ISSN 0387–7590

SHIRON 試論

Essays in English Language and Literature

CONTENTS

Engendering a Professional Woman Playwright :
Aphra Behn's Adaptation Strategies
.....Riwako Kaji 1

Ghosts and Money in *Great Expectations*
.....Takashi Nakamura 19

The Changing Distance between Jude and Sue:
Cousinship and Hardy in *Jude the Obscure*
.....Machiko Fujita 67

Ideas Floating on Their Causes:
Purgatory, *Endgame* and the Irish Dissentient Tradition
.....Miki Iwata 87

Excess of Vision:
Modernity and the Body in Pynchon's *V.*
.....Shizuka Hayasaka 105

July 2003 No. 41

SHIRON 41 試論 第41集 2003

SHIRON

Essays in English Language and Literature

No. 41

July 2003

Department of English Literature

Tohoku University

Sendai, Japan

SHIRON
Essays in English Language and Literature No.41
ISSN: 0387–7590
Department of English Literature, Graduate School of Arts and Letters
TOHOKU UNIVERSITY
Kawauchi, Aoba–ku, Sendai 980–8576 Japan
Phone : 022–217–5961
http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp

試論　第 41 集　目次

（平成 15 年 7 月）

CONTENTS

Engendering a Professional Woman Playwright :
Aphra Behn’s Adaptation Strategies
.....Riwako Kaji 1

Ghosts and Money in *Great Expectations*
.....Takashi Nakamura 19

The Changing Distance between Jude and Sue:
Cousinship and Hardy in *Jude the Obscure*
.....Machiko Fujita 67

Ideas Floating on Their Causes:
Purgatory, *Endgame* and the Irish Dissentient Tradition
.....Miki Iwata 87

Excess of Vision:
Modernity and the Body in Pynchon’s *V.*
.....Shizuka Hayasaka 105

研究会会則 128

投稿規定 129

編集後記 130

「試論」英文学研究会

Synopses

Engendering a Professional Woman Playwright : Aphra Behn's Adaptation Strategies

RIWAKO KAJI

Page 1

Following their interregnum closure, the theatres in London entered a new phase with the Restoration. Dramas performed then are usually considered original thanks to newly introduced European theatrical devices, female patronage, and especially professional women playwrights and actresses. In reconsidering the specificity of the Restoration theatrical world, Aphra Behn can usefully be examined, since she is now generally regarded as the first professional woman playwright. Such authors were sometimes called prostitutes, unskillful adapters or unintelligent plagiarists, in spite of the popularity of their plays.

In this paper Behn's *The Rover* and *The Roundheads*, plays from the later 1670s to the early *1680s* when the conflicts in power and religion produced a dangerous atmosphere are analyzed. Comparing these texts with their originals from the 1650s, which dealt principally with political issues, I show how Behn's strategic adaptations make the plays more marketable in both content and form. The political strife in the original versions is rewritten as a conflict between lovers with political implications. This also makes it possible to have a number of actresses on the stage for visual excitment. In addition to this kind of design, Behn makes use of the new publishing trend, when with the growth of a readership for printed scripts of new plays, the texts were recognized as valuable not only for playwrights but for publishers.

Using the new theatrical devices, writing parts for actresses and employing the printing press, Aphra Behn, by adapting earlier English political plays, produced love comedies that can be called "original." Frequently faced with the matter of gender, Behn exploits it at fictional and real levels to fashion herself as an author.

Ghosts and Money in *Great Expectations*

TAKASHI NAKAMURA
Page 19

One might argue that *Great Expectations* is a work of commentary on ghosts, while the novel can be read without difficulty as a study of money and the cash nexus. Ghosts, and more broadly, airy objects capable of flying or hovering accomplish a double significance; first, they are the products of fairy-tale romance, where ageless heroes, heroines, and villains are staged in an evergreen wood-world. Those airy things — ghosts, flags, balloons, casts and kites — are fanciful gravity-free objects and realized through the nonsensical play element of a (male) child. Second, ghost-like things such as the "cast" (or skull) are linked with the tradition of *memento mori* and *danse macabre*. The dark death vision is for instance focused on Newgate Prison, the novel's "black hole."

Pip is spellbound by money as he is by ghosts. Shakespeare' *Timon of Athens* is well-known as an expression of doubt about money in capitalist society; similarly, it is through Pip that skepticism about money and capital is voiced, so that the protagonist is both cursing at and cursed by money. The irony is that Pip is willingly deceived by capital, as shown in the monetary fictions whereby he intends to nullify his debts. Distortion of numbers and money is the novel's critique of the ideology of numbers in the Victorian era when Malthusian and Chadwickian language was arithmetical with myriads of numbers and tabulations. The cult of numbers in the Victorian period is thus related to the cult of capital or "great expectations." Pumblechook, Wemmick, and perhaps Estella belong to the camp of the capitalists, whereas Pip as a disclaimer of capital does not embrace money nor Mammonism, but adores ghosts in a dream vision.

The Changing Distance Between Jude and Sue: Cousinship and Hardy in *Jude the Obscure*

MACHIKO FUJITA
Page 67

The protagonists Jude and Sue in Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* (1895) are cousins. Given the ambiguous distance of their cousinship, which is neither close nor distant, they are forced to struggle between closeness and detachment in their relationship. Because they are cousins, they share an unusual similarity: they resemble each other in so extraordinary a way as to create a oneness. The combination of these two relationships has hardly been discussed, and yet it

is this specific relationship that creates the Hardy-like space in suspense, the space between tragedy and comedy.

