suggests this, asserting that her sons will be equally blessed, despite the distinctions in them discerned by Amyas: "My blessing, I suppose, will be like Esau's, to live by my sword; while Jacob here, the spiritual man, inherits the kingdom of heaven, an angel's crown" (2: 11). Kingsley grants this equal blessing to Frank and Amyas and in a way that turns Amyas's categories on their heads: for, besides succeeding in the world of human affairs by his defeat of the Armada, Amyas receives the gift of spiritual awakening, and Frank's detachment from the material world allows him to die a hero's death, surrendering his own life for love of faith and country.

Kingsley also reveals his ascetic impulses in the lusty Amyas himself. His typical theology is captured in his response to Frank's contemplative spirituality: "God made all these things [the beauties of nature] . . . what's good enough to please God, is good enough to please you and me" (2: 30-31). However, when two of his crew members appeal to this theology to justify their remaining behind in the tropical paradise, his righteous anger flares. He denounces them for "living thus the life of a beast" (1: 200), something that he himself has had to resist, as the chapter's title indicates—"How Amyas Was Tempted of the Devil."

Westward Ho!'s positive depictions of both pleasure and self-denial reflect their place in Kingsley's life. He delighted in sensuousness—pleasure in God's creation—as his letters to Fanny indicate. He reveals his eroticism in those letters, as we have seen, and especially in the drawings discovered in Fanny's diary of a nude, voluptuous maiden. A similar maiden is found in illustrations Kingsley completed for his biography of St. Elizabeth. (In one illustration the woman is even engaged in sexual intercourse with her lover!)¹⁵ Susan Chitty argues that these illustrations indicate Kingsley's sense of guilt for indulging his fantasies since in almost all the sketches the woman is undergoing torture. At the head of each chapter, for example, the woman lies crucified, and the book's frontispiece is an especially graphic drawing of Elizabeth's mother undergoing genital impalement. This apparent morbidity was not confined to the drawings. As spiritual preparation for his wedding day, Kingsley fasted, slept on the floor, and rolled naked in thorns until he bled. For the first month of his marriage, at Kingsley's insistence, Charles and Fanny abstained from sex.

Kingsley defended his "Popish raptures and visions" brought on by "self-torture" (qtd. in Chitty 75) as preparation for more perfect sexual consummation in the future, but Chitty

suggests that he deluded himself. During his college days at Cambridge, when he had temporarily abandoned religion and caroused with his schoolmates, he engaged in sex, perhaps with a prostitute. Before he married Fanny three years later, he confessed his impurity, which he felt made him unworthy of her and which could be purged through his monkish penances. In one letter to her, he confesses he even contemplated entering a monastery in France, where he would have "gone barefoot into the chapel at matins (midnight) and there confessed every sin of my whole life before the monks and offered my naked body to be scourged by them" (qtd. in Chitty 59).¹⁶

But I question Chitty's position. In openly acknowledging his ascetic impulses as well as his delight in pleasure, Kingsley was able to reconcile the two, as we have seen, by sanctifying nature, including human nature's sexual dimension. There is no reason to believe that Kingsley continued to be racked with guilt for his whole married life because of one sexual escapade during his youth. On the contrary, there is every indication that his erotic drawings and letters to Fanny brought him a sense of freedom and fulfillment that continued through his conjugal life. If we accept this, then it makes sense to accept even his monkish penances before his marriage as exactly what he claimed them to be: the means to encourage his appetite for a feast by fasting. Considering his muscular Christianity, he also might have viewed them as some kind of manly initiation rite. Even claiming Kingsley exhibits sadomasochistic tendencies does not require us to conclude that he was guilt-ridden or self-divided.

Westward Ho! might be seen as representing Kingsley's integration of the spiritual and carnal dimensions of his personality, or at least as effectively expressing his ideal of their union. The opposite tendencies of Frank and Amyas, both heroic figures, are never disparaged by Kingsley's narrator because the characters do not take them to extremes. Frank's ascetic sensibility does not preclude enthusiastic involvement in a military mission, and Amyas's lustiness does not preclude godliness, or, in the end, even an ecstatic experience.

The novel's Catholic characters are another story. On one hand, Kingsley depicts them as spiritual grotesques: the effete Campion and Parsons practice an unmanly celibacy and a misogyny encouraged by their twisted self-denial; Eustace's own religiosity and acts of mortification contribute to his villainy; and the perverse inquisitors burn sinful Protestant flesh. On the other hand, as though one pole requires the other, Catholics in the novel are fiendish gluttons: Eustace's lust for Rose, seen in "a quiver in his voice and a fire in his eye, from which she shrank by instinct" makes him hold her "the more fiercely" until she shrieks for help (1: 114); hungry for blood, Catholic soldiers bash babies against rocks; inquisitors derive sadistic pleasure from the torture they inflict; and the greedy Pope is eager to expand his coffers and his worldly dominion.

¹⁵Susan Chitty was the first biographer to bring to light the strange mixture of eroticism and asceticism in Kingsley's character. Chitty drew on documents recently released by family members, consisting of approximately three hundred of Kingsley's love letters to Fanny as well as Fanny's diary, which contained erotic drawings by Kingsley.

¹⁶He also acknowledged his own early attraction to Catholicism itself in the letter to the young man considering converting to the Roman religion:

"Believe me, I can sympathize with you. I have been through it; I have longed for Rome, and boldly faced the consequences of joining Rome; and though I now have, thank God, cast all wish of change behind me years ago as a great lying devil's temptation, yet I still long as ardently as ever to see in the Church of England much which only now exists, alas! in the Church of Rome" (*Letters* 1: 175).

Unlike the portrayal of Catholic womanishness, the portrayal of Catholic Manicheism is integrated into the novel's design. Against the dangerous extremes of spirit and flesh represented by *Westward Ho!*'s Catholic characters, Kingsley juxtaposes his own integrative vision, expressed most eloquently in the following passage from the novel's final chapter:

Yes, it is over; and the great Armada is vanquished. It is lulled for awhile, the everlasting war which is in heaven, the battle of Iran and Turan, of the children of light and of darkness, of Michael and his angels against Satan and his fiends; the battle which slowly and seldom, once in the course of many centuries, culminates and ripens into a day of judgment and becomes palpable and incarnate; no longer a mere spiritual fight, but one of flesh and blood, wherein simple men may choose their sides without mistake, and help God's cause not merely with prayer and pen, but with sharp shot and cold steel. A day of judgment has come, which has divided the light from the darkness, and the sheep from the goats, and tried each man's work by the fire (2: 419)

In this apocalyptic interpretation of history, Kingsley sees the battle against Spanish oppressors as the "palpable" and "incarnate" expression of a spiritual war. But rather than reducing the material world to its symbolic value, he understands engagement in it as the means to shape spiritual reality. Not only is it "sharp shot and cold steel" or "each man's work" that determines one's personal spiritual status as sheep or goat, it is the collective action of England that "lulled for a while, the everlasting war."

This passage serves as an appropriate prelude to Amyas's great epiphany. Earlier in the novel, Amyas chides Frank for his transcendentalism, arguing that demeaning the material world by reducing it to a reflection of a better, spiritual world shows ingratitude to the Creator. Yet after defeating the Armada, he becomes deeply convinced of the symbolic value of the material world. Seated in "narrow and untrodden cavern" beneath a "hideous" abyss where he could hear "the mysterious thunder and gurgle of the surge in the subterranean adit," (2: 442) the blind Amyas sees "the water and the sky; as plain as ever I saw them, till I thought my sight was come again" (2: 444). Amyas continues recounting his vision to William Cary:

"But soon I knew it was not so; for I saw more than man could see; right over the ocean, as I live, and away to the Spanish Main. And I saw Barbados, and Grenada, and all the isles that we ever sailed by; and La Guayra in Caracas, and the Silla, and the house beneath it where she lived. And I saw him walking with her on the barbecue, and he loved her then. I saw what I saw; and he loved her; and I say he loves her still." (2: 444)

Amyas's vision takes him to the wrecked Spanish galleon beneath the sea, where he finds Don Guzman in his cabin, prawns and crayfish swimming above the heads of him and his men. When Guzman asks Amyas to make peace with him, Amyas shakes his enemy's hand.

Encouraged by the sublime natural setting and consisting of vivid sensory impressions, this epiphany allows Amyas to enjoy spiritual communion with Guzman. The epiphany's ultimate value, however, is not as a mystical experience; rather, it is as a catalyst for action, removing his self-absorption and hatred so that he can once again carry out duties to family, friends, and country. Ultimately the vision allows him to abandon celibacy and marry Ayacanora, having forgiven her for being half-Spanish, and perhaps to eagerly anticipate (at least in the author's mind) the connubial pleasures that Kingsley himself praised.

In the final analysis, Catholicism in *Westward Ho!* serves two functions for Kingsley because it reflects two personal conflicts, only one of which was adequately resolved. Never at ease with his own feminine attributes, Kingsley turns Catholic characters into effeminate whipping boys before allowing himself imaginative freedom with Don Guzman. Even then the Don hardly affects the novel's direction. True, the blinded, bereft Amyas learns something from Guzman about feminine sensibilities, but a few pages do not bring his enemy back to life or weaken the novel's promotion of the manly hero and the British chauvinism that dominate its pages. As Robert Martin observes, "At the end of the book Amyas Leigh is struck blind by lightning because his vengeance becomes personal rather than national and religious, but Kingsley's sympathy is clearly with him in his hatred of all things Spanish and Roman" (177).

On the other hand, the author's conscious efforts to reconcile spirit and flesh are reflected in the coherent, albeit unsoundly applied, theology of *Westward Ho!* Very deliberately, Kingsley juxtaposes Catholicism's disordered views toward sensuality—seen in ascetic and depraved characters—to his own vision of spirit and flesh in harmony. One may certainly object to the role Kingsley assigns to Catholicism; however, it becomes an effective foil for enlightening his readers—and, very likely, for reminding himself—of the dangers of Manicheism.

- Chitty, Susan. *The Beast and the Monk*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1974.
- Colloms, Brenda. *Charles Kingsley: The Lion of Eversley*. London: Constable, 1975.
- Hartley, Allan John. *The Novels of Charles Kingsley: A Christian Social Interpretation*. Folkstone: Hour Glass P, 1977.
- Kauvar, Gerald, and Gerald Sorensen, eds. *The Victorian Mind*. New York: Putnam, 1959.
- Kingsley, Charles. *Westward Ho!* 2 vols. New York: J. F. Taylor, 1899.
- Kingsley, Fanny, ed. *Charles Kingsley: His Letters, and Memories of His Life*. 2 vols. New York: J. F. Taylor, 1899.
- Maison, Margaret M. *The Victorian Vision: Studies in the Religious Novel*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.
- Martin, Robert. *The Dust of Combat*. London: Faber & Faber, 1959.
- Pope-Hennessy, Una. *Canon Charles Kingsley: A Biography*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1948.
- Schiefelbein, Michael. "A Catholic Baptism for *Villette*'s Lucy Snowe." *Christianity and Literature* 45.3-4 (Spring-Summer 1996): 319-29.

Thorp, Margaret Farrand. *Charles Kingsley: 1819-1875*. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.

Christian Brothers University

_____. "Crucifixes and Madonnas: George Eliot's Fascination with Catholicism in *Romola*." *Victorian Newsletter* No. 88 (Fall 1995): 31-34.

_____. "Little Nell, Catholicism, and Dickens's Investigation of Death." *Dickens Quarterly* 8 (1991): 115-25.

Sources and Outcomes of Adolescent Crises in *Wuthering Heights*

Jacqueline Banerjee

When Sterne has Tristram Shandy describe his father's project of compiling "an INSTITUTE for the government of my childhood and adolescence" (298), the eighteenth-century novelist seems to be using the word "adolescence" much as it is used these days—to refer to the period between early childhood on the one hand, and adulthood on the other. Yet the term had none of its modern resonance then. As one historical psychologist explains, the concept of a "complicated period of psychic maturation" simply did not exist in the eighteenth century: "there was nothing to see then on the border between youth and maturity" (van den Burg 72). Even in the nineteenth century, when the process of physiological change was gradually being charted, the process of emotional adjustment was expected to follow it quickly and smoothly. After puberty, claims one nineteenth-century medical encyclopedia,

The girl's manners and habits . . . undergo a marked change. . . . she is no longer wayward, romping and careless, but becomes reserved and modest in her deportment.

(qtd. in Gorman 86)

Such a change never seems to have occurred in the life of Emily Brontë, who is on record as having wanted to "go out to play" with her sister Anne when she was sixteen (qtd. in Fraser 94), and who by all accounts remained tomboyish, a denizen of the wild moors rather than of polite society. In the years between twelve and nineteen, exactly the period usually described as adolescence, she is said to have "been introverted, self-divided and ill-at-ease with most other people" (Chitham 65). As for her heroine Catherine Earnshaw, when she tries to accomplish the required transition from child to woman, the effect is utterly disastrous. Not surprisingly, then, early reviewers with little conception of even the natural stresses of adolescence found Brontë's novel "wild, confused, disjointed" (qtd. in Allott 220). Yet twentieth-century research into its structure has indicated that the narrative of *Wuthering Heights* is open to none of these criticisms. The adjectives should be applied instead to Catherine herself, and to Heathcliff—two figures drawn with painful inwardness as the products of a particularly stressful adolescence.

Modern readers, alerted by generations of psychologists to the problems of maturation, would seem to be much better equipped than earlier ones to empathize both with the author

and her main protagonists. After all, in the very first decade of this century G. Stanley Hall was describing adolescence as a "period of transformation so all-determining" that "it alone can often give the key" to later life (1: 589). However, like the Marxist approaches to the novel (which only transform the child protagonists into counters in an ideological struggle) the psychological approaches adopted to *Wuthering Heights* in the past few decades have generally been theoretical rather than empirical. They range from Edwin Moser's Freudian interpretation of both Catherine and Heathcliff as "the id . . . the child that lurks within everyone . . . selfish, asocial, impulsive" (184-85) to Sandra Gilbert's Freudian/feminist reading of Heathcliff as *Catherine's* "childish and desirous id" (145). Such analyses usefully expose the flow and jostle of the author's unconscious feelings beneath the surface of the text, and at the same time, take the reader far beyond the text—for, as the Freudian literary theorist Frederick J. Hoffman has pointed out, "the particularities of psychic experiences lend themselves to the act of universalizing" (329). In this respect, such analyses are not so very different from Lord David Cecil's famous "cosmic" schematizing of the novel into an opposition between the "children of the storm" at the Heights and the "children of calm" at the Thrushcross Grange. Although the powerful forces proposed by the later critics are felt to operate within the psyche rather than outside it, they too seem to demonstrate that Emily Brontë's imagination "confines itself to the elemental, and presents it as an elemental way" (Cecil 164, 169).

Wuthering Heights invites such an approach precisely because its principal protagonists are fuelled by passions which more down-to-earth interpretations seem unable to account for. To see it, for example, as "a statement of a very serious kind about a girl's childhood and the adult woman's tragic yearning to return to it" (Moers 106) is both inadequate and reductive. Is there no (intelligible) statement here about male experience? Surely, the older Catherine's desperate cry, "I wish I were a girl again, half savage and hardy, and free" (163), is only half the story. Besides, the energy coursing through the fraught period between Catherine and Heathcliff's childhood and adulthood is at least as important as the drive to restore an earlier, less fraught state. The problem here is that, apart from some discussions of Catherine's anorexia, adolescence has still been allowed to drop out of sight, just as it was

in Victorian times. Surprisingly, even Patricia Meyer Spacks's rich compendium, *The Adolescent Idea: Myths of Youth and the Adult Imagination*, which draws so usefully on the findings of Erikson and other twentieth-century developmental psychologists, makes only the briefest of references to *Wuthering Heights*, simply noting that (rather than explaining why) "Catherine and Heathcliff mistreat the gentler folk who surround them" (204). Thus, very little attention is paid, even in a critical book to which the novel is so thoroughly relevant, to how true these two young characters' responses are to their particular situations as they grow up.

Yet Arnold Kettle was much impressed by the accuracy and detail of the novel's social dimension, seeing it as "a vision of what life in 1847 was like" (141); and Cecil himself noted both that "[d]uring a great part of *Wuthering Heights*, the characters are children: and very realistically drawn children," and (more significantly) that their later "deeds and passions" spring from thwarted impulses (see 178, 154). The nature and source of these impulses, their thwarting during the difficult adolescent years, and their outcomes, are all thoroughly explored by Emily Brontë. As the authors of a recent study of "Anger, Worry, and Hurt in Early Adolescence" have pointed out, "Here we think that novelists and writers have more accurately described adolescence than have social scientists" (Larson and Asmussen 38). Nothing, therefore, can substitute for a close reading of the novel. However, not only Freud and later specialists in the area of psychological maturation, such as Erikson, but also the controlled, statistically-supported studies of a new breed of social scientists like those just quoted above, can help the reader recognize and appreciate the author's insights, and reach a deeper understanding of both Catherine and Heathcliff's behavior.

One may perhaps question the validity of approaching a literary work in this way—in particular, of bringing the findings of contemporary fieldworkers to bear on fictional youth of a nineteenth-century novel (set, moreover, several decades earlier). Does it not rather naïvely presume two things: first, a quality of lived experience in imaginary figures' pasts; and secondly, even if that objection is overcome, a fundamental similarity between the problems of growing up in two entirely different eras? As to the former, Emily Brontë herself went to extraordinary lengths to draw her readers into her main protagonists' lives, both by the elaborate layering of her narrative, and by providing their life-experiences with the scaffolding of a very detailed chronology. There is every reason to suppose that the task of convincing the reader is also tackled through the amount of detail about their earlier years. Here, changes in the social fabric may sometimes obscure the author's success. For example, it is probably harder now to enter into the feelings of such a very young street arab as Heathcliff is, when Mr. Earnshaw first picks him up like flotsam from the streets of Liverpool. Yet the only real barrier to understanding is likely to be a deeper one—one which actually presupposes the essential identity of human nature. Freud, for example, suggests that generations of spectators got caught up in the Oedipal drama of *Hamlet* without having been able to understand it rationally, not because of any superficial changes in human experience over the years, but, on the contrary, because these spectators had identified all too closely with the

hero. They too, claims Freud, were "in the grip of emotions instead of taking stock of what is happening." The spectators, he maintains, resisted understanding the play because of the "repressed material" in their own unconscious minds. "[T]he conflict in *Hamlet* is so effectively concealed that it was left to me to unearth it," concludes Freud with a flourish. And it must be conceded that the Oedipal reading is now a commonplace of Shakespearean criticism ("Psychopathic Stage Characters" 126).

A more clinical approach, then, would seem to be a useful critical tool, drawing to the surface and exploring those problems which are not discussed explicitly in a literary work. This is something different from old-fashioned character-analysis based on the notion of a stable self, yet it has the virtue of focusing on the characters, who, after all, are the agents of both the author and the action.

To start at the beginning, then. No doubt the most puzzling aspect of Catherine and Heathcliff's behavior in *Wuthering Heights* is the tenacious desire to achieve an endogamous union beyond the bonds of what is socially acceptable and desirable, or even humanly possible.

This is easy to illustrate and trace through the whole length of the narrative. But the night of Christmas 1777 is a milestone. This is the scene, and it is a dramatic one: out on the moors one cold Christmas night, on the rooftop of a stout stone house, a child of twelve scrambles between two garret skylights. It is no mere prank, but a venture which illustrates the passionate determination of its perpetrator. The child is the living girl Catherine Earnshaw, whose ghost Mr. Lockwood repelled from his window after his first nightmare, earlier in the narrative—but later in her own story. For Catherine's determination is not dulled by time; on the contrary, it grows, and it eventually bears fruit. The adolescent escapade foreshadows another successful entry recounted at the very end of the novel, when her foster-brother Heathcliff's soul is "harried off," as Joseph puts it (365), through the open lattice by his deathbed, leaving a bloodless postmortem graze on the corpse's hand.

Every other challenge to our understanding—Catherine and Heathcliff's behavior towards others included—follows on from this single-minded desire for their reunion.

The desire is widely accepted now as at least semi-incestuous (to those who see Heathcliff as not only her sibling but the Oedipal father as well, it is "doubly incestuous" [Kavanagh 55]). However, it is both more and less than incestuous. It is less because, although the two have been raised together, identify strongly with each other, and are prevented from continuing their relationship by social pressures, they are not blood relatives. This is not a hair-splitting distinction. Fanny Price and Edmund Bertram are cousins who are brought up together in Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*, and there Mrs. Norris takes it for granted that an unsuitable romantic relationship will not develop; yet when such a relationship does blossom, it is the source of the novel's happy ending. The same possibility is open to Catherine and Heathcliff. When the time comes, Catherine rejects it only on social grounds ("it would degrade me to marry Heathcliff, now"

[121]). On the other hand, their feelings for each other are not based on a simple sexual predilection, wayward or otherwise. Sex is never even an issue. It is symptomatic of the obtuseness of much modern criticism that J. Hillis Miller complains that "[t]he reader never sees directly . . . the moment in childhood when Cathy and Heathcliff slept in the same bed and were joined in a union which was prior to sexual differentiation." Miller goes on to affirm dramatically that "[w]hat is lost . . . is the 'origin' which would explain everything" (184). In the first place, such a scene as he imagines is clearly implied: when Nelly looks in on the two children in the early hours of the morning after Mr. Earnshaw's death, she is surprised not because the pair are together in what is laconically termed "the children's room," but because they are still awake: "I saw they had never laid down, though it was past midnight" (84). That is likely to be enough for most readers. And in the second place (and more importantly), it is not particularly significant; it is certainly not the point on which the credibility or otherwise of their story depends. The "'origin' which would explain everything" is an emotional and spiritual bonding, such that Catherine says as an adolescent, "whatever our souls are made of, his and mine are the same" (121); and Heathcliff asserts passionately after her death, "I cannot live without my life! I cannot live without my soul!" (204).