After having finished *Jude*, Hardy wrote only poetry and some verse drama, not prose. This conversion has been interpreted in various ways. Yet, here again, Jude and Sue's cousinship has not been placed at the centre of discussion, even though this peculiar closeness shows that Jude and Sue cannot truly be equal. Keeping his eyes on social inequalities, especially ones between men and women, Hardy's dilemma reaches a climax. This essay examines the function of the cousin-relationship between Jude and Sue, which constitutes the foundation of the novel, both effectively, in the sense that it creates the space of tragicomedy, and ineffectively, as it led Hardy in a way to abandoning his fiction.

Ideas Floating on Their Causes: *Purgatory*, *Endgame* and the Irish Dissentient Tradition

MIKI IWATA
Page 87

W. B. Yeats's *Purgatory*, like *At the Hawk's Well* and *The Dreaming of the Bones*, has been interpreted as one of those plays influenced by Japanese Noh. However, twenty years separate those two plays from *Purgatory*. In the 1920s, Yeats wrote virtually no new plays but did discover a new mode of expression: he took an active interest in philosophical texts, especially those of George Berkeley. Indeed, what makes *Purgatory* distinct from Yeats's earlier dance plays is the pessimistic version of a Berkeleian idealism lying beneath the work.

Berkeley occupied a peculiar position in the eighteenth century intellectual world. He radically dissented from John Locke's doctrine representative of the scientism of the day, and then in the ascendant. According to Berkeley, objects consist of our ideas about them, only we can have due causes for such ideas; and to cause is, contrary to the Lockian idea, to act: an actively perceiving mind causes ideas about things. Thus, to oppose Locke's view of the world as a vast machine, his idealism disowns the objective existence of matter and privileges perception so as to restore the power of human subjectivity. Yeats was greatly impressed by Berkeley's subjective idealism and thought it the germ of Romanticism. However,

Yeats showed a more pessimistic view of this supposed solipsism in his later works where ideas of persons in the plays or poems are not accompanied by their causes.

In *Purgatory*, an Old Man explains to a Boy, his son, the circumstances of the family's ruin through the base marriage of the Old Man's parents. He urges upon the Boy the need for the purgation of his late mother. However, unlike *The Dreaming of the Bones*, the agony of the dead is expressed not by the ghosts themselves but by the Old Man. Therefore, the dead's biography being revised into the living's autobiography, the indeterminacy of human perception is intensified. The self-righteous speech of the Old Man contrarily reveals its unreliability and what he inwardly perceives is isolated from the outside world. Thus, there appears on stage a world covered with the sense of impossible communication, devastating arbitrariness, and bitter grief over human life. The dramaturgy and story of the play remind us of absurd theatre. *Purgatory* is believed to have been Samuel Beckett's favourite among Yeats's plays, and indeed has much in common with *Endgame*.

Endgame can also be regarded as a family saga awaiting the line's extinction. Though the play does not have such an obviously monologic structure as *Purgatory*, the persons in the play are highly interdependent on each other so that we hardly sense a multiplicity of human beings but one claustrophobic, obsessed soul, entirely separated from the outside world. The Berkeleian notion of ideas and their causes does not work here at all. On the contrary, Hamm is afraid of the possibility that it might work, that a rational being's perception causes them to mean something. Beckett's idea of perception is undoubtedly based on that of Berkeley, though, here, the ultimate eye of God is revised into the grotesque eye of a rational being from space. Thus, both Yeats and Beckett owe their ideas to Berkeley and are, consequently, operating along the same Irish line. In both, what makes their plays helplessly void has a relation to a diversion from the ordinary course of human perception that would allow our ideas appropriate causes.

Excess of Vison: Modernity and the Body in Pynchon's *V.*

SHIZUKA HAYASAKA
Page 105

The aim of this essay is to explore the representation of the modern Western body in Pynchon's novel *V.* What I wish to show is the relevance of the injurious aspect of modernity and its corporeal constituents in the representation of personal or collective violence in the novel. *V.* diagnoses the problematic nature of modernity and how it infects the Western world with political, cultural, and social disease. It consists of two narratives: one presents the chaos and violence of the riots and international warfare from the outbreak of World War I to World War II, and another depicts the languid urban life of a young American in New York City. In my discussion of the novel, the nature of the modern Western body in the description of modern violence will be examined. Although the early accounts of the New Criticism and post-structuralism inscribed the body as a discursive empty space, the materiality of the body is accepted and considered as important in my discussion.

First, the nature of the concept of the modern Western body is surveyed. My discussion gives weight to the significance of Protestantism in the nature of Western modernity. I will draw on Phillip Mellor and Chris Shilling's detailed study of the modern Protestant body. They show that Protestant bodies prioritize sight and the aural more than the tactile. Furthermore, I accept the general argument that modern Western bodily forms lay special emphasis on sight. Thus, as one of the problematic characteristics of the modern Western body, the predominance of the visual sense will be focused on.