The problem for skeptical readers like Hillis Miller seems to lie in the very intensity of the childhood bond. Yet in one of his late pieces, the now notorious paper on "Female Sexuality" completed in 1931, Freud reiterates his long-held belief in just the kind of "boundless" childhood need to love and be loved that Emily Brontë writes about. Freud describes it in his paper as a love which "demands exclusive possession," and "is not content with less than all" (378). It is, he says, a kind of bottomless hunger, impossible to satisfy and therefore doomed to frustration this side of the grave; and it provokes not only the child's defiant strategies against the world which is somehow other than it should be, but also a profound rage against it. Although Freud's attempts to explore the reasons for this and its consequence in girls (particularly, his theory of penis-envy) were already under attack when he published the essay, and have since been widely discredited, the premise itself was neither new nor controversial. Rather, it was a widely held belief. Tolstoy, for example, characterized childhood love in *Childhood, Boy, Youth* (1899) as a boundless *thirst* (52). In fact, in this discussion of girls' difficult maturation (so different in tone from the comfortable assumptions of the Victorians), Freud confidently lays even more stress than usual on the intense quality of childhood feelings. Perhaps this is because he has now been struck with special force by the realization that girls suffer as much as, and (he notes) for as long as, boys.

Moreover, the principal child characters of *Wuthering Heights* have an especially hard time of it. They are both dealt severe double blows at an early age, in the loss and denial of parental love. Here it should be noted that, although their experiences form a basis for fulfillment which is so disturbingly *otherworldly*, there is nothing at all "emblematic" about these child characters (*pace* Buchen 70). On the contrary, they are both very firmly rooted in their particular, earthly pasts. Heathcliff's sufferings begin first. Mr. Earnshaw finds the boy "starving and houseless" on the Liver-

pool streets; another significant aspect of his situation is that "not a soul knew to whom [the child] belonged." In other words, Heathcliff has already lost both his parents when he first appears. The actual cause of that loss, whether by death or abandonment, is not important (see Bowlby 296). What *is* significant is that he is unable even to give any account of it himself, because language difference has rendered him "as good as dumb" (78). The Victorians knew well what the loss of parents could mean, but it was not until this century that the burgeoning science of psychology drew attention to the consequences of a child's being unable to express his or her feelings about it: "an individual treated thus [that is, not given a chance to express grief at such a loss] is driven in on himself to bear his sorrows alone" (Bowlby 228). Thus, Heathcliff's state when Mr. Earnshaw picks him up on the streets of Liverpool is pitiable in the extreme. Indeed, Earnshaw does take pity on him; but Heathcliff is only rescued physically. He cannot shed his own psychic burden—something that relates him closely to Jane Eyre, the glum and inhibited orphan in the Reed household (see Bernstein 118-25). He appears "sullen" and never "shows any sign of gratitude" (79). Nelly's verdict is that he is "simply insensible" (80), but he might be more accurately diagnosed these days as suffering from a psychological disturbance. Children who have experienced such upheavals are now known to exhibit "wariness of relations with adults" and "difficulties with trust" afterwards (Tzeng, Jackson and Karlson 179).

From then on, moreover, Earnshaw becomes the boy's only protector amongst otherwise hostile adults. Of the two females who might have united with Earnshaw in this enterprise, and perhaps drawn Heathcliff out of himself, the older one, Mrs. Earnshaw, looks at the dirty little street arab with anger and frank repugnance. As for the nursemaid's daughter, Nelly, she treats him like a stray dog at first: "I put it on the landing of the stairs, hoping it might be gone on the morrow" (78), then takes to pinching him. Having nursed him through a dangerous attack of measles, she coolly admits that she did so only under compulsion, and dismisses his patience and obedience on his sickbed as further evidence of "hardness" (79). In the background looms another figure: the elderly servant, Joseph. He is far from being the "comic choric" figure of one critic's description (Craik 168). On the contrary, he is "the wearisomest, self-righteous pharisee that ever ransacked a Bible to rake the promises to himself, and fling the curses on his neighbours" (83), and he casts a deep Evangelical gloom over the whole household. It is scarcely surprising, then, that for all his inability to respond freely to his patron's care, Heathcliff is as wretched as Catherine herself when Earnshaw, his only source of adult affection, dies: at this second orphaning, he sets up a "heart-breaking cry" with his foster-sister (85), and there follow the sleepless hours for which even Nelly has no heart to scold the two children. In fact, Nelly is actually moved to hear them still comforting each other with talk of heaven into the early hours of the next day.

By then, of course, Mrs. Earnshaw had already died. This must have been small loss to Heathcliff, but it is likely to have affected Catherine quite differently. There is little doubt that it would have been the first of *her* great deprivations. Mrs. Earnshaw may never have been a mother to her husband's foundling, but her reaction to the "gipsy brat" need not

have been indicative of her maternal character in general. In the narrative, her rejection of him only serves to foreshadow Mrs. Linton's response to Heathcliff later, and there is no doubt at all that Mrs. Linton is an indulgent mother to her "own bairns" (77). In Nelly's narrative, only the mere fact of Mrs. Earnshaw's death is recorded; nothing is said about any of the children's reactions to it. But it is often noted that the waif at Lockwood's window appears to be the ghost of a far younger Catherine than the one who dies in childbirth, or even than the one from whom Heathcliff runs away in Chapter 9. Might it not be that when this waif describes herself as twenty years an outcast, she is thinking, first and foremost, of the loss of her mother's love (David Daiches's point, that Emily's motherly elder sister Maria had died twenty years before the chapter was written [20], seems to support this)? Apart from the original shock, such a loss would have had enormous consequences for a girl in Catherine's position (a largely male household) at the menarche. Perhaps no one has imagined such a case more sympathetically and even poetically than Hall, writing just after the end of the Victorian era:

The bark is frail, liable to be tossed by storms of feelings, at the mercy of wind and wave, and *if without chart and compass and simple rules of navigation*, aimless drifting in the darkness of ignorance, amidst both rocks and shoals, may make the weak or unadvised wrecks or castaways.

(1: 505-08; emphasis added)

It is hard not to think of Catherine's own stormy passage through puberty, and "unadvised wreck," when reading this description.

As for Catherine's father, the man who at first is eager to bestow gifts on his children (asking them what they want when he sets out for Liverpool), and who is so kind to Heathcliff, not only favors his foster-son over his natural son, but at the same time seems to develop a blind spot for his little daughter's charms. Like a number of other Victorian heroines (George Eliot's Maggie Tulliver, for example), she is worryingly tomboyish; besides, Joseph's encouragement to Mr. Earnshaw to rule his children "rigidly" seems to focus on her: "he regularly grumbled out a long string of tales against Heathcliff and Catherine; always minding to flatter Earnshaw's weakness by heaping the heaviest blame on her." That she has "the bonniest eye, and sweetest smile, and lightest foot in the parish" now seems lost on her father (83): her "fondling" attempts to make up to him are met with harsh rejection ("Nay, Cathy . . . I cannot love thee") and hurtful reproofs: "Go, say thy prayers, child, and ask God's pardon. I doubt thy mother and I must rue that we ever reared thee!" At first, Nelly recalls, such treatment makes the girl cry; but later she becomes, to use one of Nelly's favorite words, "hardened" to it (84). As in Heathcliff's case, this apparent absence of feeling might be recognized now as a self-defensive ploy, symptomatic of vulnerability rather than insensitivity. For, as Freud pointed out in dealing with the problem of anxiety in "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety": "at a certain period of life [the child's] most important interest really is that the people he is dependent on should not withdraw their loving care of him" (305). Freud also shows in this essay how the self-protective mechanism of defensiveness can

in itself lead to neurosis, describing the neurotic individual, at the end of Chapter 9, as one who cannot outgrow the traumas of childhood. It is also significant that in this long investigation, towards the end of his career, Freud has given up his insistence that such childhood trauma are necessarily sexual in origin (see Richards 232).

But Earnshaw's withdrawal of affection and his death are by no means the end of Catherine's early sufferings in *Wuthering Heights*—or Heathcliff's, either. On the contrary, the two children soon come to know the worse neglect and outright tyranny of Hindley, himself driven by a sense of his father's injustice to him in having taken in and given preference to Heathcliff. The dangers of "differential parental treatment" are now well known, and they issue here as in modern child samples in "more conflicted and hostile sibling relationships" (Dunn 5)—at least, between Hindley and his sister and foster-brother. Such is her brother's treatment of them both that Catherine writes in her makeshift diary, "I wish my father were back again. Hindley is a detestable substitute" (62). Because he turns against both of them, what could be more natural than for such "unfriended creatures" to seek out each other's company all the more desperately, and to become "more reckless daily" of whatever punishments their elders might inflict on them for doing so (87)? Recent research has found that although family discord does not necessarily unite siblings (as the case of Hindley and Catherine so clearly illustrates) "close and protective sibling relationships . . . can develop when children are in adverse family circumstances" (emphasis added) and that these relationships "although positively compensatory in some ways, may be too symbiotic to allow for ultimately healthy individuation" (Jenkins 125). This is more likely to occur between siblings (and to all intents and purposes, Catherine and Heathcliff are siblings at this point) who are close in age as well as neglected or abused: "The co-occurrence of these conditions increases the opportunity for children to seek a variety of intense and disturbed relationships with each other." A disturbed relationship in this context includes one which is "compulsive in its clinging quality" (Bank 145), as well as possibly erotic. At this point in *Wuthering Heights*, it seems clear that the relationship which was established between Catherine and Heathcliff "prior to sexual differentiation" becomes not only much more intense, but also more dangerous to normal psychological development.

Once its intensity is fully accepted, and the special factors which encouraged and reinforced it are understood, the extreme actions taken by each of the two characters to accomplish their adult union (or, more accurately, reunion) become understandable too. Indeed, even when their efforts to reach each other pass beyond the bounds of earthly experience, these efforts do not greatly strain credibility. The down-to-earth and now "matronly" Nelly serves as the reader's representative here (51), when, for all her own inclination to do so, she is unable to dismiss the shepherd lad's report of seeing the ghosts of Catherine and Heathcliff on the moors. That this even seems a satisfactory conclusion may be because it is, in effect, an adolescent fantasy come true. A term is put to all the confusions and stresses of the earlier part of the narrative (from which Heathcliff has so patently never recovered), and the goal which could not be realized then is finally achieved:

The assumption that life could actually be made to end with the end of adolescence or at tentatively planned later "dates of expiration" is by no means entirely unwelcome, and, in fact, can become the only condition on which a tentative new beginning can be based. (Erikson 170)

It is not so strange that the "new beginning" for Brontë's troubled protagonists should actually occur after their deaths: by the end of the narrative it is clear that there is simply no other way in which it could be managed.

Now how, exactly, does their relationship come to be denied during their lifetimes? Ironically, it is exactly at the point of their greatest interdependence that a wedge is first driven between the two children. They are now in their early adolescence (Catherine is twelve and Heathcliff about thirteen), a period which is generally accepted in the twentieth century to be marked not by a swift conversion to more civilized behavior, but by its egocentricity, nervous and/or daring ventures into adult society, and, above all "temporary oscillations" (Piaget 60). At this critical point in the maturation process, Hindley banishes Heathcliff from Catherine's lessons with the curate, and sends him out into the fields. "He bore his degradation pretty well at first," recalls Nelly (87); but his new status troubles Catherine deeply. This is one occasion when the reader is (*pace* Brown 149) given "direct access" to her thoughts: in the makeshift diary which Lockwood reads years afterwards, she writes:

How little did I dream that Hindley would ever make me cry so! . . . My head aches, till I cannot keep it on the pillow; and still I can't give over. Poor Heathcliff! Hindley calls him a vagabond, and won't let him sit with us, nor eat with us any more; and, he says, he and I must not play together, and threatens to turn him out of the house if we break his orders. (64)

To lose the only source of her companionship and comfort during a time of general developmental stress is almost more than Catherine can bear; as for Heathcliff, after making some attempts to keep up with her ("Cathy taught him what she learnt" [87]), the boy despairs, and becomes subsumed into the role of a laborer in the very family where he was once the father's favorite. Thus, he looks like "an out-and-outer" by the time the servant at Thrushcross Grange catches him at the window (90). An "out and out rascal" is, of course, one whose wickedness knows no bounds. But Heathcliff is hardly this—yet. Rather, he is "out" in another sense. He is "out" of the Lintons' social sphere, in a way in which Catherine, as the pretty daughter of a neighboring family, is not. And so he is now on his way "out" of Catherine's social sphere, too. For, once she has been exposed to the refinements of the world beyond the Heights, sympathy and indignation for her foster-brother are displaced by something shallower—not mockery exactly, but amusement at least: "how very black and cross you look! and how—how funny and grim!" Again, Hall was perhaps the first to note how bitterly youth (between the ages of about eight and fourteen) recoils in the face of ridicule

(2:103). Then, the psychic blow to Heathcliff becomes literally unendurable: "I shall not stand to be laughed at, I shall not bear it!" he cries when asked to shake hands with her (94).

What is happening to Heathcliff here is in some important respects what Freud claims must happen to every child:

Society must defend itself against the danger that the interests which it needs for the establishment of higher social units may be swallowed up by the family; and for this reason, in the case of every individual, but in particular of adolescent boys, it seeks by all possible means to loosen their connection with the family. . . .

("Transformation of Puberty" 148)

The same process of "loosening" is, of course, now happening to Catherine too; but again, the pain is so severe that the process is not to be borne. It is from just this time, when she is "confounded" by the contrast between Heathcliff and her rather effete new friend from the Grange, Edgar Linton (99), that Catherine's self-division grows. She is "wrenched" from Heathcliff, her "all in all" up until then (163), by her ambition for the way of life which Edgar offers, and by some genuine feelings of tenderness for him; it is an entirely natural movement outwards on her part, such as every early adolescent might be expected to make, yet she does not want to leave her old companion behind. Thus she begins to "adopt a double character without exactly intending to deceive anyone" (107)—except, it would seem, herself. "Oh, I'm burning!" she cries later, tormented both by her "exile" from the world she shared with Heathcliff (163), and her desire to return to it. The rift between them is at once deeply wounding and too incomplete to allow for the possibility of healing.

Ever since Hall's exhaustive pioneering work on adolescent psychology characterized this transitional period of life as one of psychic upheaval, it has been widely accepted that it is normal for adolescents to experience feelings of discontinuity and confusion as childhood is left behind and adulthood looms. These were the very feelings which, as mentioned earlier, the novel's early reviewers picked up and condemned as qualities of the literary work itself. Modern readers, however, who have been made fully aware of the precise and elaborate structure of *Wuthering Heights*, should be able to identify their true source. Clearly, this period is peculiarly painful for both Brontë's protagonists. It might be argued that Catherine's position is better than Heathcliff's—that, for example, far from being flogged and sent out to labor in the fields, she continues to enjoy her privileges as a member of the Earnshaw family; far from having her field of activities compulsorily narrowed, she is accepted outside her immediate family as an equal of the neighboring Lintons. However, quite apart from her strong feelings of affinity with Heathcliff, which cause her to suffer when he suffers, there is in Catherine's history just the kind of "accumulation of stressful experiences" which child psychologists suspect, over a period of years, to be as devastating and as conducive to later disturbed behavior as actual physical abuse (Widom 215-16). Similarly, it must be remembered that although Catherine's division is to some extent self-imposed, it is also largely unavoidable: Hall said long ago that "[e]arly youth is always and necessarily more or

less under the influence of great expectations," (1: 376); and present-day psychologists go further, maintaining that this *should* in fact be the time of "an expanding domain of things that matter" and an "increasing mastery of some segments of experience" (Larson and Asmussen 36). Not only does life generally open up socially and emotionally now, with the first romantic attachments being formed, but, as a consequence, this period becomes typically a time of choices, of testing others' "loyalties in the midst of inevitable conflicts of values" (Erikson 133). Hall's word "necessarily" and Erikson's word "inevitable" are obviously significant here.

Besides, before Catherine is blamed (as Heathcliff himself blames her later), it must be remembered that what she herself labels the "initiator step" in a long rebellion against the pressures on her relationship with Heathcliff has in fact already been taken (62). Not long after Earnshaw's funeral, the pair had absconded together for a "scamper on the moors" under cover of the "dairy woman's cloak" (64). This is their first escape, and a foretaste of the companionable hauntings at which the last chapter hints. It is, however, only the beginning of a protracted struggle. Increasingly desperate measures are taken to try to bypass reality and resume the old intimacy, whether that reality is generally hostile (as it is when they are younger and in Hindley's power) or simply hostile to their continued relationship (as it is when they are older, and are separated by Catherine's contact with the Lintons, her marriage, and social conventions).

The next attempt is again made by both, though it comes to fruition by Catherine's own initiative, and at her own risk. The skylight scramble is only the culmination of a long episode spanning two days and marked by the kind of "oscillations" which, as Piaget suggests, characterize the various transitions of adolescence. It is worth looking at the episode in detail, because it is the most closely described episode of their shared adolescence, and is fraught with all the tensions which later explode into Heathcliff's revenge and Catherine's self-destruction.

It is Christmas Eve when Catherine comes back from the Grange, so greatly altered in appearance. Heathcliff's discomfiture, and her own changed attitude towards him, have already been noted. Everything which follows on from this awkward meeting is entirely understandable, on both sides. At first Catherine reflects not on the damage to Heathcliff's feelings but on the danger to her new and "splendid garments" from contact with his grime (93). After all, Nelly has described the boy as being covered with dirt, and Catherine is wearing a silk frock and white trousers. This might be seen as Catherine's effort to assume the mantle of adulthood—to become, as the Victorian medical profession expected, "modest in her deportment." But Heathcliff, mortified by a sense of his own inferiority and sensing her recognition of it, cries out childishly: "You needn't have touched me! . . . I shall be as dirty as I please, and I like to be dirty, and I will be dirty." He then rushes out of the room. Catherine's amusement evaporates instantly: Nelly notes that while Hindley and Frances enjoy his reaction, which nicely fulfills their aim of

"separating the two friends" (93), it is to *her* "serious disturbance" (95). However, having spoken unthinkingly herself, she does not fully understand the reason for it. Perhaps because of her incomprehension, as well as the excitement of the occasion, she allows herself to be kept busy for the rest of the evening. Her time is taken up with Hindley and his wife's showing her the various gifts they have bought for her to give the Lintons on their Christmas Day visit. It is therefore not Catherine but Nelly who, troubled by the memory of Mr. Earnshaw's anxiety about Heathcliff, goes out to Heathcliff in the stable, and tries unsuccessfully to persuade him to smarten himself up and come indoors to the kitchen. Whatever else can be said about her (and Nelly has had a very bad press ever since James Hafley noticed her own feelings of rivalry towards her master's daughter [182ff.]), Nelly is not one of the agents of Catherine and Heathcliff's division here. Indeed, she takes it for granted that the two old friends will want to make up their difference—"then you can sit together, with the whole hearth to yourselves, and have a long chatter till bedtime." But Heathcliff is still suffering from Catherine's apparent transformation and laughter, and fails to respond. For her part, Catherine does eventually seek him out in the kitchen, but finding him absent returns to her preparations for the next day, having "a world of things to order for the reception of her new friends" (96).

These vacillations come to an end the next morning. On Christmas Day, Catherine's distress resurfaces: Nelly tells Heathcliff that "she cried when I told her you were off again this morning" (97). Heathcliff has wept too, and is ready to swallow his pride and follow Nelly's advice in order to present a pleasant face to Catherine. However, the reunion which in now looked for on both sides is at first subverted by Hindley's irritation and Edgar's rudeness, and is not accomplished easily. Before Heathcliff has done anything to warrant it, Hindley proclaims that he must be excluded from the "fragrant feast" (100). His mocking comment on Heathcliff's "elegant locks" is taken up by Edgar, "peeping from the doorway" of the room where he and his sister are warming themselves after their journey to the Heights (99). Stung by the ridicule to which his own attempt to smarten up has exposed him, Heathcliff lets fly with one of the tureens and is marched off to his room, where he is beaten before being imprisoned: "That brute of a lad has warmed me nicely," gloats Hindley on his reappearance (99). Catherine's apparent indifference soon breaks down and she is now as effectively barred from enjoying the Christmas spread as Heathcliff is. Thinking of his misery, she cannot even eat one mouthful of the goose-wing which is on her plate. She has been forced to fast before, as a punishment by Joseph, but this is the first time we see her having difficulty in eating what is put in front of her. She even pretends to drop her fork in order to lower her head under the table and hide her tears. The refusal of food will become a conscious and self-destructive ploy, a development which tallies with at least one recent study implicating what may be considered a "difficult home environment" in the genesis of female eating disorders (see Brooks-Gunn 143). Right now, thinking of Heathcliff's banishment, Catherine must remain "in purgatory throughout the day" (100). The boy, Nelly discovers, has been locked up; Catherine pleads in vain for him to be allowed to join the dance which takes place

later in the day. Although she appears to be enjoying the carol singing which follows, her heart is evidently not in it, for on the pretext that "it sounded sweetest at the top of the steps" she at last escapes from the company and climbs to Heathcliff's garret. It is when Nelly climbs up to warn her of an imminent lull in the festivities that she discovers Catherine's unexpected and dangerous feat: "instead of finding her outside, I heard her voice within" (101).

Poignant as this whole episode is, it serves only to bring home to Heathcliff the fact that he and Catherine are being forced apart by social pressures which he is currently unable to control. For it is just after this, when Nelly has brought him to the kitchen for some food after his long fast (though he too is hardly able to eat), that Heathcliff first shows signs of wanting to take revenge on Hindley. But his motive is not revenge alone, nor is it even primarily revenge. It is basically to distract himself from the havoc Hindley has wrought between him and Catherine by creating this social gulf between them. "Let me alone, and I'll plan it out," he tells Nelly. "[W]hile I'm thinking of that, I don't feel pain" (101). Nor is his brooding now a definite ambition to supplant Hindley; it is only indirectly connected to what he does to Hindley later. Large-scale but vague plans are very much the preoccupation of a normal adolescent:

We see, then, how the normal adolescent goes about injecting himself into adult society. He does so by means of projects, life plans, theoretical systems, and ideas of political and social reform. In short, he does so by means of thinking and almost, one might say, by imagination. (Piaget 67)

Catherine too is at this stage, as she explores the possibility of developing her relationship with the Lintons, while unrealistically hoping that she might somehow keep Heathcliff in the picture. There is a difference, however, and this too is rather typical of their particular situations, for it relates to the gender divide. In Heathcliff's case, the plan is aggressive. Here, social scientists have verified what common experience has long suggested, not only that child abuse and neglect are "definite risk factors" in anti-social behavior (Widom 218) but also that adolescent males are far more likely than females to externalize than to internalize their problems (see Larson and Asmussen 38), in other words, to revolt openly and actively against their stressful situations. Although the forms it will take are not yet known, Heathcliff's later violence (not only towards Hindley, who tyrannized over him, but also to Catherine, who seemed to have abandoned him, as well as to the Lintons, whose very demeanor mocked him) is all rooted in these experiences of his adolescence.

To repeat, however: his ultimate goal is neither the revenge nor the violence with which it is eventually enacted. It is to re-establish the old intimacy with Catherine. While something of that intimacy remains, he does absolutely nothing. On the contrary, five months after the fiasco of the Lintons' Christmas visit, he has let himself go in every way, slouching around morosely and ignoring Nelly's advice to try to improve himself. Nelly notes that because he cannot keep up with Catherine, he seems determined to sink even lower: "there was no prevailing upon him to take a step in the way of

moving upward" (108). He has chosen what Erikson calls a negative identity at this stage, that of the farm laborer which in his deepest heart he so bitterly scorns: "many a sick or desperate adolescent if faced with continuing conflict, would rather be nobody . . . than not-quite-anybody" (Erikson 176). What he has failed to realize is that in making such a choice he is effectively cutting himself off even more from Catherine. He no longer supplies all that his foster-sister expects in a companion. Thus, although the two of them still spend much time together, Catherine often spends the evenings with the Lintons—evenings which her companion at the Heights jealously marks on the almanack. When she points out that she does so for the conversation and amusement which she cannot get from him, Heathcliff is genuinely shocked and shaken out of his negativity. This sharp home truth is delivered just before one of Edgar's visits, and her own agitation over uttering it, and seeing its effect on Heathcliff, leads straight into her display of passion in Edgar's presence: nerves taut, she pinches Nelly and shakes little Hareton out of pure irritation, and then hits out at Edgar for restraining her. The heightened emotions of this episode, in turn, lead to Edgar's proposal and Catherine's famously overheard confession to Nelly, the nub of which is not her acceptance of Edgar but her confession that "if the wicked man in there [Hindley] had not brought Heathcliff so low, I shouldn't have thought of it" (121). Now indeed, in answer to this implicit demand for it, her secret listener sets off to better himself. Heathcliff takes a dramatic step. He runs away from his home and his one strong familial attachment.

This seems like an end, but it could also be a beginning. At this point, the pair are still in a position to recover from their childhood traumas: in Nelly's recollection, Heathcliff is sixteen (108), and Catherine is fifteen (106). Both have some positive prospects, some definite potential for (as Piaget puts it) injecting themselves successfully into society. After all, as Erikson is at pains to reassure his readers, adolescence is a normal period of life, and its storminess and uncertainties usually do pass, usually are resolved. This age (fifteen/sixteen) is a highly appropriate time for a start towards successful adulthood. And indeed, a start does seem to be made on both sides: Catherine continues her relationship with Edgar and marries him, leaving home three years and some months later, presumably when she turns eighteen, and the pair achieve a stable relationship; Heathcliff in the meanwhile is successful in transforming himself into "a tall, athletic, well-formed man . . . [whose] countenance . . . looked intelligent, and retained no marks of former degradation" (135).

Yet, now very close to the end of their teenage years, neither Catherine nor Heathcliff is actually able to forge a separate identity. Catherine has not in fact forgotten her first love, and has been calm largely because of her new husband's solicitude and forbearance; while Heathcliff, who apparently ignored the high probability that she would indeed marry Edgar, has striven only to fit himself for her. Thus, when they meet again, they draw an "undisguised delight" from each other's eyes and are too "absorbed in their mutual joy" to care

about or even be conscious of Edgar (135). There is a clear danger, now, that their childhood symbiosis will continue to be the governing factor in their lives, in that the hopeless drive to reestablish it in the present circumstances will stunt any capacity they might still have for their growth as separate individuals.

At this point, Heathcliff still has no definite plan of revenge: he explains to Catherine, to whom he has no reason to lie, that he had called at the Heights simply to enquire about her, and that he now hopes to take up residence as a paying guest there to be near her. Catherine's own feelings are positive, and not only as regards Heathcliff himself: she places Linton's hand in his in the touching belief that the two might be friends.

But the situation is impossible. As each perceives it to be so (and the realization dawns very quickly), frustration sets in, turning predictably outwards against others in Heathcliff's case, and inwards against her own self in Catherine's. Catherine herself realizes that Heathcliff acts as he now does because the sole satisfaction he can find is in "inflicting misery" (151): taking advantage of Hindley's (and then Isabella's) own weakness gives him some outlet for the frustration of his passion, as indeed does his fierceness towards Catherine. Finding her own situation—as the wife of a man she cannot love, and the lover of a man she can no longer be one with—quite intolerable too, Catherine suffers an episode of nervous agitation, and on her recovery stops eating. "The spirit which served her was growing intractable: she could neither lay nor control it" (151-52). The crises of their shared earlier adolescence, which in better circumstances might have been overcome, here give way to symptoms of neurosis and psychosis which rob them of inner calm and vitiate all their relations with external reality. Ordinary people, suggests T. S. Eliot in "Hamlet and Other Problems," batten down the intense feelings which are apt to be experienced in youth. Hamlet cannot; neither can Catherine and Heathcliff. Although Catherine is already pregnant with Linton's baby, and Heathcliff is now enough of a man in appearance for Nelly to pause in her account here, and say in an aside "Heathcliff—Mr Heathcliff, I should say in future" (139), neither of them ever attains the relative equilibrium of adulthood.

They pass instead into a no-man's-land of self-inflicted physical pains and (in Heathcliff's case) sadistic attacks on others as well. Two details serve to illustrate the former: the blood on Catherine's lips after Edgar has managed to eject Heathcliff from the Grange, and she has been "grinding her teeth, so that you might fancy she would crash them to splinters" (156); and the "several splashes of blood" around the ash tree after Catherine's death, bearing witness to the force with which the grieving Heathcliff has dashed his head against it (204). These are danger signals indeed: Freud noted at the beginning of this century (1901) that "in the severer cases of psychoneurosis instances of self-injury are occasionally found as symptoms and . . . in such cases suicide can never be ruled out as a possible outcome of the psychic conflict" (*The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* 233). As for Heathcliff's violence to others, perhaps the worst instance is when he almost kicks, tramples and batters to death the already wounded and unconscious Hindley in Chapter

17—though perhaps the attempt to hang Isabella's pet springer spaniel would have upset Victorian sensibilities even more. Such behavior is indeed grotesque; but it is Gothic only insofar as the Gothic mode is itself an exploration and expression of psychological aberrations which result from traceable causes within the characters.

After Catherine's self-sought death ("I'm tired, tired of being enclosed here" [196]), Heathcliff is left with nothing but his own desperate unfulfilled need and the thoughts of revenge which have always been consequent to it—even after the most appropriate object of the latter (Hindley) has gone. His punishment of the young people of the next generation—"I know how to chastise children, you see," he tells Nelly bitterly (303)—hints strongly at the cycle of domestic abuse which is now familiar to social workers. In particular, as Heathcliff was mistreated by Hindley once, so now he deliberately mistreats Hareton, making the connection crystal clear himself: "we'll see if one tree won't grow as crooked as another, with the same wind to twist it!" (222). It is only at the very end of Heathcliff's life that feelings of need override those of revenge again, in a reversal of the original process of cause and effect. "What does not recall her?" he says piteously to Nelly (353), longing for the final reunion with Catherine: "I have a single wish, and my whole being and faculties are yearning to attain it." Now at last he realizes that it has been useless to try to deal with his anguish by turning destructively on others and that his aim can be accomplished only by turning on himself instead: "I am swallowed in anticipation of its [his wish's] fulfillment," he cries, as impatient to escape this world as Catherine once was (354). His death, after he rejects Nelly's meals just as Catherine had done so long ago, is of course a form of suicide. On one occasion, he sweeps away his untouched breakfast, staring with rapt attention at something which seems to be moving just in front of him. The implication is that Catherine appears, and is drawing him after her.

Erikson's discussion of a real person—the young Hitler—is quite enlightening here. It reveals how a severe disappointment in late adolescence may indeed profoundly color a whole life, with the most dreadful repercussions for those unfortunate enough to fall within that embittered person's sphere of influence. In Hitler's case, it was the disappointment of his deeply-cherished ambition to be a city planner which seems to have been the key factor: "it was when he finally sent his plans for a new opera house in Linz to a prize committee which paid no attention to them that he really broke with society and disappeared, to reappear only as an avenger" (192). However, frustration in love has been cited by social psychologists as "one of the major sources of distress, strain, and perhaps psychiatric disorder in adolescence" (Larson and Asmussen 38). In other words, Heathcliff's case is more typical, more understandable. Erikson not only points out the dire results of such a youthful crisis, but also demonstrates convincingly through his chosen example that the original disappointment and the desire to compensate for it in a more positive way are never forgotten. In his very last days, he explains, Hitler was not only recognizing the hopelessness of his current situation, but also

putting the last touches on the opera house . . . which he had almost come to build. To such an eerie extent does a late-adolescent commitment persist even in a person of excessive destructive needs. (192)

As for Heathcliff, his commitment to Catherine has never faltered, and it eventually overtakes all other considerations, even the instinct to live: he himself claims that he hardly remembers to breathe (354), and Nelly bears witness to it (360). While the nature of their disappointments and commitments are so entirely different, and the scale of the damage inflicted bears no comparison at all, the parallels between this century's most hated leader and the last's most notorious literary villain/hero, are clear enough.

Perhaps it is precisely because Heathcliff attains such a malignancy that it is tempting to develop elemental interpretations of *Wuthering Heights*. Described with a kind of fascinated revulsion by Isabella as having "sharp cannibal teeth" (212) and "basilisk eyes" (215), Heathcliff does come to stand for all that challenges an optimistic reading of human nature. Moreover, there is the paradox that at the end, the shepherd lad's vision of his ghost strolling on the moors with that of his beloved Catherine is a strangely satisfying one. One might indeed wish to explain this in terms of the gratification of the amoral id, whether Brontë's, Heathcliff's, Catherine's or the reader's. However, Heathcliff is not demonic in and of himself, but as a result of the pressures to which his particular personality has been subjected at critical periods of his life; and the reader who has felt the pathos involved in that process will surely respond positively to the suggestion of a final reunion. Thus, before losing touch with the detailed texture of human experience in Emily Brontë's novel, and expanding into the wider domain of the metaphysical—or before losing the "psychic energy" from the social, moral and aesthetic form in which the author herself has so painstakingly contained it (see Hoffman 322-23)—the reader might usefully consider the psychological insights offered by this extraordinarily perceptive author.

Finally, as suggested earlier in this essay, the picture of the ghostly Catherine and Heathcliff at the end of *Wuthering Heights* may also satisfy the reader because it is an adolescent fantasy come true. Writing of that other great work about growing up, Barbara Everett has found in the profusion of references to *Hamlet* by Shakespeare's contemporaries "the response of human beings to a literary work that went deeper . . . than any aesthetic work of their experience: deep in a way that was slightly out of their control" (6). The same might be said of this novel, which concludes by validating rather than condemning the dangerous intensity of youthful feeling, giving it the kind of precedence over the rational and adult world which many readers might themselves like to grant it (if they dared). Nothing could better explain the rise in popularity of the novel which so baffled its early reviewers, for, as Phillipe Ariès has pointed out, "our society has passed from a period which was ignorant of adolescence to a period in which adolescence is the favourite age" (28).

Works Cited

Allott, Miriam, ed. *The Brontës: The Critical Heritage*. London:

- Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Ariès, Phillipe. *Centuries of Childhood*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.
- Bank, Stephen. "Remembering and Reinterpreting Sibling Bonds." Boer and Dunn, 139-51.
- Bernstein, Susan D. "Madame Mope: The Bereaved Child in Brontë's *Jane Eyre*." *Adolescents, Literature, and Work with Youth*. *Child and Youth Services* 7 (1-2): 117-29.
- Boer, Frits and Judy Dunn, eds. *Children's Sibling Relationships: Developmental and Clinical Issues*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992.
- Bowlby, John. *Attachment and Loss*: Vol. 3. *Loss, Sadness and Depression*. New York: Basic Books, 1980.
- Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. 1847. Ed. David Daiches. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne. "How Stressful Is the Transition to Adolescence for Girls?" Colten and Gore 131-49.
- Brown, Penny. *The Captured World: The Child and Childhood in Nineteenth-Century Women's Writing in England*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.
- Buchen, Irving H. "Emily Brontë and the Metaphysics of Childhood and Love." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 22 (1): 63-70.
- Cecil, Lord David. *Early Victorian Novelists: Essays in Reevaluation*. London: Constable, 1934.
- Chitham, Edward. *A Life of Emily Brontë*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Colten, Mary Ellen and Susan Gore, eds. *Adolescent Stress: Causes and Consequences*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991.
- Craik, Wendy A. "The Brontës." *The Victorians*. Ed. Arthur Pollard. *Penguin History of Literature*, Vol. 6. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993. 145-72.
- Daiches, David. "Introduction." *Wuthering Heights*. By Emily Brontë. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985. 7-29.
- Dunn, Judy. "Sisters and Brothers: Current Issues in Developmental Research." Boer and Dunn 1-17.
- Erikson, Erik H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.
- Everett, Barbara. "Growing—Barbara Everett on *Hamlet*." *London Review of Books* 31 Mar. 1988: 6-9.
- Fraser, Rebecca. *The Brontës: Charlotte Brontë and Her Family*. New York: Crown, 1988.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Female Sexuality." *On Sexuality*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 7. Ed. Angela Richards. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977. 367-92.
- _____. "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety." *On Psychopathology*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 10. Ed. Angela Richards. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979. 229-315.
- _____. "Psychopathic Stage Characters." *Art and Literature*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 14. Ed. Albert Dickson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985. 119-27.
- _____. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 5. Ed. Angela Richards. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.
- _____. "Transformations of Puberty." *On Sexuality*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 7. Ed. Angela Richards. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977. 127-54.
- Gilbert, Sandra. "Looking Oppositely: Emily Brontë's Bible of Hell." *New Casebook: Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Patsy Stoneman. London: Macmillan, 1993. 131-60.
- Gorham, Deborah. *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal*. London: Croom Helm, 1982.

- Hafley, James. "The Villain in *Wuthering Heights*." *A Wuthering Heights Handbook*. Ed. Richard Lettis and William E. Morris. New York: Odyssey, 1961. 182-97.
- Hall, G. Stanley. *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton, 1905.
- Hoffman, Frederick J. *Freudianism and the Literary Mind*. 2nd ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1967.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. "Sibling Relationships in Disharmonious Homes: Potential Difficulties and Protective Effects." Boer and Dunn 125-38.
- Kavanagh, James H. *Emily Brontë*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.
- Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel: Vol. 1. Defoe to George Eliot*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.
- Larson, Reed and Linda Asmussen. "Anger, Worry, and Hurt in Early Adolescence: An Enlarging World of Negative Emotions." Colten and Gore 21-41.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Wuthering Heights: Repetition and the Uncanny." *Modern Critical Views: The Brontës*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 169-92.
- Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women*. London: The Women's P, 1978.
- Piaget, Jean. *Six Psychological Studies*. Trans. Anita Tezner. New

York: Vintage, 1968.

- Richards, Angela. Editor's intro. "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety." By Sigmund Freud. *On Psychopathology*. Pelican Freud Library, vol. 10. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979. 229-36.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *The Adolescent Idea: Myths of Youth and the Adult Imagination*. London: Faber, 1982.
- Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. Ed. Ian Campbell Ross. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth*. New York: Thomas Crowell, 1899.
- Tzeng, Oliver C. S., Jay W. Jackson and Henry C. Karlson. *Theories of Child Abuse and Neglect: Differential Perspectives, Summaries, and Evaluations*. New York: Praeger, 1991.
- van den Berg, Jan Hendrick. *The Changing Nature of Man: Introduction to a Historical Psychology*. *Metabologica*. Trans. H. F. Croes. New York: W. W. Norton, 1961.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz. "Childhood Victimization: Risk Factor for Delinquency." Colten and Gore 201-21.

Kobe College

Collective Personification in Carlyle's *French Revolution*

R. S. Edgecombe

On the one hand Quintilian defined personification as a trope by which "inanimate objects are given life and action" (qtd. in Sonnino 54) and on the other as a scheme "by which cities and peoples may also find a voice" (55). While at first glance "cities and peoples" might hardly require prosopopoeia to give them the tongues they already wag, the figure nonetheless stylizes an actual babel into monolithic discourse and action. This reductionism has become so much a part of personification that, reading this sentence—"Rome never produced a very considerable industrial population, and her warehouses never rivalled those of Alexandria" (456)—our minds largely short-circuit the idea of a fecund woman and take the feminine pronoun as a locution for the neuter. Most uses of prosopopoeia have thus consolidated the multiplicities of the subject into a somewhat faceless, singular spokesperson, and have concretized philosophical classes into nonce species, whether it be Dullness or Duty or Rome.

In the course of blasting the foundations of eighteenth-century prose (replacing the smooth marble slabs of Addison with roughly-fashioned lumps of granite), Carlyle left his mark on Augustan personification as well—not for nothing did Joyce hail him as a liberator of English style. In *The French Revolution* he often ascribes multiple functions to the personifying subject, functions that survive its urge to consolidate and unify. Take, for instance, this passage:

In a squalid garret, on Monday morning, Maternity awakes, to hear children weeping for bread. Maternity must forth

into the streets, to the herb-markets and Bakers'-queues; meets there with hunger-stricken Maternity, sympathetic, exasperative. O we unhappy women! (1: 251-52)

Carlyle begins with that metonymic unity of space we find in such eighteenth-century tableaux as that of Villiers in "The Epistle to Bathurst" (Pope 583), but Maternity soon leaves her "squalid garret" for multiple venues—"herb-markets and Bakers'-queues"—meeting herself again as "hunger-stricken Maternity." These dissolutions of the abstraction lead naturally enough to the living individuals who then issue from its monolithic embrace—"O we unhappy women."

And then there is the Philosophism that "sits joyful in her glittering saloons, the dinner-guest of Opulence grown ingenuous, the very nobles proud to sit by her; and preaches, lifted up over all Bastilles, a coming Millenium" (1: 30). Like some legendary saints, this personification enjoys the privileges of "bilocation," her monolithic self present all at once in "glittering saloons." The Sansculottes receive the same sort of provisional omnipresence even as they are swept up together under an umbrella personification. Their discharge of different weapons makes it clear that "Rascality" also functions simultaneously as a consolidating and a dissipating device: "Rascality assembles anew, with great force, in the Place Dauphine; lets off petards, fires blunderbusses, to an incredible extent, without interval, for eighteen hours" (1: 112). In similar vein, Carlyle gives it the Briarean ability to shake all the gates of Versailles at once, general and yet

specific at the same time: "But be this as it may, menaced Rascality, in whinnying scorn, is shaking all the Gates: the fastening of one (some write, it was a chain merely) gives way: Rascality is in the Grand Court, whinnying louder still" (1: 277). Later he tells us that "Journalism, through all its throats, gives a hoarse outcry, condemnatory, elegaic-applausive" (2: 87), where again we sense a monstrous reduplication (as in the heads of the Hydra), contained by the singularizing compass of the trope.

The same reckless play of numbers against a unitary design informs Carlyle's use of antonomasia. In traditional Augustan applications of the figure, the typifying individual almost always represents its class by singular gestures: "Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest / Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood" (Gray 128). Carlyle, by contrast, reduplicates specific historical events in a way that half dissolves their representative function even as they discharge it. "Peterloo" (modelled on "Waterloo" as "Irangate" on "Watergate") is thrown into the plural and made to flank its prototype, likewise pluralized out of its historical selfhood. The effect becomes even more marked when an historical event *sui generis* (Napoleon's retreat from Moscow)—an event that in English idiom, at least, lacks the symbolic oestrus of Waterloo—gives birth to a multitude of retreats. Everything dissolves into undifferentiated atoms *sub specie aeternitatis*: "What a work, O Earth and Heavens, what a work! Battles and bloodshed, September Massacres, Bridges of Lodi, retreats of Moscow, Waterloos, Peterloos, Tenpound Franchises, Tarbarrels and Guillotines;—and from this present date, if one might prophesy, some two centuries of it still to fight!" (1: 133).