Then various descriptions of personal and collective violence and its entailing representations of the modern body will be examined. What is to be discussed is the problem of human beings' objectification through psychological and physical mechanization. The point I wish to make is that Pynchon elaborately presents the disease of modernity: the precedence of the visual and its reciprocal and circular relation to modern violence.

Engendering a Professional Woman Playwright: Aphra Behn's Adaptation Strategies

Riwako Kaji

I

The Restoration of Charles II in 1660 brought about great changes to the theatrical situation in London. After the interregnum shutdown of the theatres, Thomas Killigrew (1612-83) and Sir William D'Avenant (1606-68) were given licenses to set up respectively the King's Company and the Duke of York's Company and to reopen the theatres with newly devised equipment or structures.[1] In addition, new theatres in London saw various innovations, such as the appearance of a professional woman playwright or of powerful female patronage. These alterations are sometimes thought to have been caused by the break in the tradition of English drama resulting from the puritans' strictures on the stage. However, the Restoration stage could not maintain its vitality even to the end of the century, as the eighteenth century has been viewed as an age of the novel.[2] Therefore, we usually have the impression that Restoration plays are unique, that is, they are quite different from the plays before and after that period. But is this a fair idea of Restoration drama?

In reconsidering the specificity of Restoration drama, Aphra Behn and her plays can usefully be examined, because she offers us illustrative cases for making clear this problem in the levels of dramatic text and theatrical system.[3] Aphra Behn is now widely esteemed as the first professional woman playwright in England, but this recognition was controversial in her own time. Gerard Langbaine, her contemporary, describes "Aphra Behn" in his *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691) as follows:

> A Person lately deceased, but whose Memory will be long fresh amongst the Lovers of Dramatick Poetry, as having been suffi-

> ciently Eminent not only for her Theatrical Performances, but several other Pieces both in Verse and Prose; which gain'd her an Esteem among the Wits . . . . Most of her Comedies have had the good fortune to please: and tho' it must be confest that she has borrow'd very much, not only from her own Country Men, but likewise from the French Poets: yet it may be said on her behalf, that she has often been forc'd to it through hast: and has borrow'd from others Stores, rather of Choice than for want of a fond of Wit of her own: it having been formerly her unhappiness to be necessitated to write for Bread, as she has publisht to the world. 'Tis also to her Commendation, that whatever she borrows she improves for the better. . . .
>
> (Langbaine, pp. 17-18)

Langbaine admires, to some extent, her achievement as a writer "not only for her Theatrical Performances, but several other Pieces both in Verse and Prose," yet also points out that her creative activity is indebted to various English and French dramatists. Though it is important not to miss his evaluation of her improvement of the plays, we should also note his assuming that she needed to "write for Bread" and "borrow'd from others Stores."

The theatre was much swayed by the social situations of the day, and the Restoration stage was frequently affected by power politics in court, at parliament or in the market. This made Behn, who had to live on her writing, sensitive to the time's political tides. Nevertheless, she did not avoid dealing with such social or political matters, but treated these delicate themes, usually by strategically adapting what are called political plays. In this paper, I will reconsider the uniqueness of the Restoration theatrical world, by examining the first professional woman playwright and her ways of adapting earlier English plays. Compared with these works, it will be clear how she made good use of the masculine culture of English drama, and how she could gain the status of a professional writer in such a theatrical tradition.

II

To see how Aphra Behn became a profit-making playwright, we must first examine her greatest hit, *The Rover*, and its original, Thomas Killigrew's *Thomaso, or The Wanderer*. *The Rover* was so popular as to be repeatedly performed over a long period.[4] *Thomaso*, on the other hand, has no record of performance, though some plans seem to have been made to put it on in the 1660s. Proclaimed as a two-part work, the play is actually composed of ten acts, incoherently sequenced,

which give the impression of a diffuse design unfit for performance. Probably written at the time of Killigrew's exile in Madrid from 1654 to 1655, the play is thought to be to some extent autobiographical.[5] Behn, surely with Killigrew's consent, adapted *Thomaso* in 1677, seven years after her debut, when he, with royal support, was a man of power in the theatrical world. Though Behn and Killigrew had probably known each other for some time, she started her career with the Duke's Company, Killigrew's rival.[6] As we do not know how their relationship affected Behn's production of *The Rover*, we will contrast it in detail with its original to disclose her methods of adaptation. First, let us see how Killigrew characterizes and presents his autobiographical hero.

Thomaso is set in Madrid, to which the banished cavalier Thomaso has come, pursuing his beloved Serulina. Fleeing from England, Thomaso, with financial problems, is distressed by the fact that Serulina is the daughter of a wealthy family. This poor knight is so proud that he cannot court her for fear of being suspected of loving her only for her fortune. Meanwhile, he leads a corrupted life, keeping company with whores and making fun of them. Finding himself in desperate straits, these whores plan to revenge themselves upon him, but in the end he is rescued from their schemes. As a result, he swears his love for Serulina by promising to be truly penitent. Until his joyful announcement that the hardships in love come to an end thanks to his love for Serulina, Thomaso has been a wanderer, one so destitute as to accept money from Angelica Bianca, a courtesan who loves him.[7] The exiled cavaliers spend depraved and wandering lives with the prostitutes, which lead to inconceivable happenings, as in the following scene, where he blames his drunken friends, Ferdinand and Edwardo, for their attempt to rape Serulina:

> *Thom*. Do you know this lady? — nor you, *Edwardo*?
> *Ferd*. I have seen that face, but where I cannot call to mind.
> *Edw*. Nor I; yet there are dark lines in my memory that lead me to her face; 'tis not *Lucetta* I am certain.
> *Thom*. I shall remove this wonder with another; have you never heard me mention the name of *Serulina*. Horrid beasts! are you not both struck with the judgement of this vision? — Do's not your black breasts accuse you of all the villany most barbarous men can be guilty of? what misery can this oppress'd innocence inflict, that your own souls will not say you ought to suffer? what mercy can you hope from this provok'd vertue, whose barbarous breasts, even forgetting her sex, could proceed to

> threaten blows, which she could have suffer'd too with less affliction then those wounds your rage and lust impos'd?
> (*The Second Part of Thomaso*, p.417. III. iv)

Thomaso severely laments their unjust and inhuman act, and their frightening the innocent Serulina, and he cannot believe that they are not "struck with the judgment of this vision"; in sum, they cannot distinguish a lady from a courtesan. Edwardo is represented as so stupid a fellow as to revenge himself on the whore by slashing her face with a knife, only because he has been tricked out of his money and goods. We can say, however, that it is a convention to mistake ladies for courtesans in comedies. Ferdinand and Edwardo, in a sense, function properly in a comic plot, but, in this writing of Killigrew's, more noteworthy is the fact that Thomaso alone will not make this mistake. He is the one character with a unique and privileged status; that is to say, for women, he is a lover whose love they wish for, and for men, he is a hero they really admire. Therefore, having indulged in dissipation with his friends, he is happily settled at the end. When all the stratagems and intentions of the plots converge for the final reconciliation, Thomaso relates that "our Loves has crown'd," for the "Virtue of this Star, bright *Serulina*, whose Friendship thus has fixt the Wanderer" and now "all Fears and Tyranny of the Boy must be remembred onely as the salt and seasoning of this Joy" (*The Second Part of Thomaso*, p.464. V. x).

As the comic mistaken identities of women and the happy conclusion show, the hero of *Thomaso* is presented as an exceptional character. In considering how this character is received or adapted by Behn, we will now examine the hero of *The Rover*, what ending he comes to, and how the motif of mistaking a friend's love for a prostitute appears in the plot. In rewriting the play, she creatively selects, adds to, and improves the characters or plots, and a story is concocted in which some of the women can devise strategies for controlling their own marriages.[8] When we consider her alteration of the same mistake motif as in *Thomaso*, we can find Killigrew's hero greatly transformed into the rake, Willmore, a fashionable figure on the 1670s' stage:

> WILLMORE Whe how the Devil shou'd I know *Florinda*?
> BELVILE Ah plague of your Ignorance! if it had not been *Florinda*, must you be a Beast? — a Brute? a Senseless Swine.
> WILLMORE Well Sir, you see I am endu'd with patience — I can bear — tho Egad y'are very free with me, methinks. — I was in good hopes the Quarrel wou'd have been on my side, for

so uncivilly interrupting me.
BELVILE Peace Brute! whilst thou'rt safe — oh I'm destracted.
WILLMORE Nay, nay, I'm an unlucky Dogg, that's certain.
BELVILE Ah Curse upon the Star that Rul'd my Birth! or whatsoever other Influence that makes me still so wretched.
WILLMORE Thou break'st my Heart with these complaints; there is no Star in fault, no Influence, but Sack, the cursed Sack I drunk.
FREDERICK Whe how the Devil came you so drunk?
WILLMORE Whe how the Devil came you so sober?
(*The Rover*, III. ii. 197-210)

The situation is almost the same; a man blames his friend for attempting to rape his beloved. But, here, Willmore, the hero of the play, is not blaming but blamed by his friends, because he, mistaking Belvile's love, Florinda, for a whore, nearly ravishes her. Willmore not only talks disgracefully about his drunkenness, but he is also called a "Beast." With regard to the conventional motif in Restoration comedies of trying to rape a woman by mistake, what is noteworthy here is that the characters take extremely different positions in *Thomaso* and *The Rover*. Willmore is, far from the privileged character of Thomaso, portrayed in accordance with Edwardo, a fool called "beast[s]" by Thomaso. While, in the original, the hero blames and severely laments over his friends' stupid conduct, the hero in the adaptation deserves to be censured, disparaged or even called "a senseless Swine." Why does Behn present her hero quite differently from its proto-character? To conform the points of her design, let us also consider how Blunt, Edwardo's equivalent, is described in *The Rover*.

Blunt is certainly another Edwardo, as he, having been fooled out of his money and goods by a whore, decides to revenge himself on every one of them. While he is making a firm resolution, Florinda suddenly comes into his house seeking refuge from pursuit by her brother, a paternal figure trying to force her into an arranged marriage. To Florinda who appears "by a strange unlucky accident, to seek a safety," Blunt, pulling her rudely, replies that he "will be reveng'd on one Whore for the sins of another" (*The Rover*, IV. i. 593-615). Blunt is pleased that he could have an immediate chance of vengeance, since he is convinced that Florinda is a whore. In the original play, the hero is distinctly different from the other male characters, and especially from the gull. In *The Rover*, by contrast, the distinction between the hero and the foolish figure is extremely blurred, as both Willmore and Blunt not only fail to tell a noblewoman from a courtesan but try to

rape the same lady, Florinda. Moreover, Willmore is such a mercenary person that, as soon as he knows of her fortune, he tries to marry the heroine, forgetting his previous declaration of aversion to the marriage system. In this way, he is relegated to a kind of gull who has no privileged qualities and does not behave rationally.

The play ends with three marriages, including his own with the heiress. This conclusion, however, cannot suggest a happy-ever-after like Thomaso's, because Willmore, having discarded a courtesan, almost has his consent to marriage arranged by the heroine. Killigrew's autobiographical hero is represented as a character in an exclusive and privileged position, distinguished from other characters, which implies that his Thomaso possesses the disposition of the elite Royalist with a predominant male sexuality. The image of Thomaso in the last scene where he stops wandering to be happy with the virtuous Serulina recalls that of the Royalists, who were restored to power by reversing their expatriation. Aphra Behn, on the other hand, dramatizes the elite Royalist and his predominant male sexuality in a comical or ludicrous way, where her hero has no privileged nature but bears a striking resemblance to the gull, and nor does he take the initiative in love triangle and marriage. Behn, using Killigrew's *Thomaso* originally written from the Royalist standpoint, strips the hero of his unique or privileged quality in social or sexual respects. Furthermore, she again used *Thomaso* for *The Second Part of the Rover* in 1681, in which the rover is once more involved in a love triangle, but, this time, he decides to live together with a courtesan without getting married in the end. As this last scene clearly shows, where the marriage system might be questioned, Behn presents a variety of gender relationships rather than political problems. While weakening political viewpoints or awarenesses, she extracts from the original the bright European culture of witty or charming girls, and gorgeous courtesans.

III

The comedy adapted by Aphra Behn from an original play with political meanings turned out to be her most successful play. At the time *The Rover*s were acted, English political alliances were shifting from France to Holland. The situation parallels that of *Thomaso*'s creation, that is, social or political uncertainty was producing a threatening atmosphere, when Charles in exile approached Spain rather than France.[9] Within the country, the problem of succession to the throne

became increasingly a matter of grave concern: James, Duke of York, left England, escaped from danger, even though the second Exclusion Bill was rejected with the dissolution of Parliament and the disapproval of the House of Lords. Charles, after dissolving Parliament in 1681, newly convened another one, but soon dissolved it when the third Exclusion Bill was put on the agenda, and parliament was never again summoned until the king's death. From the later 1670s to the early 1680s, the conflict for power between king and parliament appeared to be repeating the situation of the Civil War. When *The Second Part of the Rover* was played, it was one of the only two comedies acted in the 1680-81 season. The play was well received by the audiences. At time when some plays were prohibited from being performed because of their usurpation themes, it was dedicated to the Duke of York, a central figure in the Exclusion Crisis.[10]

She, as her dedication suggests, was never indifferent to social or political issues, though she weakened such matter in her adaptations. On this point, consideration of another adaptation by Behn will be useful to see how she strategically produces the plays for the stage. After *The Second Part of the Rover*, she made adaptations in succession in 1681-82. One of them, *The Roundheads, or The Good Old Cause* is based on a work written during the Commonwealth, and usually considered as a political play performed when a politically disquieting atmosphere prevailed. When publishing this play in 1682, she warned Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Grafton, in the Epistle Dedicatory to "beware of false Ambition," alluding to his half brother, the Duke of Monmouth, who was threatening royal stability (Epistle Dedicatory, l02).[11]

The Roundheads is adapted from *The Rump, or The Mirrour of The late Times* brought out around 1659/60 by John Tatham, who, as a writer, experienced extremely complicated transitions in the times when steps were diversely taken against the theatres. He opened his career in 1632 with a play that favored the court, probably from ambition for patronage. With the Civil War's breaking out, his works were not performed or published during the 1640s. His second play, which is a tragicomedy where royal blood is finally restored after repetitive usurpations, appeared as a publication in 1651 and there is no record of performance. At the same time, he also published an anti-Scottish play, and, afterwards, came to be engaged in producing the Lord Mayer's Show. By producing the show, he tried to fashion a new English nation and to play an intermediate part between parliament and city. *The Rump* was his last play created in 1659/60, after which his name

disappeared from the stage, though he continued to write civic shows until 1664. John Tatham, as his career shows, writes in various positions with regard to the court, parliament and the city.