By way of coda, we can note that Carlyle's idiosyncratic prosopopoeia seems to have influenced Dickens, for among his many complex experiments with personification we find this in *Little Dorrit*:

As they eyed the stranger in passing, they eyed him with borrowing eyes—hungry, sharp, speculative as to his softness if they were accredited to him, and the likelihood of his standing something handsome. Mendicity on commission stooped in their high shoulders, shambled in their unsteady legs, buttoned and pinned and darned and dragged their clothes, frayed their button-holes, leaked out of their figures in dirty little ends of tape, and issued from their mouths in alcoholic breathings. (91)

The inspiration behind this passage is not hard sought. Dickens has used prosopopoeia to "seek out" an aspect of the scene before him and then to *attach* it to the figures in the tableau instead of following the more usual neoclassical procedure of conjuring abstractions out of nothing. And, even as he does that, he diffuses the monolithic "Mendicity" (as Carlyle had diffused "Maternity" or "Rascality" in *The French Revolution*) through a multitude of agents.

Works Cited

- Carlyle, Thomas. *The French Revolution*. 3 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, 1896.
- Dickens, Charles. *Little Dorrit*. London: Oxford UP, 1953.
- Gray, Thomas, et al. *The Poems of Gray, Collins and Goldsmith*. Ed. Roger Lonsdale. London: Longman, 1969.
- Pope, Alexander. *The Poems of Alexander Pope: A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations*. Ed. John Butt. London: Methuen, 1963.
- Sonnino, Lee Ann. *A Handbook of Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Wells, H. G. *The Outline of History, Being a Plain History of Life and Mankind*. 1920. Rev. London: Cassell, 1932.

University of Cape Town

Star-Crossed Love:

The Gravity of Science in Hardy's *Two on a Tower*

Jim Barloon

I

"Many a hearth upon our dark globe sighs after many a vanish'd face.

Many a planet by many a sun may roll with the dust of a vanish'd race.

II

Raving politics, never at rest—as this poor earth's pale history runs,—

What is it all but a trouble of ants in the gleam of a million million of suns?"

Tennyson, "Vastness" (1-4)

The plot synopsis on the back cover of Oxford's World Classics edition of Hardy's *Two on a Tower* reads, in part: "Published in 1882, his ninth novel, *Two on a Tower* is Hardy's most complete and daring treatment of the theme of love between characters of different classes and ages. Viviette, the married lady of the manor, is nine years older than Swithin St. Cleve, the 20-year old 'Adonis-astronomer,' a 'lad of striking beauty, scientific attainments, and cultivated bearing,' the orphaned son of a curate who married the daughter of a family of farmers. The story of their love, both complex and remarkable, involves adultery and accidental polygamy." As this summary implies, the theme of "love between characters of different classes and ages" is hardly

original in Hardy—or, for that matter, in Victorian fiction generally. What is original in *Two on a Tower*, but what the blurb barely observes—being more concerned, perhaps, with luring potential buyers of the book—is Hardy's creation of a character of real "scientific attainments." For an author as attuned as Hardy was to scientific developments and their implications, surprisingly few scientists, of any attainment, appear in his novels. Examining the handling of what is arguably the only legitimate scientist-protagonist in Hardy's fiction reveals several things, not least the degree to which Hardy revered the scientific vocation. It is considered so important, in *Two on a Tower*, that it surpasses the love of woman; in fact, women are portrayed not only as "detours" in the advance of science, but as dead-ends. Although in terms of his attitude towards women Hardy would generally be counterposed to Kipling and Hemingway—writers wary of, at times hostile to, the intrusion of women into masculine spheres of activity—*Two on a Tower* affirms the necessity of a realm of "men without women."

It is science itself which helps to adjust our perspective accordingly. As in many other of Hardy's novels, the lessons of science tend to undermine the pretensions, even the cheerfulness, of man. Early in their acquaintance, Swithin warns Viviette, "If you are cheerful, and wish to remain so, leave the study of astronomy alone. Of all the sciences it alone deserves the character of the terrible" (35). In other novels, time—or, to be more exact, the immensity of time—and the sense that the unfolding drama has been enacted countless times in the past help to account for the *Weltschmerz* of the more sensitive characters. Tess, for example, remarks, "The best is not to remember that your nature and your past doings have been just like thousands' and thousands', and that your coming life and doings'll be like thousands' and thousands'" (182). In *Two on a Tower*, Hardy focuses upon another dimension, one just as enervating as time: space. Though barely twenty, Swithin fully grasps the chastening ramifications of his chosen field: "Until a person has thought out the stars and their interspaces he has hardly learnt that there are things much more terrible than monsters of shape, namely, monsters of magnitude without known shape. Such monsters are the voids and waste places of the sky" (33-34).

These hardly seem like the sorts of remarks a young man angling to win a woman's heart would make; actually, Swithin, at this point, has no such designs. Not only would it be presumptuous, even scandalous, for a young man of scant means to pay his addresses to an older, aristocratic, married woman, but it does not even dawn upon Swithin, initially, that Lady Constantine is an attractive, lonely woman. Swithin apparently has eyes only for *literal* celestial bodies:

The ennobling influence of scientific pursuits was demonstrated by the speculative purity which expressed itself in his eyes whenever he looked at her in speaking, and in the childlike faults of manner which arose from his obtuseness to their difference of sex. He had never, since becoming a man, looked even so low as to the level of Lady Constantine. His heaven at present was truly in the skies, and not in that only other place where they say it can be found, in the eyes of some daughter of Eve. (44)

There is something charming, if also idealized, about Swithin's sexless, prelapsarian innocence, but what registers most strongly is Hardy's obvious fear that Swithin's "ennobling" devotion to science will be adulterated or supplanted by devotion to a woman. In *Two on a Tower*, scientific pursuit and sexual love are constructed as irreconcilable, even antithetical, domains; what is more, the text consistently privileges the former over the latter. If scientific pursuits are "ennobling," pursuit of or devotion to a woman is, by implication, the obverse. The passage quoted above, for example, continues: "Would any Circe or Calypso, and if so what one, ever check this pale-haired scientist's nocturnal sailings into the interminable spaces overhead and hurl all his mighty calculations on cosmic force and stellar fire into Limbo? O the pity of it, if such should be the case!" (44). Presumably the woman who "checks" Swithin's epic sidereal journey could not be a mere flesh-and-blood woman, and is likened, sight unseen, to a Circe or a Calypso, a being with uncanny, coercive powers. One can only hope that such an encounter would not render Swithin irrevocably swinish.

But woman—Lady Constantine in this case, but, presumably, any woman would have the same effect—does more than merely "check" Swithin: she emasculates, or threatens to emasculate, him. In a richly allusive scene, Viviette snips a lock of hair from the head of a sleeping Swithin and hurries away ashamedly (ch. 5). The act not only evokes Samson and Pope's *The Rape of the Lock*, but Hardy's own *Far from the Maddening Crowd* (1874), where Sergeant Troy slices a lock of Bathsheba's hair with his ravishing sword. Feminist critics are quick to spell out the fairly obvious sexual implications of Sergeant Troy's swordplay and his "rape" of Bathsheba's lock (Boumelha 32-34, Morgan 30-57); one wonders what these same critics would have to say about an impassioned woman with a ready pair of scissors. As it turns out, Lady Constantine half-involuntarily, half-conscious seduction of Swithin transforms a far-sighted astronomer into a goggle-eyed lover.

Once Swithin is awakened (only to drown?) from his starry pursuits—due, in part, to a kiss bestowed upon him by Lady Constantine—he no longer dreams of the heavens and scientific glory, but only of his new love, Viviette. As he tells her, "Your eyes are to be my stars for the future" (95). Swithin, at this point, seems willing to sacrifice his very sight for a woman—much as Núñez is asked to do in H. G. Wells' "The Country of the Blind" (1904). The question is, will Swithin pay such a heavy price or ultimately decide, as Núñez does, that a good woman is not a sufficient reward for voluntary blindness? Hardy leaves little doubt as to his answer: "The alchemy which thus transmuted an abstracted astronomer into an eager lover—and, must it be said? spoilt a promising young physicist to produce a commonplace innamorato—may be almost described as working its change in one short night" (92). Though Hardy is prepared to narrate the course of Viviette and Swithin's love, he makes it clear that he doesn't particularly approve of all their romantic nonsense. In this respect, the narrator of *Two on a Tower* closely resembles Dr. Jocelyn St. Cleve, a misogynistic great uncle of Swithin's.

In a Dickensian twist, Swithin learns, on the morning of his clandestine marriage to Lady Constantine, that a great

uncle he never met has left him a bequest—upon certain conditions of course. Swithin is to receive £600 a year for life provided he not marry before the age of twenty-five; the annuity, which would begin when Swithin turns twenty-one, was intended to advance Swithin's fledgling scientific career, about which Jocelyn St. Cleve had heard promising things. But Dr. St. Cleve has also learned, after sending a "trusty friend" to investigate his great nephew, that "there was something in [his] path worse than narrow means, and that that something was a woman" (121). The life-long bachelor Dr. St. Cleve, in a letter sent to Swithin by the dead man's solicitor, counsels Swithin from the grave: "If your studies are to be worth anything, believe me they must be carried on without the help of a woman. Avoid her, and every one of the sex, if you mean to achieve any worthy thing" (121). Much of the letter continues on in the same vein; what is most interesting, perhaps, is not the attitude itself, but how closely it coincides with the narrative point of view. Indeed, certain of Jocelyn St. Cleve's warnings have already come to pass—lending credibility to his position—by the time Swithin reads the letter: "Your wide heaven of study, young man, will soon reduce itself to the miserable narrow expanse of her face, and your myriad of stars to her two trumpery eyes. An experienced woman waking a young man's passions just at a moment when he is endeavouring to shine intellectually is doing little less than committing a crime" (122).

For better or for worse, Jocelyn St. Cleve's letter reaches Swithin too late to influence him in thought or deed. Swithin and Viviette have decided to marry, largely because Swithin's desperate passion for Viviette has rendered him impotent as a scientist: "I can do nothing! I have ceased to study, ceased to observe. The equatorial is useless to me. This longing I have for you absorbs my life, and outweighs my intentions. The power to labour in the grandest of fields has left me" (99). Both Swithin and Lady Constantine view their secret marriage, then, as an expedient, a means to enable Swithin to refocus upon "the grandest of fields," for they also agree that, for the time being, their marriage shall make no outward difference in their lives. Their decision says less, perhaps, about the damping effect of marriage upon romantic passion than about the perturbing effect of unfulfilled sexual desire. Presumably once Swithin "possesses" Viviette his blood will cool to the point where he can resume his more dispassionate study of the stars; the unspoken implication is that marriage will properly restore Swithin's priorities, his rededication to "the grandest of fields" eclipsing his earthly love.

Certainly the conflict between "purposive masculine activity and distracting feminine emotion," as J. I. M. Stewart describes it (157), did not originate with Hardy, nor was *Two on a Tower* the first or last time this conflict appears in Hardy. But never before, or after, did Hardy's narrative labor so one-sidedly on behalf of "purposive masculine activity." It is one thing for Clym Yeobright's or Jude Fawley's studies to be stymied by a bewitching woman, but neither Clym nor Jude demonstrated any genuine scientific ability. Swithin St. Cleve

would appear to be a special case¹; Hardy perhaps felt a special kinship with a field that validated, *scientifically*, what he was at pains to convey through less empirical means: "The simple fact is that the vastness of the field of astronomy reduces every terrestrial thing to atomic dimensions" (221). Helping readers to absorb the implications of these proportions—which all of the "grander" fields, not only astronomy, teach—was something of a desideratum for Hardy.

Although the narrative in *Two on a Tower* looks askance at the meddling of women in "purposive masculine activity," Viviette Constantine is not an unsympathetic character. Indeed, F. B. Pinion describes her as "perhaps the most attractive . . . of Hardy's heroines" (49). A major reason for this is her sincere interest in advancing Swithin's career—which necessarily entails deciding what her own role in his life should be. Initially, Lady Constantine struggles to find, or forge, a *via media*, one which allows her to assist the young astronomer while at the same time endearing herself to him. With this in mind, she buys Swithin an equatorial, an expensive object lens that would be invaluable to his observations; the gift might also, of course, effect other, more earthly benefits (from Lady Constantine's point of view), but we are given little reason to doubt Lady Constantine's genuine, if patronizing, interest in Swithin's career: "The possibility of that young astronomer becoming a renowned scientist by her aid was a thought which gave her secret pleasure. The course of rendering him instant material help began to have a great fascination for her: it was a new and unexpected channel for her cribbed and confined emotions" (50). Hardy seems perfectly willing to accept that a struggling scientist may require a patron or helpmate, a role that a woman who knows her place can adequately fill. However, to aspire any higher, to compete with science for first place in this scientist's heart, would signify, from the point of view of the narrative, regrettable presumption.

As we have seen, Hardy manages to maintain sympathy for Viviette even when she agrees to marry Swithin by arranging events so that her acceptance of him, while completing her own happiness, also promises to remedy the more serious matter of Swithin's inability to apply himself to his work. Later, however, Viviette is confronted with a situation that forces her to choose between personal happiness and scientific progress. Shortly after her "marriage" to Swithin, Viviette learns that her husband actually died months later than thought and in a much different manner than was first reported; since Sir Blount Constantine was still alive when Viviette and Swithin marry (the "accidental polygamy" alluded to in the blurb), their marriage is invalid. On top of this, Lady Constantine inadvertently finds out about the bequest that Jocelyn St. Cleve left to his great nephew—she learns in other words, that she, who has very little money herself, is the only obstacle between Swithin and an inheritance that could propel him, literally and metaphorically, to the stars. What course Viviette now takes will determine whether she deserves the title of heroine.

¹Though Hardy was no astronomer, he did, as Suleiman M. Ahmad notes in his introduction to the edition of *Two on a Tower* cited above, some serious

research before beginning to write. Hardy even made a visit to the Royal Observatory at Greenwich (xix).

Though she struggles with her decision, Viviette never doubts that releasing Swithin to collect his annuity and survey the Southern constellations is the right thing to do. Her love for him and his avowed love for her seem to carry little weight ultimately; what matters most—and here one suspects that narrative biases force Viviette's hand—is “mankind at large”:

By the extraordinary favour of a unique accident she had now an opportunity of redeeming Swithin's seriously compromised future, and restoring him to a state no worse than his first. His annuity could be enjoyed by him, his travels undertaken, his studies pursued, his high vocation initiated, by one little sacrifice—that of herself. She only had to refuse to legalize their marriage, to part from him for ever, and all would be well with him thenceforward. . . . He wished to examine the Southern heavens—perhaps his uncle's letter was the father of the wish—and there was no telling what good might not result to mankind at large from his exploits there. (230)

This is particularly ironic given that Viviette's husband, Sir Blunt Constantine, abandoned her to indulge his “mania for African lion-hunting which he dignified by calling a scheme of geographical discovery” (27). Apparently “geographical study”—even if only a cover for more insidious adventures—does not rate with examining the Southern heavens in its potential for benefiting mankind; yet what those benefits might possibly be remains nebulous.

Ultimately, then, not only do the narrator and Jocelyn St. Cleve lament the intervention of a woman between Swithin and “the grandest of fields,” but so too does the woman herself. Lady Constantine even acknowledges the justice of Jocelyn St. Cleve's harsh pronouncements on the virtually criminal nature of her Eve-like “seduction” of the guileless Swithin: “There succeeded a feeling in comparison with which resentment and mortification are happy moods—a miserable conviction that this old man who spoke from the grave was not altogether wrong in his speaking, that he was, perhaps, virtually right” (228). Although Swithin's promise as a scientist is not the only reason Lady Constantine decides that she must let him go—she especially worries that the nine years difference in their ages will someday cause Swithin to resent an attachment to her—it is his scientific ability, something that attracted her to him in the first place, that settles the issue. Thus, with Lady Constantine's resolve, no one is left to challenge the notion that science matters more than love between mere humans.

Like Sir Blount before him, Swithin leaves Viviette to seek his fame, or the means to it, in Africa (Swithin spends most of the more than three years he is away from England at an observatory in Cape Town). His departure from England, and Viviette, gives proof to the old adage “out of sight, out of mind”: “Whoever may deplore it, few will wonder that Viviette, who till then had stood high in his heaven, if she had not dominated it, sank, like the North Star, lower and lower

with his retreat southward” (262). One would expect that the normally chivalrous Hardy might betray some indication of deploring it—deploring, if not Swithin's “rally,” then at least Viviette's lonely fate. Although he does not stint in his praise of Lady Constantine's selflessness, Hardy seems to approve the decision that she (with little objection from Swithin) makes. The greatest good for the greatest number approximates the sort of utilitarian ethic to which Viviette is offered up.

It is instructive to consider, if only briefly, this complex dynamic in Freudian terms. In *Civilization and Its Discontents* Freud argued:

Women represent the interests of the family and sexual life. The work of civilization has become increasingly the business of men, it confronts them with ever more difficult tasks and compels them to carry out instinctual sublimations of which women are little capable. Since a man does not have unlimited quantities of psychical energy at his disposal, he has to accomplish his tasks by making an expedient distribution of his libido. (59)

In the early, uncomplicated phases of their relationship, Swithin asks Viviette, “But can I not study and love both?” Her reply bespeaks not only her wider experience, but also, perhaps, a presentiment about what lies ahead: “I hope so—I earnestly hope so. But you'll be the first if you do—” (96). When Swithin discovers that, at least in this regard, he will not distinguish himself from other men, Viviette herself must decide. By privileging “the work of civilization” over “the family and sexual life,” Viviette Constantine accomplishes an historic feat: she breaks the Freudian deadlock simply by yielding to the supposedly higher claim of the male. Hardy characterizes her act in heroic, historic terms: “Love between man and woman, which in Homer, Moses, and other early exhibitors of life, is mere desire, had for centuries past so far broadened as to include sympathy and friendship; surely it should in this advanced stage of the world include benevolence also. If so, it was her duty to set the young man free” (230-31). Viviette sets Swithin free, then, to do “the work of civilization”; one can imagine Kipling and Hemingway—perhaps even Freud himself—nodding their approval.

However, Viviette's magnanimity immediately shrinks when she discovers, shortly after Swithin departs, that she is pregnant. As Hardy puts it, “Her altruism in subjecting her self-love to benevolence, and letting Swithin go away from her, was demolished by the new necessity, as if it had been a gossamer web” (244). But as fate or chance would have it, Viviette's desperate letters fail to reach Swithin—or, to invoke, as Hardy did, *The Odyssey*, Swithin has sailed out of reach of the Siren's call. Thanks to his great-uncle's annuity, Swithin settles in Cape Town to study “strange-eyed constellations,”² while Viviette saves appearances by marrying the Bishop of Melchester, who had been pursuing her for several months. As happens so often in Hardy, “the woman

pays”—pays not only for her own indiscretion or mistake, but for those of others as well. Yet, despite Swithin's role in engendering Viviette's desperate plight, no blame on the narrator's or Viviette's part undercuts his lofty stature. Much as the importance of Aeneas's mission justifies his treatment of Dido, so the necessity of scientific progress excuses Swithin from giving much thought to his would-be wife and new-born child. Years later, a few months before the time when Swithin could marry without sacrificing his annuity, he learns that the Bishop has died, and we learn just how hopeless is Viviette's enduring love for Swithin: “women were now no more to him than the inhabitants of Jupiter” (270). Though somewhat ambiguous as applied to an astronomer, the statement underscores just what a jealous mistress science is—and that, emotionally as well as physically, Viviette and Swithin are worlds apart.

When Swithin finally does return to England, it is not to redeem his promise to Viviette to marry her when he turns twenty-five, but rather to consummate his years of labor: “The materials for his great treatise were collected and it now only remained for him to arrange, digest, and publish them, for which purpose a return to England was indispensable” (271). A kind of stellar imperialist, Swithin plunders the southern skies and, laden with booty, returns home to “cash in.” Nor does it seem to trouble him that the entire expedition has been bankrolled by a man who regarded women as dangerous beings, as the Scylla and Charybdis of which ambitious men must steer clear. Presumably a man who has his sights set on the stars—or, more generally, the work of civilization—can be excused for his blindness to more mundane realities.

Although Swithin no longer loves Viviette—as she immediately perceives when they finally meet—it is now Swithin's turn to act selflessly, and he asks her to marry him despite his own desires. But it seems that everything conspires to prevent the legal union of Swithin and Viviette; in this case, Hardy himself contrives an incredible, gratuitously cruel obstacle: the death of Viviette. Apparently a woman in her mid-thirties cannot withstand the stress of hearing good news: “Sudden joy after despair had touched an overstrained heart too smartly. Viviette was dead.” (281). While this maneuver brings the novel to a rather hasty close, it also lets Swithin off the hook. He has done the honorable thing by asking Viviette to marry him, but her death means that he will not be saddled with a middle-aged woman he does not love, and who, worst of all, might have interfered with his work.

In fact, by the time Swithin finally asks Viviette to marry him, he has already acquired the helpmate who will assist him with his work without exacting, at least in the short term, too large a portion of his limited “psychical energy.” Tabitha Lark is a pretty young woman who had aroused Lady Constantine's jealousy even before she had secured Swithin:

somehow it was very charming to talk to Miss Lark; and by degrees St. Cleve informed Tabitha of his great undertaking,

ing, and of the voluminous notes he had amassed, which would require so much rearrangement and re-copying by an amanuensis as to absolutely appal him. He greatly feared he should not get one careful enough for such scientific matter, whereupon Tabitha said she would be delighted to do it for him. Then blushing and declaring suddenly that it had grown quite late she left him and the garden for her relation's house hard by. (275)

In Tabitha, it seems, Swithin has found a woman who knows her place, who humbly accepts a sublunary role. Whether Tabitha Lark poses a long-term threat to Swithin's work or not, the novel ends with only the hint of a cloud obstructing Swithin's ascent to the stars.

My contention that *Two on a Tower* subordinates romantic love to the prerogatives of science—or, what is more, that the novel portrays women as impediments to what Freud termed “the work of civilization”—is at odds with most interpretations of the novel, including Hardy's own. In his 1895 preface to *Two on a Tower*, Hardy claimed: “This slightly-built romance was the outcome of a wish to set the emotional history of two infinitesimal lives against the stupendous background of the stellar universe, and to impart to readers the sentiment that of these contrasting magnitudes the smaller might be the greater to them as men” (3). Most critics have shared this view of the novel.³ But who mourns Viviette's death? Who regrets or questions Swithin's virtual abandonment of Viviette to pursue his stary dreams? Viviette dies of joy, and Swithin, we have little doubt, will gratefully reset his sights upon “the stellar universe.”

The last line of the novel, which follows immediately after the revelation of Viviette's death, reads, “The Bishop was avenged” (281). This undoubtedly refers to the Bishop's discovery that Lady Constantine agreed to marry him simply because, as she confessed to her brother, “[she had] physical reasons for being any man's wife . . .” (253); indeed, the child she eventually bore, reputed to be the Bishop's, was a “seven-months' baby.” Perhaps the Bishop was “avenged” by Viviette's death, but the line applies equally to Jocelyn St. Cleve, Swithin's great uncle. It was he who had warned Swithin years earlier:

If your studies are to be worth anything, believe me they must be carried on without the help of a woman. Avoid her, and every one of the sex, if you mean to achieve any worthy thing. Eschew all of that sort for many a year yet. Moreover, I say, the lady of your acquaintance avoid in particular. . . . Women's brains are not formed for assisting at any profound science: they lack the power to see things except in the concrete. (121-22)

The Bishop, then, is not the only man avenged by Viviette's death.

²The phrase “strange-eyed constellations” appears, of course, in Hardy's poem “Drummer Hodge” (1899); see *Complete Poems* (90-91).

³See, for example, Taylor. He asserts: “Despite Swithin's devotion to stellar grandeur and to science it is . . . the ‘lamentably human’ values that triumph, at least temporarily, as man's will and his charity transcend the forces of dark-

ness and the enthralling powers of the universe. The novel celebrates a turning away from external nature and back to human sympathies” (145-46).

Works Cited

- Boumelha, Penny. *Thomas Hardy and Women*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1982.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. 1930. New York: Norton, 1989.
- Hardy, Thomas. *Complete Poems*. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- _____. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. 1891. New York: Penguin Classics, 1985.
- _____. *Two on a Tower*. 1882. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

- Morgan, Rosemarie. *Women and Sexuality in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Pinion, F. B. *Hardy the Writer*. New York: St. Martin's, 1990.
- Stewart, J. I. M. *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Biography*. London: Longman, 1971.
- Taylor, Richard H. *The Neglected Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1982.

University of Kansas

"A Sign-Seeker" and "Cleon": Hardy's Argument with Browning

James Persoon

Though Thomas Hardy was a personal friend of Robert Browning and admired much of his poetry greatly, the optimism he read in Browning completely baffled him:

The longer I live the more does B's character seem *the* literary puzzle of the 19th century. How could smug Christian optimism worthy of a dissenting greengrocer find a place inside a man who was so vast a seer & feeler when on neutral ground? (qtd. in Millgate 409)

"Smug" is a treacherous word in Hardy's formulation; its lack of empathy in a man notoriously empathic invites our attention. So does the label "optimism" from a man who himself was routinely labeled a pessimist and hated it.

Hardy was steeped in Browning. He owned at least four editions of Browning's poetry, read him throughout his life, alluded to him freely (quoting from "The Statue and the Bust," for example, in seven separate works), and even saved reviews of his poetry. But in those reviews the passages which Hardy marked are those critical of his friend. In the *New York Times Book Review* for 23 March 1924, stuck in Hardy's well-marked 1897 edition of the older poet, is a review by Dorset native Llewellyn Powys of Browning that continues Hardy's disparaging food metaphor:

It was not for nothing that he was descended from the butler of Sir John Bankes of Corfe Castle. For there is something unmistakably gross, something that might well have had its origin in a well-stored buttery, about his attitude to life. He appears in the light of God's highly favored caterer who is always ready to declare that nothing is much amiss below the high table.

And in the introduction to Browning in his copy of *The English Poets* Hardy marks this criticism of Browning's thought:

His processes of thought are often scientific in their precision of analysis; the sudden conclusion which he imposes upon them is transcendental and inept.¹

Thus we have Browning the ineptly transcendental caterer. Hardy may have focused on this sort of criticism of Browning, and even uttered it himself, in part as an obvious defense against the charges of pessimism that had so long plagued him. He could line up critics on his side of the optimism-pessimism tug-of-war. But his exasperation with Browning had a deeper purpose than to distance himself from his own critics. Browning's poetry, in Hardy's readings and misreadings, attacked a central point of self-definition for Hardy, his life-long attempt to reconcile what for him were the antipodal absolutes of religion and reality. To this quintessentially Victorian problem (treated as a commonplace in the introduction to Browning which Hardy was reading, called there the conflict between religion and scientific criticism or between Faith and Doubt), Hardy had an uneasy resolution; he defined himself as a "churchy agnostic,"² who hoped for the best while playing the surer game of preparing for the worst. What Hardy saw when he took his full look at the worst was, in an 1889 entry from his notebook that the human race is too extremely developed for its corporeal conditions, the nerves being evolved to an activity abnormal in such an environment" (*Life* 227). Hardy questioned if Nature, "when she crossed the line from invertebrates to vertebrates, did not exceed her mission." That is, the human race has too much mind for its

body, too much mind to fit it comfortably in a material world. Hardy's examination of Nature is structured similarly to the argument Browning's Cleon makes in the monologue named for him. This monologue Hardy had imitated in "In St Paul's a While Ago."

Cleon, a late-classical poet-philosopher, replies to a letter from King Protus, who has asked the poet if he fears death less than other men since a poet's life "stays in the poems men shall sing" while a king's dies with his "brain and arm" (ll. 170, 173). Cleon's answer is no. Like Hardy, he examines man's evolutionary progress: "Why stay we on the earth unless to grow?" (114). And like Hardy, he concludes that evolutionary growth is ultimately Nature's mistake. Arguing that the great evolution ultimately amounts to nothing, Cleon answers Protus bitterly:

Thou diest while I survive?
Say rather that my fate is deadlier still,
In this, that every day my sense of joy
Grows more acute, my soul (intensified
By power and insight) more enlarged, more keen;
While every day my hairs fall more and more.
My hand shakes, and the heavy years increase—
(ll. 308-14)

The growth of man's faculties leads finally to the disappointment of death, a disappointment made only worse by the increase in power and insight. Cleon seeks visible evidence:

—where is the sign? I ask,
And get no answer. . . . (ll. 268-69)

He gets no answer, he concludes, because "Zeus has not yet revealed it" (l. 334). Browning ends his poem ironically, with Cleon, who desires a revelation to prove that death is not final, in the last line dismissing certain barbarians, Paulus and Christus, whose "doctrine could be held by no sane man" (l. 353).

Hardy's poem "A Sign-Seeker," published forty years after "Cleon," is most often linked with Tennyson. There are dozens of verbal echoes from "Locksley Hall" and *In Memoriam*, and the rhyme scheme and even the printing of the lines mimic the latter poem. Hardy appears to be employing a Tennysonian vocabulary and form to dispute *In Memoriam*'s central argument.

Because the links to Tennyson are so clear, the ways in which Browning also stands behind Hardy's poem have not been noticed. In "A Sign-Seeker" Hardy places his speaker in the position of Cleon, a watcher looking for some visible sign of something beyond this life. Each of the first five stanzas of Hardy's poem begins with an act of watching:

I mark the months in liveries dank and dry,
The noontides many-shaped and hued;
I see the nightfall shades subtrude,
And hear the monotonous hours clang negligently by.

I view the evening bonfires of the sun
On hills where morning rains have hissed;
The eyeless countenance of the mist

Pallidly rising when the summer droughts are done.

I have seen the lightning-blade, the leaping star,
The cauldrons of the sea in storm,
Have felt the earthquake's lifting arm,
And trodden where abysmal fires and snow-cones arc.

I learn to prophesy the hid eclipse,
The coming of eccentric orbs;
To mete the dust the sky absorbs,
To weigh the sun, and fix the hour each planet dips.

I witness fellow earth-men surge and strive;
Assemblies meet, and throb, and part;
Death's sudden finger, sorrow's smart;
—All the vast various moils that mean a world alive.

Against a backdrop of "evening bonfires of the sun," stars leap, rains hiss, mists rise. Into this chaotically alive world, science intrudes to try to impose an order—"weigh the sun, and fix the hour each planet dips." One of the more curious sources for these images is Browning's "A Grammarian's Funeral":

Here's his place, where meteors shoot, clouds form,
Lightning's are loosened,
Stars come and go! (ll. 141-43)

Hardy uses Browning's images in his own poem to suggest that the vast world which science and Tennyson try to reduce (by different means, of course) is, like the Grammarian's mind, a spiritual place, to be wondered at.

In subsequent stanzas of "A Sign-Seeker" what the speaker most wants sight of is not "all vast various moils that mean a world alive" but rather

Those sights of which old prophets tell,
Those signs the general word so well
As vouchsafed their unheed, denied my long suspense.
(ll. 22-24)

Not trusting the words of the general mob, the speaker wants

To glimpse a phantom parent, friend,
Wearing his smile, and 'Not the end!'
Outbreathing softly: that were blest enlightenment.
(ll. 26-28)

In Hardy's brand of churchy agnosticism, enlightenment is "blest" when it comes not from the revelation of the prophets but rather from optical proofs—a phantom here—through which the ultimate chaos of dying is contradicted. Phantoms have entered this poem earlier, in the second stanza, where the mist, imaged with an "eyeless countenance," suggests the blind face of the spirit presences in the world, forecasting the unlikelihood of proving transcendence with visual proofs.

In the last stanzas of "A Sign-Seeker," Hardy most explicitly denies that eyes, as blank as the face of the mist, can find proof for immortality. He does so in words strongly reminiscent of *In Memoriam*:

¹Hardy's copy in the Dorset County Museum is marked by this passage. As so many others have done before, I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of R. N. R. Peers, Curator of the Hardy Collection.

²Even Hardy further quotes Hardy commenting on his walks to Stinsford churchyard: "I believe in going to church. It is a moral drill, and people must have something" (306).

—There are who, rapt to heights of trancelike trust,
 These tokens claim to feel and see,
 Read radiant hints of times to be—
 Of heart to heart returning after dust to dust. (ll. 37-40)

Physical signs—seeing the face, feeling the pressure of a hand—are, in Hardy's reading, the foundation of Tennyson's trust in something better. Hardy mocks the realness of any touch Tennyson might have felt by asking that any "dead Love" of his "leave some print to prove her spirit-kisses real" (l. 32). Hardy's "heart to heart returning after dust to dust" (l. 40) parodies Tennyson's stanza CXVI, "the life re-orient out of dust." Earlier in his poem he has given us a different vision of what becomes of dust, when the speaker says he has learned "to mete the dust the sky absorbs" (l. 15). Rather than the dust of man re-orienting into new life, dust here is measured as it is absorbed into the sky, and the measurement does not reveal Hardy's sky to be Tennyson's Heaven. The dust rising is suggestive of the blank mist "[p]allidly rising," not to an afterlife but rather for a reason explainable in purely pragmatic terms: "the summer droughts are done" (l. 8).

Hardy rejects his Tennysonian stanza, however, with a line that owes more to Browning in its colloquialness and inversion—"Such scope is granted not to lives like mine . . ." (l. 41). There is a faint echo here of the argument of *The Ring and the Book*, that art will yield truth, "to mouths like mine" (XII, 840). "For," as Browning asks, "how else know we save by worth of word" (l. 828)? The word will "mean beyond the facts," even "suffice the eye" (XII, 862-63). But for Hardy, the eye is not satisfied by visions nor the ear by language. There is no meaning beyond the facts, and the facts in "A Sign-Seeker" are grim:

I have laid in dead men's beds, have walked
 The tombs of those with whom I had talked,
 Called many a gone and goodly one to shape a sign,

And panted for response. But none replies;
 No warnings loom, nor whisperings
 To open out my limitings,
 And Nescience mutely muses: When a man falls he lies.
 (ll. 42-48)

Nescience, a word not common to many poetic vocabularies, was a part of Browning's. He used it in "La Saisaiz," to a quite different purpose from Hardy, momentarily re forging a belief in God and soul:

Living here means nescience simply: 'tis next life that
 helps to learn.
 Shut those eyes, next life will open . . . (ll. 469-70)

Where Browning images the possibility that when our eyes shut the next life opens, Hardy, unwilling to shut his eyes, panting for response, confronts Nescience, which does not "open out" his limitations, or the limits of the physical world. The personification is characteristically his, occupying the same place as God, who to Hardy was another personification. Hardy, like Cleon, seeks a sign, and receiving none, ends his poem with Cleon's doctrine of death. Cleon's "I . . . sleep in

my urn" (ll. 321-23) is not very far from Hardy's "when a man falls he lies." That is knowledge to face up to.

In a patronizing comment about Browning, Hardy praised his own courage in facing up to this knowledge:

Imagine you have to walk [a] chalk line drawn across an open down. Browning walked it, knowing no more. But a yard to the left of the same line the down is cut by a vertical cliff five hundred feet deep. I know it is there, but walk the line just the same. (qtd. in Millgate 409)

Again the issue of vision is crucial. Browning's vision, in religious matters, was to Hardy as narrowly limited as that chalk line.

Despite his certainty in dismissing what he read in Browning as optimism, Hardy was never skeptical when it came to the possibility of actually sighting a ghost. His photographer-friend and motoring companion Hermann Lea was emphatic on this point: "Very often this subject cropped up between us, for we were both interested—as who is not?—in the Great Future . . . He was always sympathetic and free from scepticism" (30). In a conversation with William Archer, Hardy made the offer to give up ten years of his life "to see a ghost—an authentic, indubitable spectre" (45). This was not an isolated wish. By Hardy's later years its wording had become as formulaic as a litany, as here recalled again by Lea:

Once, I remember, we dwelt on the subject of spiritualism and the possibilities of individuals "seeing ghosts," and I recollect him saying to me, "I have always wanted to see a ghost: I am receptive and by no means sceptical. I would willingly concede ten years of my life if I could see any supernatural thing that could be proved to me to exist by any means within my capacity. (30)

The "capacity" through which Hardy would allow proof that a ghost was "authentic" and "indubitable" was of course the chief organ of the previous century's empiricists, sight.

This emphasis on sight as final proof of transcendence is evident in Hardy's most direct formulation on the subject of the ultimate purpose of life:

I have been looking for God for 50 years, and I think that if he had existed I should have discovered him. As an external personality of course—the only true meaning of the word. (qtd. in Millgate 234)

Hardy has been "looking"; he's always wanted to "see" a ghost, or, here, God, or even just the oxen kneeling on Christmas eve—some sign. A question one might ask is why he so insisted on seeing a ghost when any reader of his poetry would everywhere find him seeing ghosts—in the imprint of long-dead worshipers in church pews and stone steps, of hands on thresholds and stair-railings, of fingers that once played the strings of a violin, of his first wife Emma's shadow in their garden or in scenes he revisited after her death. Metaphorically speaking, ghosts were obviously and everywhere visible to Hardy. But Hardy remained firmly fixed in the stance of Cleon. To possess a literal sign of transcendence would be to possess the most intensely wished for and per-

petually unlocatable quality in Hardy's universe, and prove life *not* a "trick of Nature on the vertebrates."

Though Hardy never got a sign to his satisfaction, one eye was always firmly fixed on the place where heaven was supposed to be. The insistence that heaven be a place and that it be proved empirically—"I have always wanted to see a ghost"—left heaven unproved and Hardy unconvinced, and insured that "A Sign-Seeker" would end with the attitude of Cleon rather than the irony of Browning.

And yet Hardy and Browning share important similarities. One is the nature of the questions their poetry asks. Even though Hardy made sure to have his own way with the famous lines Browning gave Pippa by having Angel Clare reverse them ("God's *not* in His heaven; all's *wrong* with the world!"), the reason they needed reversing was that Browning had pronounced on the same issue that Hardy cared about. Roy Gridley moderates the conflict between the two men by suggesting that "Hardy was not the profound pessimist many of his contemporaries thought him to be; nor was Browning the easy optimist Hardy sometimes took him for" (168). He points to the way Hardy used Browning to sustain himself in two dark periods: during World War I, re-reading the robust assertions of faith of *Asolando*, and on his deathbed having all of "Rabbi Ben Ezra" read to him. Perhaps the "optimism" did not always appear so "smug." Tom Paulin argues that Hardy saw himself, Browning, and Shakespeare in that group of artists who on the outside appear to live a commonplace life but who actually possess visionary powers (108-11). That is an important identity. By it, imagination and ordinariness are linked, and so are Hardy and Browning.

One of their links is that they are poets who believed in being visionaries, "seers," despite outward appearances. Hardy certainly gives that title to Browning, even in his pejorative lines—Browning the green grocer is a "vast seer" when on other than religious grounds. They ask similar questions, but since their conclusions are so often at odds, it is in some ways understandable that they picked up those opposite and unhelpful labels optimist and pessimist.

Or more accurately, Hardy appears less the pessimist and more truly the agnostic he always claimed to be. One can see this clearly by comparing *Asolando*, which Hardy read during the Great War, and Hardy's own poem from those dark years, the opening poem to his 1917 volume, "Moments of Vision." In *Asolando*'s "Prologue" Browning has returned in the last year of his life to the Italian village of Asolo and is initially surprised to find that "now a flower is just a flower: / Man, bird, beast are but beast, bird, man." In his youth he knelt before the natural world of Asolo as Moses in awe of the burning bush, but now he questions where the terror, power, beauty, glory have gone:

And now? The lambent flame is—where?

Italia's rare
 O'er-running beauty crowds the eye—
 But flame? The Bush is bare. ("Prologue" 31-35)

In the nine stanzas of the "Prologue" Browning asks nine questions, and each time he answers his question. The last line of the "Prologue" responds to all of the preceding ques-

tions when the speaker turns away from his eyes to his "purged ear" for an answer and hears a commanding voice assert "God is it who transcends" (l. 45). Hardy's "Moments of Vision" is also a questioning poem, but in contrast to *Asolando*, the questions are not answered. They end their stanzas rather than begin them. In the final stanza Hardy uses the same interrogative as Browning:

Yea, that strange mirror
 May catch his last thoughts, whole life foul or fair
 Glassing it—where?

Thus "Moments of Vision" ends with us looking for the location of the afterlife and finding our vision multifracted and slow, unable to follow the glancing, splitting light disappearing off the mirror. Where Browning uses "where" as the beginning to an answer, for Hardy the word serves as the incomplete and untraceable moment of ending.

The willingness of Browning and Hardy to ask similar questions in similar frames is a strong link between them, one that would guarantee the younger poet's lifelong fascination with the older. Browning's answers, and his willingness to answer, are where they part company, each getting pushed over a line, Hardy to the label pessimism, Browning to optimism. Hardy, that churchy agnostic and juggler of necessary incompatibles, was willing to draw that chalk line to label Browning, even as he himself hated to be labeled. But he also, the evidence shows, continued to read Browning until he could no longer read.

Works Cited

- Archer, William. *Real Conversations*. London: Heinemann, 1904.
 Browning, Robert. *Robert Browning: The Poems*. Ed. John Pettigrew and Thomas J. Collins. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
The English Poets. Vol. IV. Ed. Thomas Humphrey Ward. London: Macmillan, 1895.
 Gridley, Roy. *Browning*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
 Hardy, Evelyn. *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Biography*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1954.
 Hardy, Thomas. *The Complete Poems*. Ed. James Gibson. London: Macmillan, 1976.
 ———. *The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Michael Millgate. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1985.
 Lea, Hermann. *Thomas Hardy: Through the Camera's Eye*. Beaminster, Dorset: Toucan P, 1964.
 Millgate, Michael. *Thomas Hardy: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
 Paulin, Tom. *Thomas Hardy: The Poetry of Perception*. London: Macmillan, 1975.
 Tennyson, Alfred Lord. *In Memoriam*. 1850. Ed. Robert Ross. New York: Norton, 1973.

"A Warning to the Curious": Victorian Science and the Awful Unconscious in M. R. James's Ghost Stories

Brian Cowlshaw

M. R. James, who published four collections of ghost stories between 1904 and 1925,¹ was "the perfect embodiment of a successful post-Victorian man of letters" (Sullivan 73): he was a graduate fellow, museum director, and finally Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, as well as a respected medievalist and biblical scholar. The standard critical approach to his stories has been to focus upon the "man of letters"—to seek the sources of the historical and archaeological details that crowd his ghost stories in his academic/antiquarian occupations.² That this should be the *standard* approach is a bit strange, though, considering James's own assertions that the stories are definitely not "based on my own experience" (*Stories* 5), that both the settings and the legends attaching to them are mostly imaginary, and that "the fragments of ostensible erudition which are scattered about my pages" are almost completely "pure invention" (5-6). Authors' statements about their work cannot always be trusted, but statements as direct as these should be taken more seriously than they have been.

One more fruitful approach to his stories can be found in the *first* half of Jack Sullivan's characterization: James as "post-Victorian." James might accurately say of himself the words he gives the narrator of "A Neighbour's Landmark": "Remember, if you please . . . that I am a Victorian by birth and education, and that the Victorian tree may not unreasonably be expected to bear Victorian fruit" (*Stories* 289). James was born in 1862, only twenty-five years into Victoria's sixty-four-year reign, and he graduated from Cambridge in 1886. His roots, then, are solidly Victorian, as is his "fruit," his stories.