The title page of *The Rump* says the play was "Acted Many Times with Great Applause, At the Private House in *Dorset*-Court." In this play, real members of parliament in 1659-60 are presented as characters with some changes to their names, for example, Bertlam from Lambert. The author could not be completely sure of his security at the time of writing, because he describes the Rump disparagingly or ridiculously, and its members and their wives stupidly or wretchedly. As well as the Rumpers' foolishness, a sharp criticism toward women's unsoundness is invited not only by Mrs. Cromwell but Lady Bertlam. Lady Bertlam is presented as being as ambitious as her husband, who secretly aspires to take Cromwell's place. Her arrogance makes her preside over the women's "Common-Wealth" and forces her woman to call herself "highness." The women's congress was a target of frequent attacks in the 1650s, but Lady Bertlam's is pictured on the stage in such a ridiculous way that women there are complaining about their husbands or walking companions.[12] When proposals are made like "the Cavaliers may not be lookt upon as Monsters, for they are Men," she goes to the Parliament House to "have um confirm'd" (*The Rump*, pp. 27-28. II. i.), only to be refused to entry to the House and called by her husband "a Mad Woman"(*The Rump*, p. 35. III. i.). At a time when confusion or struggle for power within the Rump became more serious, the Rumpers' wives proposed that they should improve cordial relations with men [the Cavaliers] with a sexual connotation, but the proposal results in refusal by their husbands [the Rump]. Though *The Rump* portrays the characters and their relations ridiculously and cynically, matters of Rump versus Cavaliers, or republicanism versus monarchy are definitely brought into question. In the play, to say nothing of the Rumpers themselves, the women come to a wretched end, as they are relegated to street vendor, whore or mad woman. Tatham indicates his public standpoint by markedly debasing the characters on the side of the Rump or republicanism.

Adapting this clearly political play, Aphra Behn wrote *The Roundheads* with new characters and plots added. The play ridiculing the Roundheads made a certain profit in performance in 1681/82. Behn does not use the changed names of the original characters but the real ones, and, more than anything else, she devises new characters; two Cavaliers [Loveless and Freeman] and a wife for the Roundhead

[Lady Desbro]. New plots make the "adaptation" extremely dissimilar from the original, where strategies for love are developed between Loveless and Lady Lambert, and between Freeman and Lady Desbro who promises to marry Freeman when her husband dies. Behn produces love stories between the Cavaliers and the wives of the leading Roundheads figures. As an example, let us look at the motif of the women's congress presented by Behn in quiet different settings from Tatham's, where the ladies' proposal is made by Loveless disguised as a woman. The scene is moved to the end of the play as a climax, and changed into the incident that unites Lady Lambert and Loveless in sincere love:

> LADY LAMBERT Alas, I do not merit thy Respect,
> I'm fall'n to Scorn, to Pity and Contempt. *Weeping*
> Ah *Loveless*, fly the Wretched —
> Thy Vertue is too noble to be shin'd on
> By any thing but rising Suns alone:
> I'm a declining shade. —
> LOVELESS By Heaven, you were never great till now!
> I never thought thee so much worth my Love,
> My knee, and Adoration, till this Minute. *Kneels*
> — I come to offer you my Life, and all,
> The little Fortune the rude Herd has left me.
> LADY LAMBERT Is there such god-like Vertue in your Sex?
> Or rather, in your Party.
> Curse on the Lies and Cheats of Conventicles,
> That taught me first to think Heroicks Devils,
> Blood-thirsty, lewd, tyrannick Savage Monsters.
> — But I believe 'em Angels all, if all like *Loveless*.
> What heavenly thing then must the Master be,
> Whose Servants are Divine?
> (*The Roundheads*, V. i. 368-86)

As becomes a climax, the scene foregrounds the joyful relationship of lovers, in that Loveless declares his love to Lady Lambert, offering his "Life, and all," by which she is moved. She was taught at first to think his sex or his Party "Heroicks Devils, / Blood-thirsty, lewd, tyrannick Savage Monsters," but changes her view, as there is "such god-like Vertue" in them, meaning not only men but also the Cavaliers. Indeed, Tatham's Lady Bertlam also proposes to form friendships with the Cavaliers, but she is scornfully excluded and not saved in the end. By contrast, Lady Lambert is given an ending quite unlike the original; having been informed of her husband's downfall, she is rescued by Loveless from the mob rushing to the congress. While the original

scene presents political matters in a critical light, as if poetic justice could be done by excluding obstacles from future harmony, the altered scene advances love stories between puritan women and the cavaliers.

What is important here is that Aphra Behn uses the women's congress to transform political problems into gender issues, convenient, of course, for putting on stage many actresses. This is not simply because obvious antipathies in power relations should not be presented on the stage during times of national crisis. Political struggle plots were not only fit for adaptation into lovers' conflicts, but attractive enough to draw the audience to the theatre by making them wonder what design would be developed from those delicate matters. Then, the audience witnesses the brilliant stage on which actresses play witty and attractive women engaging in love plots. The play appears undoubtedly to convey a political message behind the scenes, as the final union of lovers suggests the possibility of reconciliation between the rival parties, but, nevertheless, highlights love and gender afflictions or pleasures.

IV

As we have seen in the previous sections, *The Rover*s and *The Roundheads* are love comedies, adapted from 1650s' plays. Adaptation is safe, in a sense, to perform, when the popularity of the original work can be a promise of success, like Shakespeare's. However, we cannot say that the original plays we have discussed here could guarantee success in performance, because *Thomaso* might not have been staged, and *The Rump*'s popularity must have been transitory when the London citizens were enjoying the fall of tyrannical rulers. Then, what made Behn rewrite these Royalists' plays into love comedies in which courtesans and wives are presented as in love?

Aphra Behn, though so popular a writer during the Restoration period, had difficulty in drawing a large audience to her plays and consequently gaining earnings. In those days, when performing a play produced a great success, fair box-office proceeds would come into the company's possession. By contrast, playwrights could acquire only a part of the profits, partly because they, in performing their dramatic works, had to pay a registration fee or entertainment expenses for the actors and other theatrical staff, and mainly because it was only from the third night of performance that they received money, with various costs subtracted. Furthermore, two companies were in such

hard straits that they could not be run independently and united in 1682, which made the theatrical circumstances even more difficult, economically speaking.[13] Then not only playwrights but the companies themselves were obliged to achieve a great success in producing a play, or secure the patronage of courtiers or wealthy citizens, comprising the greater part of the audience. For that purpose, they could not but feel the necessity of being sensitive to the responses of the audience and indulging their tastes.

However, from the late 1670s to the early 1680s, such triangular balances as Anglican, Catholic, and Protestant in religion, or King, Parliament, and City in power began to collapse. When the theatre could hardly find generous patrons, the playwrights' primary consideration would have to be how their works would win popularity with an audience. At this critical time, Behn changed a play that ridicules enthusiastic characters in the civil strife into a comedy in which fashionable lovers lightly devise tricks or strategies in their love games. In this regard, *The Rover*s and *The Roundheads* reveal a playwright's strategic adaptation to her times in attempting to replace political strife with gender conflict. Behn's gender conflict is distinctively represented in such characters as a courtesan distressed by her passionate and genuine desire for love, or a wife in anguish over her own marriage and a girl over her arranged marriage. This strategy, as well as utilizing the original antagonism in political conflict for lovers' struggles, is simultaneously useful in performance, for it would enable many actresses to appear on the stage, offering visual pleasure to the audience. Therefore, her planned rewriting will have been a quite effective way to make the play more marketable in both the form and content of the work.

In addition to her designs on the stage, Behn published her play soon after its first performance, as was often the case at that time, because publishing new plays was recognized as a way of making money for both playwrights and publishers since the 1670s.[14] Consequently, even if the performances ended in failure, some of their scripts would be reprinted later, so the playwrights would justify or reevaluate their own plays or unsuccessful performances from the standpoint of the writer. Such a new trend promoted by Restoration publishers was to encourage playwrights to realize their own status as writers in the ownership of their creations. Behn must have been one of the dramatists who were conscious of authorship, as she struggled desperately to be approved as a writer, not an adapter, much less a pla-

giarist.

As a woman playwright, she must feel acutely that she cannot be free from prejudice that labels her as an unintelligent plagiarist. For example, Gerard Langbaine comments on her successful comedies as follows:

> *Rover, or The Banisht Cavaleers,* in Two parts, both of them Comedies, Acted at the Duke's Theatre, and printed in quarto, *Lond*. 1677, and 1681. the Second Part being Dedicated to his Royal Highness the Duke. These are the only Comedies, for the Theft of which, I condemn this ingenious Authoress; they being so excellent in their Original, that 'tis pity they should have been alter'd: and notwithstanding her Apology in the Postscript to the first part; I cannot acquit her of prevarication, since *Angelica* is not *the only stol'n Object,* as she calls it: she having borrow'd largely throughout. The truth is, the better to disguise her Theft . . . and therefore could not justly call these Plays her own.
>
> (Langbaine, pp. 20-21)

Langbaine is enthusiastic in finding out who or what works affect the play he is discussing; he points out "*Angelica* is not *the only stol'n Object,* as she calls it," referring to the postscript to *The Rover* where Behn remarks that she has borrowed the "sign of Angelica" from *Thomaso*. Though *Thomaso* might have inspired her to produce *The Rover*, her play assumes a completely different character by introducing freshly dramatic persons and plots. Its successful staging is explicit evidence for her ingeniously composing plots or assigning cast; around 1680, she appointed Elizabeth Barry to important parts in her plays and achieved success. Nevertheless, according to Langbaine's account, we "could not justly call these Plays her own." Admittedly, how far the writer can claim the right to the ownership of the work is an issue, especially in cases of adaptation. But, regarding this matter, it is interesting to note another of Langbaine's opinions on *Thomaso*, in which he notes that "the Author has borrow'd several Ornaments" and "has made use of *Ben Johnson* considerably." For all that, "'twould certainly be very excusable" because he does "not believe that our Author design'd to conceal his Theft" and "he is not the only Poet that has imp'd his Wings with Mr. *Johnson*'s Feathers" (Langbaine, pp. 313-14). Despite the fact that we could see little distinction between their means of creation, Langbaine openly denies Aphra Behn's authorship, and, on the other hand, professes Killigrew's act of borrowing to be forgivable. However, his standard for judging whether a work is plagiarized or adapted depends on the relationship between its

author and himself, as the case of *Thomaso* is excusable for acknowledging his borrowings from or debt to the greatest comic poet. Even though Langbaine's decision cannot be entirely trustworthy, it certainly shows that Aphra Behn exposed herself to frequent attacks for plagiarizing.