From this point of view, the stories prove quite revealing. What they reveal is a particularly Victorian set of assumptions about history, historical records, evolution, and human civilization that closely resembles Sigmund Freud's, but that seeks to bury what Freud seeks to uncover and decode. That is: James's stories reproduce Victorian reconstructive science's³ assumption that history and civilization are readable, though generally only with difficulty and with uncertainty as to results. James also reproduces the Victorian doctrine of evolution—that *homo sapiens* descended from simpler organisms, some of which still survive in the present in primitive, unevolved form. In James's stories, as in Victorian reconstructive science, human existence can be conceived of in levels of development or civilization, with the most

"civilized" and recent level lying nearest the top (in terms of both quality and accessibility). Earlier, lower, more "savage" levels survive below; one cannot ordinarily see them, but with the right kind of "digging" one can locate, reconstruct, and read them. James's conception of human civilization, borrowed from influential Victorian scientists, thus closely resembles Freud's. In effect, then, if not in intention, when James reproduces in his stories the views of Victorian reconstructive science, he is writing about what Freud would call "the unconscious." However, James differs radically from Freud in his attitude toward the unconscious. Whereas the Victorians and Freud saw the unearthing and reading of the past "as an important practical guide to the understanding of the present and the shaping of the future" (Tylor 1:24), James's stories suggest that the reading of the past is actually dangerous—that to unearth the savage past is to summon it to the more civilized present, with frightening, destructive results. Whereas Freud sought to read the unconscious much as Victorian scientists sought to read fossils, the geological record, and human cultures, James wants to keep the unconscious buried. Freud sought to relieve repression; James encourages it.

I. Reading the Past

In M. R. James's ghost stories, the past is always readable, if with difficulty. In this belief James follows the lead of Charles Lyell and Charles Darwin. Lyell, a very influential early-Victorian geologist,⁴ first published *Principles of Geology* in 1830. In that text, Lyell writes of "reading" the geological evidence; he envisions the world as a text, its fossils and geological formations being the "handwriting." His task as geologist is to interpret this handwriting accurately. But Lyell, "a student of Nature" recognizes he can at best become "acquainted only with one-tenth part of the processes *now* going on upon or far below the surface, or in the depths of the sea" (1:462, emphasis added), let alone the processes that occurred millennia ago. This renders all attempts to read the earth's distant past in the geological record sketchy and uncertain; geologists find themselves in much the same position as readers of human language "acquainted with just one-tenth part of the words of some living language," and then "presented with several books purporting to be written in the same tongue ten centuries ago" (1:

461). Provided with such a fragmented text, a geologist could easily "declare without hesitation that the ancient laws of nature have been subverted" (1:462)—and be completely wrong. Charles Darwin, too, employs Lyell's reading metaphor, in addition to echoing Lyell's warnings. In *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859, Darwin writes:

For my part, following out Lyell's metaphor, I look at the natural geological record, as a history of the world imperfectly kept, and written in a changing dialect; of this history we possess the last volume alone, relating only to two or three countries. Of this volume, only here and there a short chapter has been preserved; and of each page, only here and there a few lines. Each word of the slowly-changing language, in which the history is supposed to be written, being more or less different in the interrupted succession of chapters, may represent the apparently abruptly changed forms of life, entombed in our consecutive, but widely separated formations. (316)

With such fragmentary evidence to interpret, the geologist can gather a sense of the past, but can make no complete or certain readings. For Lyell and Darwin, then, the geological-historical record is readable but only with considerable difficulty and uncertainty.

James imbibes both elements of the Victorians' attitude toward the historical record: confidence in the possibility of reconstructing and reading the past, and caution that the results may not be complete or accurate. Like the narratives of Darwin and Lyell, James's ghost stories center around reconstruction of the past by means of the available evidence. The person performing this historical reconstruction generally does that sort of work habitually, being an amateur antiquary, an academic, or both. He (there are no female investigators in James's stories) sets out to reconstruct a history, usually of an old church or of another decrepit building. Often, significantly, this place of research is a site of ruins, suggestive perhaps of the Temple of Jupiter Serapis (see Lyell 1:449-59), which mysterious ruins Lyell used to illustrate his "reading" techniques. Or at any rate, ruins in James definitely indicate a long human history waiting to be read. Ruins provide a physical location for the act of reading human history, in much the same way geological formations provided a physical location for reconstructive scientists' acts of reading geological history. While investigating the history of the ruin or building, James's investigator accidentally discovers another, secret history; the piecing-together of this secret history is the focus of the story. His investigators connect evidence from physical artifacts with fragments of private letters and journals, published histories, reference books, parish records, and other official documents, to form the narrative of the secret history. Again, this method, piecing together narratives by means of physical evidence and written texts, was precisely that of Victorian scientists.⁵ Sometimes, in James's stories, part of the evidence is in

another language, generally Latin; or it is written in secret code. And finally, the stories are narrated in such a way that the reader must do some of the reconstructive work; James never provides a complete, confident, explicit explanation of events in the manner of, say, a Sherlock Holmes mystery. By coding some of the evidence and leaving histories more or less incomplete and implicit, James thus emphasizes the *difficulties* in reading history as much as the *possibility* of it.

An extended example should illustrate these generalizations. In "'Oh, Whistle, and I'll Come to You, My Lad,'" a "Professor of Ontography" (*Stories* 75), one Mr. Parkins, decides to find, examine, and sketch a ruined Templar church he has read about. Note Parkins's occupation, Professor of Ontography. No such position actually existed at an English university; the invented title suggests he studies what-writing-is, which indicates his investment in words, reading, writing, and investigation in general. At the site of the ruins, he sees among mysterious mounds and eminences a bare patch of earth, where the turf has been "removed by some boy or other creature *ferae naturae* [of a wild nature]" (79). (That James equates a boy with a wild creature is significant, as should be apparent in the second section of this essay.) Digging below the bare spot, Parkins finds "a small cavity" containing an object "of man's making—a metal tube about four inches long, and evidently of some considerable age" (79). This turns out to be a whistle, with inscriptions on front—

FLA
FUR BIS
FLE

and back:

QUIS EST ISTE QUI VENIT (81)

He translates the latter inscription to read, "Who is this who is coming?" It should be noted that the Latin word "iste," the word "this" in the translation, connotes disgust. Also, in Latin grammar, "quis" and "qui," "who," can refer either to a person or a creature; there is not the "who/that" distinction that exists in English. Parkins, however, never deciphers the meaning or significance of the four three-letter words. (Or are they even words?) Nor does he decipher the swastika-like symbols. (The story was written and is set a few decades before the advent of the Nazis.) Thus he is able to make only a partial reading of this artifact—just enough to gather a cryptic warning that something dreadful is coming.

In his curiosity, Parkins blows the whistle twice; that night he experiences all sorts of frights—fears he will die, nightmares, and awful sounds in the wind. In the morning he shows the whistle and its inscriptions, and relates his experiences, to a fellow lodger at his hotel, a Colonel just back from India. Putting together the written and physical evidence, the Colonel decides that Parkins's blowing the whistle has caused

¹The contents of these four volumes, plus the story "Wailing Wall," are collected in *The Penguin Complete Stories of M. R. James*, as well as in the Wordsworth Classics edition of *Collected Ghost Stories*. References in this essay are to the Penguin edition.

²In addition to Sullivan, see Pfaff, J. Randolph Cox, and Michael Cox.

³The "reconstructive sciences" included primarily biology, geology, and anthropology—branches of science which construct narratives accounting for the past out of available physical evidence.

⁴To give one index of Lyell's influence: Charles Dickens mentions Lyell in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, Chapter 22. La Fayette Kettle, an American, invites Martin Chuzzlewit to speak to the Young Men's Watertoast Association "upon the Tower of London," or, if he prefers, "upon the Elements of Geology" (363). *The Elements of Geology*, published in 1838, was a simplified recasting of the third volume of the *Principles*, cited here. Apparently the *Elements* was a book an American could expect an educated Englishman to know in 1843-44, when *Martin Chuzzlewit* was published.

⁵Lyell, for example, cites copious texts dating back hundreds of years as evidence of the geological conditions of various parts of Europe at those times, in addition to his analyses of physical evidence.

bad experiences, though the Colonel can't say exactly why or how that is so. He suspects the whistle's being found at a Templar ruin probably indicates some sort of evil magic: "he should himself be careful about using a thing that had belonged to a set of Papists, of whom, speaking generally, it might be affirmed that you never knew what they might not have been up to" (86). More specifically, the Templars, who some believe to be the precursory organization to the Freemasons (see Robinson and many, many others), have long figured in conspiracy theories both supernatural and secular. However, the Colonel can only suspect; he cannot reconstruct the entire history. Nor can he explain satisfactorily what happens to Parkins the next night: Parkins is attacked by "a horrible, an intensely horrible, face of crumpled linen" (90) that arises from his supposedly empty spare bed. The Colonel bursts in and saves Parkins, taking away the whistle, "which he cast[s] as far into the sea as a very brawny arm could send it" (90), returning the artifact back to the oblivion whence it came. The whistle seems to have summoned the mysterious creature, but no one—including the reader, who is only told as much as the Colonel—can determine exactly what the creature was, what its powers might be,⁶ why the whistle summons it, what the Templars have to do with the creature and the whistle, or what might have happened had Parkins blown the whistle once more.

Such methods and understandings of reconstructing history are typical of James's stories in general. James's characters and readers, like Victorian reconstructive scientists, can always draw connections between certain significant fragments of physical and written evidence, always construct some sense of what happened. However, no one can progress from there on to total explanation or to absolute certainty. And teleology—why certain events happen—generally remains shrouded in mystery, just as the teleology of the earth's or animals' evolution remained obscure to Darwin and Lyell.

II. Evolution and Civilization

M. R. James ghost stories also reproduce Victorian science's beliefs regarding evolution and human civilization. Specifically, the stories reveal the position first advanced by Robert Chambers and furthered later by Charles Darwin, that *homo sapiens* descended genealogically from simpler organisms. Also, one can see behind James's stories E. B. Tylor's (and, earlier, Darwin's) doctrine of survivals.

In *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, first published in 1844, Chambers placed all living creatures in a hierarchy: "The vegetable and animal kingdoms are arranged upon a scale, starting from simply organized forms, and going on to the more complex, each of these forms being but slightly different from those next to it on both sides" (236). Atop the scale in the animal kingdom is "man," for humans belong to the most complex "sub-kingdom" (239), the vertebrata; and human beings are the "typical" vertebrate—that is, the "best" of that type or sub-kingdom.

Chambers argued not only that humankind is the best representative of the best sub-kingdom, but also that humankind descended genealogically from the "lower animals": "[T]he simplest and most primitive type, under a law to which that of like-production is subordinate, gave birth to the type next above it . . . this again produced the next higher, and so on to the very highest" (222, emphasis in the original), from one-celled animals all the way up to human beings. As evidence Chambers observes that "every individual amongst us actually passes through the characters of the insect, the fish, and reptile, (to speak nothing of others), before he is permitted to breathe the breath of life!" (234-35). (Note the word "characters" here, suggestive not only of bodily forms but also of written, readable language.) Furthermore, he claims, once the fetus reaches a recognizably human state, "the varieties of his race are represented in the progressive development of an individual of the highest, before we see the adult Caucasian, the highest point yet attained in the animal scale" (199). The developing Caucasian fetus passes through the form of the "lower" races in ascending to that of the "highest": "it passes through the characters in which it appears, in the Negro, Malay, American, and Mongolian nations, and finally is Caucasian" (306). (Here again appears that important word "characters.")

For Chambers, then—not surprisingly, a Caucasian himself—the Caucasian is both the most recently evolved and the best of all creatures in the animal kingdom. But its status is not assured, for regression, and other races' progression, always remain possible. Chambers cites the example of an American Indian tribe, the Mandans, who he claims "cultivated the arts of manufacture, realized comforts and luxuries, and had attained to a remarkable refinement of manners. . . . They were also more than usually elegant in their persons, and of every variety of complexion between that of their compatriots and a pure white."⁷ Supposedly the more "civilized" they became, the whiter they grew, even as individuals, which suggests that white skin is a result and signifier of "civilization." It also indicates that levels of civilization need not be congenial—they can be earned. But if they can be earned, they can be lost, too; Caucasians can easily revert to barbarism and consequently grow darker. Thus, "the varieties of mankind. . . are simply the result of so many advances and retrogressions According to this view, the greater part of the human race must be considered as having lapsed or declined from the original type. In the Caucasian or Indo-European family alone has the primitive organization been improved upon" (308-309). Skin color becomes for Chambers a reliable index of civilization, at the levels of the tribe and the individual.

Here Chambers's views on human evolution coincide with Tylor's. Tylor arranges human cultures in a hierarchy according to their levels of "civilization," a term he never really defines. By reading a culture as a "complex whole" (1:1), and assigning that whole a place in his hierarchy, he hopes to "draw a picture where there shall be scarce a hand's breadth

difference between an English ploughman and a negro of Central Africa" (1:7)—just as Chambers ought to arrange all organisms into a virtually seamless hierarchy.

Key to understanding James's stories, too, is Tylor's concept of "survivals." Tylor writes that even within the most civilized societies, there are "processes, customs, opinions, and so forth, which have been carried on by force of habit into a new state of society different from that in which they had their original home, and they thus remain as proofs and examples of an older condition of culture out of which a new has been evolved" (1:16). These he calls "survivals." Not only discrete phenomena observable within particular cultures, but whole societies, "modern savage tribes," can be considered survivals or "remains of an early state of the human race at large," people whose culture does not change despite "the main tendency of culture . . . [to move] from savagery towards civilization" (1:21).

The concept of survivals constitutes an anthropological version of Darwin's "Tree of Life," drawn in *The Origin of Species*. Tylor himself likens his study of cultures to Darwin's work: "What this task is like, may be almost perfectly illustrated by comparing these details of culture with the species of plants and animals as studied by the naturalist" (1:8). Darwin's "Tree of Life" illustrates his conception of the genealogy of species: one species ramifies into many, some of which become extinct; some branches die out altogether; and some species do not ramify at all, but instead continue to exist unchanged, unadapted, while other originally contemporary species change and ramify greatly (*Origin* 160-61). Thus, according to Darwin and, later, to Tylor, many levels or periods of evolution—both human and animal—exist simultaneously in the present.

James reproduces in his ghost stories the theories of Chambers, Darwin, and Tylor outlined above. One way James does this is in the making physical form of his "ghosts" resemble humans at earlier stages of evolution. Unlike most other English writers' ghosts, James's have tangible bodies. As Michael A. Mason observes, the typical Jamesian ghost is "solid enough to inflict considerable damage" (256). And these solid, tangible forms resemble the human form as it might have appeared in an earlier time. For example, James describes the ghost of "Canon Alberic's Scrap-book" thus:

At first you saw only a mass of coarse, matted black hair; presently it was seen that this covered a body of fearful thinness, almost a skeleton, but with the muscles standing out like wires. The hands were of a dusky pallor, covered, like the body, with long, coarse hairs, and hideously taloned. The eyes, touched in with a burning yellow, had intensely black pupils. . . . Imagine one of the awful bird-catching spiders of South America translated into human form, and endowed with intelligence just less than human, and you will have some faint conception

(16-17)

The avenging creature in "The Haunted Dolls' House" "might be described as a frog—the size of a man—but it had scanty white hair about its head" (272). Note the explicit linking of these humanoid creatures with other, "lower" animals: the links go beyond mere comparison (humanoid creature = spider

or frog) to suggest unevolved states of *homo sapiens*, human beings as they might have looked when humans still resembled, or might have resembled, frogs or spiders. Note in the first example, too, the excessive hair as a signifier of sub-humanity. According to Richard Pfaff, hair is "one of MRJ's favourite motifs" (410). Many of James's creatures resemble humans but are too hairy to be human; see, for example, "The Diary of Mr. Poynter," "An Episode of Cathedral History," and "A View from a Hill." In all his stories James's "ghosts" occupy places below modern *homo sapiens* in a Chamberian/Darwinian evolutionary hierarchy. Some creatures are very much subhuman: for instance, the creature menacing "The Residence at Whitminster" possesses "long thin arms, or legs, or feelers" (218), while in "Count Magnus," the "unduly short" figure "muffled in a hooded garment" (71) brandishes tentacles. The creatures always prove dangerous to the antiquarians who unearth them; sometimes the investigator escapes alive, and sometimes he does not, but he is always threatened and horrified. The creatures appear to be survivals, loathsome living fossils of earlier, less evolved states of humankind, come from the past into the present to destroy.

The other important way James reproduces Victorian beliefs regarding human evolution and civilization is in making the very appearance of the supernatural a kind of regression to an earlier, less civilized stage in humanity. For James, "civilized" and "skeptical" are synonyms. His investigators are all Caucasian, well-educated, upper-class, refined in manners and speech, and disinclined to believe in ghosts and similar rubbish. For people like this—people at the very acme of Chambers, Darwin, and Tylor's hierarchies—to experience firsthand and be forced to attest to the reality of the supernatural is for them to return to "a world which only a few generations ago would have been our own—a world of witchcraft and black magic, fairies and goblins, when the supernatural was too much a reality to be reasoned away" (Search 20). James's urban antiquarians move backward in time to the world of servants and rural folk. It is not the polished investigators but the "lower orders"—working-class, country, and serving people—who know the local legends and superstitions, who are most closely in touch with supernatural forces. James has them relate their information to the investigator, and thereby, to the reader, in exaggeratedly illiterate accents that highlight their dearth of civilization. "Martin's Close" describes one character, a country boy, so backward that when he gives testimony in court regarding an experience with the supernatural, "my lord could not well apprehend him, and so asked if there was anyone that could interpret him" (180); the parson, apparently more civilized than the boy but less civilized than the judge, has to translate. By connecting the supernatural with the uncivilized, James implies a cause-and-effect relationship: if the uncivilized were not to tell what they know about the supernatural, or were to become more civilized and so forget it, the truly civilized would never discover it. The supernatural would disappear; humankind would evolve beyond it. Tylor writes that "most of what we call superstition is included within survival" (1:17); James suggests that these particular survivals would *not* survive if not for the cultural foot-dragging of certain low-class types.

⁶The Colonel is "of opinion that . . . its one power was that of frightening" (90-91), but Parkins has other ideas.

⁷(298-99). Chambers did not do this research himself. He uncritically cites one "Mr. [George] Catlin" on the subject of the Mandans.

III. The Unconscious

Thus, in writing his ghost stories, M. R. James reproduces the assumptions of Victorian geological, evolutionary, and anthropological science. To use a Lyellian geological metaphor, James's stories portray human civilization as a thin, recently developed crust riding uncertainly atop a restless mass of older formations threatening at every moment to destroy the crust and break through to the top. One can partially, tentatively reconstruct the history of the formations by digging through and examining various strata or layers, then assembling the bits of evidence.

This conception of human civilization, of course, closely resembles that of a famous contemporary of James's: Sigmund Freud. Freud, too, writes of the human mind in terms of genealogical development and survivals, and conceives of consciousness as a recently formed, relatively complex, and highly evolved formation residing uneasily atop older, simpler ones. In *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Freud writes, much in the vein of Chambers, Darwin, Tylor, and James, "In the animal kingdom we hold to the view that the most highly developed species have proceeded from the lowest; and yet we find all the simple forms still in existence to-day" (15-16). As in the animal kingdom, in the

realm of the mind, . . . what is primitive is so commonly preserved alongside of the transformed version which has arisen from it that it is unnecessary to give instances as evidence. When this happens . . . one portion . . . of an attitude or instinctual impulse has remained unaltered, while another portion has undergone further development. . . . [I]n mental life nothing which has once been formed can perish . . . everything is somehow preserved and . . . in suitable circumstances (when, for instance, regression goes back far enough) it can once more be brought to light.

(*Civilization* 16-17)

The mind's "primitive" and "simple forms" survive along with more complex, more highly civilized forms, just as, for James and Victorian scientists, less evolved organisms survive along with their more highly evolved descendants. More highly civilized forms of the mind reside in consciousness, comprising only a small portion of the mind, the "top"; the former remain in the unconscious, constituting most of the mind, "deeper down." As Freud explains in "The Unconscious," "at any given moment consciousness includes only a small content, so that the greater part of what we call conscious knowledge must in any case be for very considerable periods of time in a state of latency, that is to say, of being psychically unconscious" (167).⁸

In psychoanalysis, the analyst's work is a work of historical reconstruction, much like that of James's antiquaries. The analyst assembles the fragments of evidence dug up from the unconscious in an effort to reconstruct the history of the mind, as Freud explains in "Constructions in Analysis":

His task is to make out what has been forgotten from the traces which it has left behind or, more correctly, to *construct* it. . . . His work of construction, or, if it is preferred, of reconstruction, resembles to a great extent an archaeologist's excavation of some dwelling-place that has been destroyed and buried or of some ancient edifice.⁹

(259)

The task proves complicated, however, and the results necessarily inconclusive, for the analyst is working only with "traces," and, too, "if an object makes its appearance in some particular level, it often remains to be decided whether it belongs to that level or whether it was carried down to that level owing to some subsequent disturbance" (259). Only fragments of the record remain, and they cannot always be arranged chronologically. Still, a dogged analyst can generally reconstruct at least a sense of the patient's psychic history—much like James's determined investigators, or the Victorian reconstructive scientists they emulate, can assemble some sense of the historical narrative in their respective fields.

Clearly, then, James's conception of human civilization bears close resemblance to Freud's. Given the close similarity of their understandings of civilization and the human mind, James can be seen as, in effect, writing about the unconscious. James does not refer directly to "the unconscious," but his stories posit its existence metaphorically: the subhuman, the uncivilized, the superstitious, the supernatural—all the horrifying phenomena unearthed by his antiquarian investigators may be considered "the unconscious," for James views these phenomena in much the same light as Freud regarded the unconscious. That is, the ghastly/the unconscious is old, unevolved, uncivilized, and large; the rational/the conscious is new, evolved, civilized, and small.

While James might be understood to be writing metaphorically about the unconscious, his plans for what to *do* with the unconscious differ radically from Freud's. Freud sought actively to dig down through the layers of memory, uncover repressed memories, reconstruct the history stored in the unconscious fragments, and use that history, once brought to the patient's consciousness, to facilitate psychoanalytic cure. James, in contrast, indicates that digging into the past/the unconscious is a mistake: the results are invariably horrifying and sometimes even fatal. To dig into the past is to transport oneself back in time to a more superstitious, savage state of humanity, and to uncover terrible things better left buried. If James's antiquarians would only let sleeping ruins lie, they would remain safe. True, the unearthed horrors belong to secret histories *other* than the ones being investigated directly, but with the past/the unconscious that is precisely the point—one never knows *what* one will dig up. James suggests that our minds work more of less like Mrs. Maple's, the Oldyses' maid in "The Residence at Whitminster":

"How will Miss Oldys manage to make [Mrs. Maple] remember about the box?" I asked.

"Mary? Oh, she'll make her sit down and ask her about her aunt's illness, or who gave her the china dog on the mantelpiece—something quite off the point. Then, as Maple says, one thing brings up another, and the right one will come round sooner than you could suppose."

(*Stories* 221)¹⁰

To think of one thing, all one need do is think of another. To summon a vengeful demon, all one need do is poke around a picturesque ruin. It is the *act* of delving into the past, not the precise subject, that James finds dangerous.

Sometimes James warns directly against investigativeness. For instance, of Mr. Wraxall, protagonist of "Count Magnus," he writes, "His besetting fault was pretty clearly that of over-inquisitiveness, possibly a good fault in a traveller, certainly a fault for which this traveller paid dearly enough in the end" (65). Wraxall's "price" was to be haunted, harried, and eventually slaughtered by the Count, after inadvertently raising him from the dead. And all Wraxall originally *intended* to investigate was materials for a travel book. In "Rats," Mr. Thomson, "in a mood of quite indefensible curiosity, and feeling confident that there could be no damaging secrets in a place [the hotel room next door] so easily got at" (343), finds a dead man, or rather an undead man, and barely escapes with his life. History/the unconscious is for James a kind of Bluebeard's chamber,¹¹ and he warns his readers of the dangers of opening it.

Besides providing such direct warnings, he also models repression metaphorically. His stories include example after example of some secret and/or enclosed space that is opened, reveals some horror, and is hurriedly sealed back up. In "The Treasure of Abbot Thomas," for instance, Mr. Somerton interprets a secret code that leads him to a treasure buried in an abbey well. Trouble is, sealed up with the treasure is a supernatural guardian; therefore, Somerton and his servant and friend seal up the well again. The title character of "Mr. Humphreys and His Inheritance" discovers, at the center of his newly inherited hedge maze, "a face—a human face—a *burnt* human face . . . waving black arms prepared to clasp the head that was bending over them" (204). Humphreys barely escapes the humanoid creature with his life, and immediately has the maze destroyed. And in "An Episode of Cathedral History," the repressed actively tries to escape. While renovating the Cathedral at Southminster, workmen lay bare a tomb below the altar, and worse, make a small breach in the tomb's wall. Every day a mason fills the hole with a brick—and every day the brick is pushed out again by the ghost living inside. Finally the tomb is destroyed, and out of it rushes a "thing like a man, all over hair, and two great eyes to it" (247). These secret/enclosed spaces represent the unconscious mind; the horrible creatures inside, repressed memories and desires. James shows that when one has opened those spaces/the unconscious, the best and safest thing to do is to

seal them up again quickly. Otherwise, the hidden horrors will have their revenge, like the creature of "Martin's Close," who, sealed in a small cupboard for many years, immediately commits a gruesome murder once set free. The typical ghost story by James, then, offers a "Warning to the Curious"¹²: do not investigate the past/the unconscious, for what you find will frighten and probably harm you. James is the ultimate Enlightenment figure, warning against even *looking* into the dark.

Thus, James, imbued with the tenets of Victorian reconstructive science, constructs in his ghost stories a model of human evolution, civilization, and mind which is strikingly Freudian. In effect, he posits both the existence of the unconscious and its readability. The attitude Julia Briggs ascribes to English ghost story writers in general is particularly true in James: "as a descendant [sic] of the beasts, [man] had a bestial inheritance within him which he must learn to sublimate and restrain" (20). Better to sublimate and restrain, for James, than to dig up, piece together and work through. To repress is to progress, both as an individual and as a species.

Works Cited

- Briggs, Julia. *Night Visitors: The Rise and Fall of the English Ghost Story*. London: Faber, 1977.
- Chambers, Robert. *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation and Other Evolutionary Writings*. Ed. James A. Secord. Chicago, London: U of Chicago P, 1994.
- Cox, J. Randolph. "Ghostly Antiquary: The Stories of Montague Rhodes James." *ELT* 12 (1969): 197-202.
- Cox, Michael. *M. R. James: An Informal Portrait*. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. 1859. Ed. J. W. Burrow. London: Penguin, 1985.
- Dickens, Charles. *The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit*. 1844. The Oxford Illustrated Dickens. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. New York & London: W. W. Norton, 1961.
- _____. "Constructions in Analysis." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. Eds. James Strachey and Anna Freud. 24 vols. Vol. 23. London: Hogarth P, The Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1964. 255-69.
- _____. *The Unconscious*. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. Eds. James Strachey and Anna Freud. 24 vols. Vol. 14. London: Hogarth P, The Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1957. 159-215.
- James, M. R. *The Penguin Complete Ghost Stories of M. R. James*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.
- Lyell, Charles. *Principles of Geology*. 1830. 3 vols. Chicago, London: U of Chicago P, 1990.

⁸The dwarfing of consciousness by the unconscious parallels the way that, for Chambers, the uncivilized greatly outnumber the civilized.

⁹Recall that James's investigators generally do their investigating at a site of ruins or another decrepit building.

¹⁰As I argue above, for James, servants such as Mrs. Maple are more in touch with the supernatural unconscious than more "civilized" people. For Freud and James, all minds work essentially like hers; hers is just *closer* to those hidden forces than, say, the mind of her master, Mr. Oldys, an urbane clergyman.

¹¹James himself uses the phrase "Bluebeard's chamber" in "The Residence at Whitminster," to describe the room containing a box that holds fatal magical artifacts (*Stories* 224).

¹²This is the title of a story by James and of his fourth published collection of stories.

- Mason, Michael A. "On Not Letting Them Lie: Moral Significance in the Ghost Stories of M. R. James." *Studies in Short Fiction* 19 (1982): 253-60.
- Pfaff, Richard William. *Montague Rhodes James*. London: Scolar P, 1980.
- Robinson, John J. *Born in Blood: The Lost Secrets of Freemasonry*. New York: M. Evans, 1989.
- Search, Pamela, ed. *The Supernatural in the English Short Story*. London: Bernard Hanison, 1959.

- Sullivan, Jack. *Elegant Nightmares: The English Ghost Story from Le Fanu to Blackwood*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1978.
- Tylor, E. B. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*. 7th ed. 2 vols. New York: Brentano's, 1924.

University of Oklahoma

Mire, Bog, and Hell in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*

Alan Smith

Gothic conventions in *The Hound of the Baskervilles* need hardly be enumerated. Keenly attuned to these conventions, which have changed very little if at all in their transmission from Walpole and Radcliffe to Stephen King and Anne Rice, twentieth-century readers can easily discern a plethora of elements that contribute to the novel's atmosphere of gloom, mystery, and terror. Yet Watson's many references to the Grimpen Mire as a "bog"¹ may carry a distinct hint of the diabolical that has escaped readers intent on viewing the novel as a remarkable, if quaint, specimen of Victorian detective fiction. In fact, it is questionable whether more than a relative few of Conan Doyle's American readers have ever caught this aspect of the word's meaning.

Among the uses of *bog* as either substantive or verb are those that possess connotations of human waste. Readily grasped as denoting "A piece of wet spongy ground, consisting of decayed or decaying moss and other vegetable matter . . ." (*OED sb* 1), a usage dating from at least 1505, *bog* was also used as early as 1552 to denote a latrine, and the term *bog-house*, in use by 1705, was a vulgarism applied to any outbuilding erected specifically for use as a toilet. Similarly, *bog* was used as a verb to denote either the evacuation of the bowels or the defacing of property by the smearing on of animal or human waste (*OED v* 3).

Bog has retained its scatological sense and is still deployed as such in British slang. Apropos of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, William Baring-Gould facetiously observes that transforming Dartmoor's Grimspound Bog into the fictional Grimpen Mire is "a nice example of Watson's Victorian primness" that neatly dispenses with the arousal of schoolboy giggles at unintended scatological references (2: 47). Baring-Gould's remark fails to account for Watson's many applications of the word to the Mire—surely an application would be as provocative as the name—and it misses what is perhaps Conan Doyle's point: to evoke the association of the scatologi-

cal with the infernal, an association that underlies the notion of a bog, or marsh, as a place haunted by ghosts and demons (cf. *OED boggard* and *bog sb* 2).

From the river of excrement in Canto XVIII of the *Inferno* to the *raisonneur* sewer cleaner in John Whiting's 1961 stageplay *The Devils*, Hell and its inmates have routinely been associated with scatology. This association is to modern sensibilities perhaps the most notable (and repulsive) feature of Reformation propaganda (see McGinn 200-230), and in popular British literature it assumes its most pointed expression in medieval religious drama. In the N. Towne *Fall of Lucifer*, for instance, the Devil signals his transformation from "an aungel bright" into "a devyl ful derke" by farting (Adams 78-79). Cain's scatological language and his references to the Devil in the Wakefield *The Killing of Abel* distinguish him as an agent of Hell, as do the same traits of both Cayphus in the Wakefield *The Buffeting* and the First Jew in the Chester Ironmonger's *Christ's Passion*. The Chester *Last Judgment* depicts sinners imprisoned in the Devil's bowels. One of the many non-dramatic instances of this association is Chaucer's description in the Summoner's "Prologue" of the sinful "freres" swarming "out of the develes ers. . ." (l. 1694). The scatological references in these and other works, observes John W. Velz, "are potentially marks of alienation from God both in their implication of a finite corporeality and in their connotation of the rejected, the no longer valid, the insalubrious."²

These marks and their evocations contribute to certain thematic elements in specimens of British literature ranging from *Gammer Gurton's Needle* through Jonson's *The Alchemist* down to Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* and John Whiting's *The Devils*. It is difficult to imagine that Conan Doyle—reared in the Church, educated in Jesuit schools, keenly interested in spiritualism, and formidably read in medieval history and literature (Higham 22-40, 88-127; Cox

13-137)—would have been ignorant of the diabolical implications traditionally inherent in scatology or that he would have been insensitive to their connotations in regard to the specifically British use of *bog* as a designation of either "bugbear" or "latrine." It is therefore possible, perhaps even probable, that Conan Doyle uses the Grimpen Mire in *The Hound of the Baskervilles* as a representation of Hell that makes Stapleton's fate, like that of Marlowe's Faustus, an instance of Hell's claiming its own: "Somewhere in the heart of the great Grimpen Mire, down in the foul slime of that huge morass which had sucked him in, this cold and cruel-hearted man is forever buried" (2: 760). Stapleton, like Faustus, is a damned soul pulled finally into the depths of perdition.

What remains to be seen is whether the Grimpen Mire finally loses its aura of the diabolical when it is examined in the clinical light of human reason. The penultimate chapter of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* finds Watson assuming a Dantean role as he explores the "'bog-girt island" (2: 760), the lair of Stapleton's hound, under the Virgilian aegis of the rationalist Sherlock Holmes. Here the duo finds corporeal evidence that debunks the myth of the demon-hound's origin: a staple and chain, a quantity of gnawed bones, the grisly remains of Dr. Mortimer's spaniel, and the tin of luminous paint with which the hound was daubed. But there are no signs of the malefactor: Stapleton is presumed to have been sucked into the bowels of the Grimpen Mire, and his body is nowhere to be found.

This unresolved element of the novel has suggested to Lawrence Frank that Conan Doyle ultimately entertained "reservations about Holmes's scientific use of the imagination"—that the author seriously questioned the hardy Victorian belief that "the universe will yield itself to human understanding" through scientific inquiry (ts., 27). Such hedging at the possibility of the unknowable and its inevitable corollary, the unknown or the supernatural, appears more clearly throughout Conan Doyle's Professor Challenger stories, where the science always betrays a strong undercurrent of spiritualist principles (Cox 199-220). Yet there emerges even in the Holmes stories a yearning for verifiable evidence of a divine order that will explain the inexplicable. Despite all his allegiance in *The Sign of Four* to the ideas espoused by Winwood Reade (1: 96-97), Holmes can still ruminate on the circumstances of James Browner, the hapless murderer in "The Cardboard Box":

"What is the meaning of it, Watson?" said Holmes solemnly as he laid down the paper. "What object is served by this circle of misery and violence and fear? It must tend to some end, or else our universe is ruled by chance, which is unthinkable. But what end? There is the great standing perennial problem to which human reason is as far from an answer as ever." (2: 901)

Similarly, in "The Boscombe Valley Mystery," terminally ill John Turner arouses Holmes's longing for some indication of a divine purpose:

"God help us," said Holmes after a long silence. "Why does fate play such tricks with poor, helpless worms? I never hear of such a case as this that I do not think of Baxter's words, and say, 'There, but for the grace of God, goes Sherlock Holmes.'" (1: 217)

Holmes's admission that human reason has its limits invites a consideration of Stapleton's death, for which Holmes can find no evidence, as something that implies the enactment of a cosmic justice by preternatural forces that intervene whenever malefactors escape the corporeal grasp of human agents.

The idea of cosmic justice—a balancing of the spiritual scales or even, if you will, the enforcement of divine retribution—need not be of a specifically Christian hue. Conan Doyle's early rejection of the Roman Catholic faith and of the Bible as a manual of spiritual instruction forestalls his seriously entertaining such a concept. (Nevertheless, it is tempting to speculate about the impetus behind Conan Doyle's attempts in his later, nonfiction writings to reconcile the teachings of the Bible with those of the spiritualists [Cox 217-32]). At any rate, the author's personal rejection of Christianity would hardly preclude his communicating with his readers through Christian symbolism which, obviously, is so pervasive as to be understandable to almost any British or American reader. Whatever Conan Doyle's own notions about cosmic justice or divine retribution, there appear in Holmes stories other than *The Hound of the Baskervilles* suggestions of a traditionally Christian Hell and of the author's use of Christian symbolism as the means implicitly to destroy and to damn those malefactors whose trail Holmes relentlessly but unsuccessfully pursues.

The death by shipwreck of the Ku Klux Klansmen in "The Five Orange Pips" and the throwing overboard of Neligan in "The Adventure of Black Peter," together with the loss of all but Trevor and his seven companions in the sinking of the ship in "The *Gloria Scott*," are redolent of the centuries-old associations of church with ship and of damnation with shipwreck or drowning. Biblically, the damned are imaged as castaways (I Corinthians 9.27) who are said to "drown in destruction and perdition" (I Timothy 6.9). Patristically, the ark of Noah was used for centuries as a type of the Church, and this element of Christian typology remains present today in baptismal fonts whose octagonal shape commemorates the eight passengers saved aboard the ark from the waters of the flood. Furthermore, the sea in the Bible is the habitat of Leviathan, the multi-headed sea monster of Psalm 74.13-14 and Job 41.1-34 that was regularly used by patristic authors as a type of Satan. Also, the Book of Common Prayer includes in its service for baptism the use of the sea as a symbol of the world and "the ark of Christ's church" as the only safe means of transport across it to the shore of Heaven (Danielou *Primitive* 58-70; *Bible* 70-113).

This body of symbolism and typology, adopted by a host of secular writers from Dante through Shakespeare and Milton to Emerson and Melville,³ lends an aura of divine retribution (i.e. damnation) to the fate of the Ku Klux Klansmen who

¹*The Hound of the Baskervilles* in *The Complete Sherlock Holmes* 2: 707 ff. Subsequent references to the novel and to other stories follow the text and pagination of this edition.

²The present discussion of scatology in medieval English drama and in subsequent literature is drawn from Velz's pages 4-21.

³See, for example, Berkeley *Inwrought* 37-204, "Figuræ" 108-23; Smith and Morris 3-5; Brumm *passim*.

murder John Openshaw and who escape, via ship, the retributive but corporeal grasp of Sherlock Holmes:

There is ever a flaw, however, in the best laid of human plans, and the murderers of John Openshaw were never to receive the orange pips which would show them that another, as cunning and as resolute as themselves, was upon their track. Very long and very severe were the equinoctial gales that year. We waited long for news of the *Lone Star* of Savannah, but none ever reached us. We did at last hear that somewhere far out in the Atlantic a shattered stern-post of the boat was seen swinging in the trough of a wave, with the letters "L. S." carved upon it, and that is all which we shall ever know of the fate of the *Lone Star*.

(1: 229)

Damnation as implied by shipwreck is also the fate of the cutthroats under the sway of Jack Prendergast, the "raging devil" aboard the *Gloria Scott* who, after allowing Trevor and his companions to disembark in a lifeboat, incites his convict shipmates to murder their guards in cold blood (1: 384). As well, the loss overboard of Neligan, though ultimately disclosed as a murder committed by the unsavory Patrick Carey (2: 570), is sufficient, even without his son's unsatisfactory excuses, to call into question Neligan's innocence in regard to the failure of his bank. These drownings and shipwrecks, like the submergence of Stapleton beneath the foul surface of the Grimpen Mire, imply that there is at work in the world of Sherlock Holmes—a world generally subject to causes that have rational explanations—an element not of chance but of the divine.

The essence of Conan Doyle, the man, is captured in his own epitaph: "Steel True, / Blade Straight" (Higham 334). An inflexible sense of fair play and an unimpeachable decency are personal traits that the author transfers to the stories and novels that make up the saga of Sherlock Holmes. The bringing to justice of malefactors in the majority of the cases, together with the occasional dispensation of arbitrary pardons to those whose acts are "morally justifiable, though technically criminal," as Holmes says of his own legally dubious actions in "Charles Augustus Milverton" (2: 576), are reflective of Conan Doyle's ethical stance. The aspect of Conan Doyle that is traditionally regarded as omitted from or at least suppressed in the Holmes stories is his resolution to prove the existence of the other-worldly and to demonstrate the interaction of the

supernatural with the natural. Clearly, the seamier aspects of spiritualism—mediums, seances, table-rappings, and speaking-horns—are thankfully deleted from the sitting room at Baker Street. But Conan Doyle's nature was such that, even in the world of fiction, justice must be served. Should the malefactor escape the grasp of Sherlock Holmes, there must be an agency capable of balancing the scales. In *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, that agency is Hell personified by the Grimpen Mire.

Works Cited

- Adams, J. Q. *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*. Cambridge: Riverside P, 1924.
- Baring-Gould, William S. ed. *The Hound of the Baskervilles* in vol. 2 of *The Annotated Sherlock Holmes*. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1975.
- Berkeley, David S. "Figuræ Futurarum in *Moby-Dick*." *Bucknell Review* 21.3 (1973): 108-23.
- _____. *Inwrought with Figures Dim: A Reading of Milton's "Lycidas"*. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.
- Brumm, Ursula. *American Thought and Religious Typology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1970.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Chaucer's Major Poetry*. Ed. Alfred C. Baugh. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Cox, Don Richard. *Arthur Conan Doyle*. New York: Ungar, 1985.
- Danielou, Jean. *Primitive Christian Symbols*. Trans. Donald Attwater. Baltimore: Helicon, 1964.
- _____. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1966.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Intro. Christopher Morley. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1930.
- Frank, Lawrence. "Reading the Gravel Page: Lyell, Darwin, and Conan Doyle." Unpublished essay, 1989.
- Higham, Charles. *The Adventures of Conan Doyle*. New York: Norton, 1976.
- McGinn, Bernard. *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*. San Francisco: Harper, 1994.
- Smith, Alan R., and Karen T. Morris. "Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part III*. *Explicator* 41 (1983): 3-5.
- Velz, John W. "Scatology and Moral Meaning in Two English Renaissance Plays." *South Central Review* 1(1984): 4-21.

City College, Norman, Oklahoma

Books Received

Fall 1998

- Bendiner, Kenneth. *The Art of Ford Madox Brown*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1998. Pp. xviii + 204 + 123 illustrations. \$60.00. "This book examines the paintings and designs of Ford Madox Brown (1821-93). Each chapter treats a fundamental component of his art. Archaism, humor, realism, Aestheticism, and Brown's social concerns are the topics. The interrelation of these themes surfaces as the book progresses, the most persistent connector being Brown's negative sensibility. And Brown's negativism most forcefully displays itself through humor. To a considerable degree, this book charts the course and meaning of comedy through Brown's career" ([1]).
- Cohen, Monica F. *Professional Domesticity in the Victorian Novel: Women, Work and Home*. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture 14. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Pp. xi + 216. \$54.95. "In a sense, the Victorian housekeeper depicted in these novels [*Persuasion*, *Villette*, *Great Expectations*, *Little Dorrit*, *Felix Holt*, *Daniel Deronda*] stood on common ground with the intellectual and the artist: amateurs who used the language of professionalism to represent their work as the fulfillment of a higher calling that, in answering to the collective good, merited rights and privileges, all of which extended the definition of property in a characteristically English conservative tradition. While many advocates of 'civic maternalism' used a woman's moral superiority as grounds for the legal recognition of her property and even for her political enfranchisement, novelists promoted their own careers in claiming a moral higher good for their quasi-intellectual, quasi-artistic products. Professional domesticity can be seen then as a temporary means of resolving the oppositions subtending the separate-sphere doctrine: rather than saying a woman should have equal rights because a woman is like a man, professional domesticity implied that a woman should have equal rights because her innate moral property entitles her to them" (9-10).
- Fulmer, Constance M. and Margaret E. Barfield, eds. *A Monument to the Memory of George Eliot: Edith J. Simcox's "Autobiography of a Shirtmaker"*. Literature and Society of Great Britain, vol. 4. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities vol. 2054. New York & London: Garland 1998. Pp. xvii + 293. \$65.00 "This complete transcription of the *Autobiography of a Shirtmaker* by Edith J. Simcox (1844-1901). . . [has] never before [been] printed in its entirety"; it "is a personal journal—not intended for publication—in which Simcox made entries more or less regularly from May 1876 to January 1900" [xvii]. "The love-passion of her life was for the novelist George Eliot. . . . On one occasion Simcox actually wrote that her autobiography was not that of a shirtmaker but of a love. Edith Simcox adored and admired George Eliot, who was twenty-five years older than she, from the time they met in 1872 when Simcox was preparing her review of Eliot's novel, *Middlemarch*. For the next seven years, Simcox frequently was among

- the literary elite who gathered on Sunday afternoons at the home of George Eliot and George Henry Lewes. The journal entries for 1877 and 1878 provide detailed accounts of the conversations on those occasions" (xv).
- Goldsmith, Barbara. *Other Powers: The Age of Suffrage, Spiritualism, and the Scandalous Victoria Woodhull*. A Borzoi Book. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998. Pp. xv + 531. \$30.00. "These fragmentary details [about Commodore Vanderbilt and Victoria Woodhull] led me to look further into the connection between Vanderbilt and Woodhull and especially into Spiritualism. From the study of Spiritualism, I was inevitably led to the woman's rights movement, both before and after the Civil War, for one of the many ways women managed to relieve the burdens imposed upon their gender was by seeking empowerment through the spirits. Not all members of the woman's rights movement were Spiritualists, but woman's rights were inseparable from Spiritualism. "What interested me most was how the social and sexual mores, the pressures and events of that time, affected these people, particularly women. I have relied mainly on such primary sources as letters, diaries, conversations recorded in shorthand, the public and private writings of the principals concerned, trial transcripts, and, of course, the newspapers of the day" (xi).
- Harman, Barbara Leah. *The Feminine Political Novel in Victorian England*. Victorian Literature and Culture Series. Charlottesville & London: UP of Virginia, 1998. Pp. xi + 224. \$35.00. "My purpose in this book is to investigate, in the historical and literary record, the meaning of public life for nineteenth-century Englishwomen when it begins to emerge as a dangerously real possibility. I begin with the "woman's mission" arguments of the 1840s and 1850s because Charlotte Brontë and Elizabeth Gaskell read them and because domestic ideologists imagine a moral influence on public life for middle-class women while, at the same time, opposing their direct engagement in the political arena" (2). Novels examined are *Shirley*, *North and South*, *Diana of the Crossways*, *In the Year of the Jubilee*, *The Convert*, and there is a conclusion—"The Fate of Public Women."
- Homans, Margaret, and Adrienne Munich, eds. *Remaking Queen Victoria*. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture 10. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Pp. xiii + 279. \$59.95 cloth, \$19.95 paper. Contents: Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich, "Introduction"; Elizabeth Langland, "Nation and Nationality: Queen Victoria in the Developing Narrative of Englishness"; Mary Loeffelholz, "Crossing the Atlantic with Victoria: American Receptions, 1837-1901"; Alison Booth, "Illustrious Company: Victoria among Other Women in Anglo-American Role Model Anthologies"; Nicola J. Watson, "Gloriana Victoriana: Victoria and the Cultural Memory of Elizabeth I"; Sharon Aronofsky Weltman, "Be No More Housewives, but Queens: Queen Victoria and Ruskin's Domestic Mythology"; Maria Jerinic, "How We Lost the Empire:

Retelling the Stories of the Rani of Jhansi and Queen Victoria"; Robin L. Bolt, "I Know What Is Due to Me": Self-Fashioning and Legitimation in Queen Liliuokalani's *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*"; Gail Turley Houston, "Reading and Writing Victoria: The Conduct Book and the Legal Constitution of Female Sovereignty"; Susan P. Casteras, "The Wise Child and Her 'Offspring': Some Changing Faces of Queen Victoria"; Karen Chase and Michael Levenson, "I Never Saw a Man So Frightened": The Young Queen and the Parliamentary Bedchamber"; Dagni Bredesen, "The 'Widdy's' Empire: Queen Victoria as Widow in Kipling's Soldier Stories and in the *Barrack-Room Ballads*"; Janet Winston, "Queen Victoria in the *Funnyhouse*: Adrienne Kennedy and the Rituals of Colonial Possession"; Bibliography.

Hoppen, K. Theodore. *The Mid-Victorian Generation 1846-1886*. The New Oxford History of England [vol. 3]. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998. Pp. [xiv] + 787. \$45.00. "This book is . . . not constructed around any overarching thesis. None the less, it has, . . . been written with three very general themes or contexts in mind. The first might be called the context of 'established industrialism': that at virtually all levels of society men and women increasingly realized that factory life and manufacturing had come to stay . . .

"The second context might be called that of 'multiple national identities': that, beneath the shell of a unitary state, there flourished separate and overlapping national traditions which make it necessary sometimes to speak of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, sometimes of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, sometimes of Britain and Ireland, sometimes of the United Kingdom, sometimes of the British Empire. . .

"The third context might be called that of 'interlocking spheres' or the manner in which the public culture of the period . . . was generated, not by a series of influences operating separately, but by means of developments resonating reciprocally—and perceived to be so resonating—between spheres of politics, economics, science, literature, and art. But because these three contexts or themes do not . . . illuminate or 'explain' everything, I have tried to apply them with a light touch. By the same token, I have written individual chapters on certain major topics, but not on all. In particular, the experiences of mid-Victorian women ranged so widely that I thought it best to discuss them at a number of different points" (4-5).

Lewis, Linda M. *Elizabeth Barrett Browning's Spiritual Progress: Face to Face with God*. Columbia & London: U of Missouri P, 1998. Pp. xii + 256. \$34.95. "I shall argue not only that she faced theological issues of her own time but also that her religious convictions colored every aspect of her ideology—politics, gender, sexual love, social activism—and that apart from the religious context, one cannot adequately interpret many works of the Barrett Browning canon" (4).

Lubitz, Rita. *Marital Power in Dickens' Fiction*. Dickens' Universe vol. 3. New York: Peter Lang, 1996. Pp. [iii]

+ 146. \$39.95. "In this study, I examine numerous marriages in Dickens's works, focusing on the role power played in each. An analysis of these marriages shows that Dickens presents many different kinds of relationships. They include patriarchal unions—the dominant male and the submissive female; unions in which the female is dominant and the male submissive; alliances formed for mercenary reasons; marriages that reflect Dickens's vision of the ideal relationship; and marriages that Dickens uses at the conclusion of most of his works to reward his worthy characters. . .

"Whenever possible, I show how each union is related to the themes of the work in which it appears and to the major issues that concerned Dickens throughout his life. Finally, I demonstrate how the success or failure of a marriage is intrinsically linked to whether or not there is an abuse of power in the relationship" ([iii]).

Maynard, John. *Browning Re-viewed: Review Essays, 1980-1995*. American University Studies Series IV; English Language and Literature Vol. 186. New York: Peter Lang, 1998. Pp. ix + 247. \$44.95. Maynard has collected his reviews of Browning works over 15 years. They are: "Browning's Beginnings: The Art of Disclosure by Herbert F. Tucker, Jr."; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1981"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1982"; *The Poet Robert Browning and his Kinsfolk by his Cousin Cyrus Mason* ed. with afterword by W. Craig Turner; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1983"; "How Substantial was Robert Browning? *Browning and Italy* by Jacob Korg and *Becoming Browning, The Poems and Plays of Robert Browning, 1833-1846* by Clyde de L. Ryals"; "The Browning Collections: A Reconstruction with Other Memorabilia: The Library, First Works, Presentation Volumes, Manuscripts, Likenesses, Works of Art, Household and Personal Effects, and Other Association Items of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning compiled by Philip Kelley and Betty Coley"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1984"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1985"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1986"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1987"; "The Decade's Work in Browning Studies"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1989"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1990"; "Robert Browning: Year's Work, 1991-1992"; "Robert Browning by Joseph Bristow; *Robert Browning's Literary Life: From First Work to Masterpiece* by Gertrude Reese Hudson"; "Browning: Living, Hating, Loving; or Uneven Developments: Theory in the Browning Boondocks: *The Life of Robert Browning* by Clyde de L. Ryals; *Browning's Hatreds* by Daniel Karlin; *The Infinite Passion of Finite Hearts: Robert Browning and Failure in Love* by Pratul Pathak; plus an index of Browning's works and an index.

Melnyk, Julie, ed. *Women's Theology in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Transfiguring the Faith of Their Fathers*. Literature and Society in Victorian Britain vol. 3. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 2055. New York & London: Garland, 1998. Pp. xviii + 242. \$54.00. Contents: Julie Melnyk, "Introduction,"; Robert M. Kachur, "Envisioning Equality, Asserting Authority:

Women's Devotional Writings on the Apocalypse, 1845-1900"; Frederick S. Roden, "The Kiss of the Soul: The Mystical Theology of Christina Rossetti's Devotional Prose"; Kimberly VanEsveld Adams, "The Madonna and Anna Jameson"; L. Robert Stevens, "Intertextual Constructions of Faith: Julia Wedgewood (1833-1913)"; David Goslee, "Religion as Contextualized Critique in the Letters of Harriett and Jemima Newman"; Julie Melnyk, "Evangelical Theology and Feminist Polemic: Emma Jane Worboise's *Overdale*"; Virginia Bemis, "Reverent and Reserved: The Sacramental Theology of Charlotte M. Yonge"; Mark M. Freed, "The Moral Irrelevance of Dogma: Mary Ward and Critical Theology in England"; Lucretia A. Flammang, "'And Your Sons and Daughters Will Prophesy': The Voice and Vision of Josephine Butler"; Susan Mumm, "Ellice Hopkins and the Defaced Image of Christ"; Sarah Willburn, "Victorian Women Theologians of the Mystical Fringe: Translation and Domesticity"; Susan Thach Dean, "Decadence, Evolution, and Will: Caroline Rhys Davids's 'Original' Buddhism."

Meredith, George. *George Meredith's Essay "On Comedy" and Other "New Quarterly Magazine" Publications: A Critical Edition*. Ed. Maura C. Ives. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1998. Pp. 361. \$49.50. "This is a critical edition of George Meredith's "The House on the Beach," "On the Idea of Comedy, and of the Uses of the Comic Spirit," "The Case of General Ople and Lady Camper," and "The Tale of Chloe," all of which were first published in the *New Quarterly Magazine*" (7).

"The texts are followed by Textual Histories that explain each work's publishing history and note any special circumstances affecting my choice of copy-text, emendations, and the treatment of accidentals. The scholarly apparatus includes textual notes, a list of emendations, a historical collation of substantive variants, and a list of line-end hyphens in the copy-text: Additional lists or tables appear as needed" (8-9).

Moliterno, Frank. *The Dialectics of Sense and Spirit in Pater and Joyce*. 1880-1920 British Authors Series No. 12. Greensboro, NC: ELT Press, 1998. Pp. x + 180. \$30.00. Chapter 1 focuses "on *Marius the Epicurean and Portrait [of the Artist as a Young Man]*" (23); "In Chapter 2, 'The Secular Religion,' I apply F. C. McGrath's reading of Hegel's historical idealism to Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* and to *Portrait*" (19); "Chapter 3 . . . compares Stephen's hyper-refined theories on art in part V of *Portrait* with Pater's complex and much misunderstood aesthetics" (21); "Chapter 4 . . . examines the remarkably close parallel development of the epiphany in Pater and Joyce's work" (22); "Chapter 5 . . . examines the dialectic between empiricism and idealism in Pater and Joyce" (23).

Naverette, Susan J. *The Shape of Fear: Horror and the Fin de Siècle Culture of Decadence*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1998. Pp. xii + 314. \$37.95. "Conjoining the aesthetics of 'horror,' 'decadence' (both cultural and stylistic), and the methodology of scientific theory, *The Shape of Fear* diagnoses the form and the function of

certain hybrid literary monstrosities and contextualizes the structural, stylistic, and thematic systems developed by writers seeking to record and to reenact in narrative form what they understood to be entropic, devolutionary, and degenerative forces prevailing in the natural world. . . . *The Shape of Fear* attempts to construct a poetic based on underlying structural principles that engender both meaning and horror. Its primary interest, however, is to reconstruct some portion of the *histoire de mentalité* betrayed by the defining themes and verbal patternings symptomatic of these stories, themselves woven together out of reticulated strands drawn from the graphic arts, the sciences and pseudosciences, philosophy, aesthetics, and literature. . . .

"Primary emphasis is given to the literary detritus or 'refuse' (which we might think of as 'hybrids' or variations within a genre) that, although it has a great deal to say about the culture that produced it, has itself long suffered under what E. P. Thompson calls 'the enormous condescension of posterity.' The works of largely ignored authors such as Walter de la Mare, Vernon Lee, and Arthur Machen are given pride of place, although works of 'major' authors—Henry James and Joseph Conrad, for example—are also discussed" (6).

Roberts, Hugh. *Shelley and the Chaos of History: A New Politics of Poetry*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1997. Pp. [x] + 534. \$75.00, £67.50 cloth, \$25.00, £22.50 paper. "My argument falls into three more or less independent parts. In the first part I begin by discussing some of the general philosophical and critical issues that underlie any attempt to conceive of the literary text as a political entity" (3).

"Although the persistent attempts to read Shelley's philosophy as a 'mix' of skepticism and idealism have serious problems, I accept their central point, which is that elements of both approaches can be found in his thought. I argue, however, that these elements are parts of a heretofore unrecognized 'third way' that allows Shelley to accept aspects of both the Romantic-idealist and Enlightenment-skeptical approaches while correcting the political incoherences that plague them both. . . .

"Last, in Part Three, I engage in a number of extended readings of selected poems and prose works from throughout Shelley's career to demonstrate the wide-ranging implications of this approach for our understanding of Shelley's entire oeuvre" (4).

Sherrick, Julie. *Thomas Hardy's Major Novels: An Annotated Bibliography*. Magill Bibliographies. Latham, MD & London: Scarecrow P and Pasadena, CA & Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Salem P, 1998. Pp. xiv + 194. \$36.00. "The following bibliography is an assembly of selected secondary sources that reflect trends in criticism within the last thirty years. The materials in the bibliography have been organized in such a way as to provide the readers with access to information relating to various aspects of Hardy's six major novels [*Far from the Madding Crowd*, *The Return of the Native*, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *The Woodlanders*, *Tess*, *Jude*]. The materials that have been collected have been grouped into five distinct

categories ['Circumstances of Composition, Comparative Studies, Nature of the Novel, Salient Features of the Novel, Character Analysis']" (1). Includes "A Topical Guide to Subjects and Themes" and "Background Study on Victorian England and Thomas Hardy."

Smith, Vanessa. *Literary Culture and the Pacific: Nineteenth-Century Textual Encounters*. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture 13. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Pp. xiv + 296. \$59.95. "The first section of this book looks at a number of complex representations of true and false reading in early written accounts from the Pacific. It argues that the confident manipulation of these figures conceals an inherent contradiction: the desire simultaneously and strategically to authorise and undermine the indigenous reader, in order to instate those European objects and technologies that were being subjected, during the early contact period, to a new context of reception" (7).

"By focusing on the Polynesian reader within European accounts, this book seeks to pay something more than the conventional lip service to contexts of textual production; to make explicit the 'entangled' status of the very representations through which contact in the Pacific was initially portrayed to foreign readers" (9).

"The first section of this book also focuses on the Europeans and Americans who brought their material culture and technologies, including the technology of writing, into this new context of reception

"Subsequent chapters shift from the question of readership to examine conceptions of authorship as they became illuminated in the nineteenth-century Pacific context. My example here is a figure who perhaps embodied Victorian consensus on the romance of authorship—Robert Louis Stevenson" (10).

Traxell, David. *1898: The Birth of the American Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998. Pp. xiii + 365. \$28.95. "I have attempted to render a portrait of America in 1898, warts and all, that depicts its people as individuals, as men and women acting from a sense of personal freedom. In telling their stories, I have avoided any over arching theory or analytical approach that would make decisions and events seem orderly, predictable, and exclusively determined by large impersonal forces. Luck, contingency, and individual initiative also played their parts" (xii). Includes notes, bibliography, index.

Varty, Anne. *A Preface to Oscar Wilde*. Preface Books. London & New York: Longman, 1998. Pp. xi + 247. "This study focuses critical attention on the work from [1890-1895]. But since Wilde's literary endeavours from 1881 contributed significantly to his mature success, work from this earlier period is also represented. During the 1880s Wilde worked as a poet, lecturer, journalist and short-story writer. All these aspects of his production are considered here. His ability to observe issues of the day and to comment obliquely on them—most important elements of his dramaturgical and critical power in the mature comedies—are evident as crafts learned early in his literary development, and during the

1890s he frequently returned to matters both of style and substance which he had treated earlier.

"... [T]his 'preface' opens with a skeleton biography of Wilde in tabular form, and goes on to consider four major aspects of his life and afterlife: the two figures in his immediate family, his mother and his wife; the politics of the late-nineteenth century relating to Ireland and homosexuality; and, last, a glance at the legendary Wilde, as our culture has incorporated ghostly versions of the man in the visual arts, literature and film.

"Part Two of this book surveys Wilde's philosophy through an analysis of his various non-fictional writings. The third section offers critical interpretations of his major works, arranged chronologically, and concludes with an account of his letters. Finally there is a reference section which both supports the preceding chapters and provides resources for further study" (x).

Wade, Thomas. *The Poems and Plays of Thomas Wade*. Comp., ed., intro, notes John L. McLean. Troy, NY: Whitson, 1997. Pp. 699. \$65.00. "The goal of this edition is to present clear reading texts of the known poems [some 291] and plays [5] of Thomas Wade [1805-1875] in the form and order in which he gave them to the world, insofar as his latest intentions may be discerned. Thus the last version of a work published in his lifetime ordinarily serves as copy text for this edition. The poems have been arranged chronologically, except for those grouped for publication in 1825, 1835, 1837, and 1839, which are given as he ordered them. . . .

"The plays are grouped . . . after the poems in chronological order of their performance, . . . *The Life and Death of King Henry the Second* appearing last" (16-17).

Zatlin, Linda Gertner. *Beardsley Japonisme and the Perversion of the Victorian Ideal*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Pp. xiv + 304. \$70.00. "Above all, this study analyzes the way Beardsley arrived at his unique style, which resonates with the imprint of the Japanese. Moreover, because the late Victorians had accumulated a number of prejudices about the Japanese in the forty years since the two cultures' first encounter, Beardsley's choice was also culturally significant. In order to retrieve the significance of Beardsley's integration of Japanese art into his work for the modern reader, I have reconstructed parts of the cultural milieu in which Beardsley worked, accenting the Japanese influence in Britain, in Europe, and on this young artist. To construct a definition of Far Eastern influence on Beardsley and to assess the multiplicity of Beardsley's stylistic adaptations, I have examined each technical element individually. In addition to technique and form, Beardsley appropriated Oriental content, and so I explore his adaptations of two Japanese subjects, or themes, the grotesque and the voyeur. Beardsley's technical, formal, and substantive use of Japanese art influenced succeeding generations of artists; therefore, I conclude by broadly indicating the directions in which twentieth-century followers took Beardsley's ideas" (17-18). Includes 124 illustrations, a selected bibliography, an index of Beardsley's drawings and a general index.

Victorian Group News

Announcements

The Delaware Art Museum will hold a symposium in celebration of the addition of the Morris-Rossetti Chairs ("The Arming of the Knight" ca. 1856-1857 and "Glorious Gwendolen's Golden Hair" ca. 1856) to the Museum's Samuel and Mary R. Bancroft and Related Pre-Raphaelite Collections. The Symposium will be held Friday, 16 October 1998. For information contact: Margaretta Frederick Watson, c/o Delaware Art Museum, 2301 Kentmere Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19806; fax: 302-571-0220; phone inquiries to Jenine Culligan at 302-571-9590, ext. 549. To receive a symposium registration form call 302-571-9590.

A major conference on the works of the Victorian novelist George Gissing will be held at the University of Amsterdam 9-11 September 1999. The conference will be hosted by the English Department of the University of Amsterdam. Its setting will be the newly restored Doelenzaal, a splendid example of seventeenth-century Dutch architecture in the heart of the old city. It is within walking distance of some of the world's greatest art collections, housed in the Rijksmuseum, the Municipal museum, and the Van Gogh museum.

The aim of the conference is to further the international exchange of research on George Gissing, whose reappraisal has been intensified by the recently completed publication of his collected correspondence, and the publication of the *Gissing Journal*.

For further information, please contact Bouwe Postmus, English Department, University of Amsterdam, Spuistraat 210, 1012 Amsterdam, The Netherlands; e-mail: B. P. Postmus@let.uva.nl; fax: (+31) 20 5253052; phone: +31 75 6283406.

RUSKIN AND GENDER. A one-day conference on Ruskin and Gender will be held in Trinity College, Oxford, UK, on 22 September 1999, followed by a wine reception in the The University Museum. Conference speakers include Dinah Birch, J. B. Bullen, Francis O'Gorman, and Sharon Aronofsky Weltman. More details/booking information can be had from Dr. Dinah Birch, Trinity College, Oxford, OX1 3BH (dinah.birch@tri.ox.ac.uk), or Dr. Francis O'Gorman (francis.ogorman@btinternet.com).

Notice

The number on your address label is the number of the last issue covered by your subscription. Renewals should be made at the rate of \$5/yr. or \$9/2yrs.—\$6/yr. foreign and Canada.

Back issues of VN, at \$4 per copy (\$5 for Index) are available for the following numbers: 8, 20, 23, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, Index