Depending for her living mainly on stage success, she exploited gossip about herself as a prostitute to attract theatergoers. Even an ugly rumor functioned as a useful instrument for theatrical sensation, and yet, what she aimed at was to acquire a reputation as a writer. The publishing current assisted her in this desire by providing the opportunity to proclaim her opinions and view. For instance, when publishing *The Dutch Lover*, presented in 1673, Behn appended a long "Epistle to the Reader," where she blames the play's unpopularity on the unskillful performance and the audience's prejudice against the author, a woman with little education. In response, she states her ideas about plays:

> In short, I think a Play the best divertisement that wise men have; but I do also think them nothing so, who do discourse as formallie about the rules of it, as if 'twere the grand affair of humane life. This being my opinion of Plays, I studied only to make this as entertaining as I could, which whether I have been successful in, my gentle Reader, you may for your shilling judge.
>
> (*The Dutch Lover*, Epistle, 90-95)

What Behn asserts here is that dramatic works should be enjoyable entertainments and that the readers should judge and find pleasure as they like without being affected by their previous (un)successful performances. This remark does not simply appeal for defense of her work, but clearly indicates that she supposes a plural relation towards the play's texts, that is, those of audience and reader. The readers of dramatic works can be assumed, in a sense, to have appeared during the Interregnum. The ruthless suppression of stage performance by the Commonwealth government deprived playwrights and actors of their living, so that they had to find means of support for themselves; some sold to publishers the dramatic texts owned by their companies; others turned into pamphleteers, bringing dramatic forms into print.[15] As a result, during the period of civil strife, plays or dramatic forms for reading were widely produced, which not only kept alive the plays but shaped their readers as devotees of drama. So, the period of theatrical oppression can be discussed as a period that might have prepared new dramatic foundations for the renewed stage, or new

possibilities that were to flower with the Restoration.

Aphra Behn understood the new theatrical situation in which an audience which was disappointed by a play's performance might enjoy reading the script, or that readers loving the works would come to see them presented on the stage. She cleverly uses the devices newly introduced into the Restoration theatres, such as theatrical machinery, actresses, and the printing system. While she tried to attract more audience to her plays or to improve her status as a writer, she always faced the matter of gender for good or ill. In other words, the real appearance of women on the stage and behind the scenes made the theatrical context of women more complicated. Yet the remarkable fact is that Behn, feeling that her gender produced prejudice, as seen in her Epistle or in Langbaine's comments, nevertheless received benefits at fictional and real levels.

V

The theatres in London, entering a new phase in reopening with the Restoration, were searching for ways to gain success in their staging of dramatic performances. Restoration drama is largely divided into two kinds; adaptations from the works of European writers or English authors like Shakespeare, and new plays created by contemporary playwrights. Performing adaptations from Shakespeare would probably have assured favorable receptions, but the right to perform them was controlled or restricted. Therefore, new plays were eagerly sought after, but their presentation was sometimes a very risky gamble for the company. Though accepting occasionally the patronage of the court or city, the company was frequently troubled in its management depending on performance records, so that the failure of a performance could be its deathblow.

In such a context, Aphra Behn, under the pressure of necessity, had to produce plays attractive enough to gain satisfactory profits. During her theatrical career, it is true that she was often regarded critically as a writer of adaptations with few original works, but her adaptations change more than enough to be called "original," because they bear only a slight resemblance to the original works. Furthermore, the fact that she does not select original plays because they were popular is supported by the cases of *Thomaso* and *The Rump*. Rather, she chooses the plays out of her own concerns or intentions: The original strife in politics enables her to represent conflicts between lovers with

political implications, or to put a number of actresses on the stage for visual effect. That is to say, she reproduces love comedies in a time of social, political, and religious instability, by utilizing prototype ideas and forms.

The desire for successful performance may have led her to create a play fundamentally in favor of the courtiers, powerful patrons of the theatre, but she, on several occasions, expresses disapproval of them in their politically or religiously blind enthusiasm or privileged control. In rewriting political plays into Restoration comedies, with actresses assigned to newly created characters like a courtesan struggling for love, political matters, in her hands, could be changed into gender issues arousing the audience's curiosity. Meanwhile, printed scripts had gradually gained a readership since the Civil War, and been read in private with imagination. The growth of this second medium allowed Behn to make good use of printing for her status as a writer. In this way, by using both the strategies of performance and printing, Aphra Behn fashions herself as a writer. In addition, her plays' popularity into the eighteenth century contributed to her being recognized as the first professional English woman playwright. However, the fact that other professional woman playwrights did not appear in the Restoration theatre shows that Aphra Behn established a unique position in the theatrical and social sphere at a time when England was rapidly changing.

Notes

* This article is part of a study supported by the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research 2001-2002, and revised from a paper read at the Tohoku Branch Meeting of the Japan Society of Seventeenth-Century English Literature at Miyagi Gakuin Women's College on September 22, 2001.

[1] When Charles II and the courtiers returned to London, they brought the European culture they had acquired in exile to the English theatres; the roofed buildings were furnished with stage settings imported from Europe, which made possible new stage directions, and the Companies engaged, for the first time, professional actresses on the English stage, as many of the European stages had already done. For changes to the theatres before and after the Restoration, see Leslie Hutson 82-132, and Frances Kavenik 1-25. For a study of Restoration actresses, see Elizabeth Howe.

[2] The change of literary forms has been considered, for example, in terms of inner moral worth, as Colley Cibber's attack on the stage indicates (Laura Brown

185-209), or in the emergence of closet drama (Mary A. Schofield and Cecilia Macheski 355-82).

[3] Since the 1990s, Aphra Behn has drawn much attention from literary critics with various viewpoints; in gender studies, she is examined as the first professional woman playwright in England; in respect of international politics or colonialism, she is often connected with her experience of being in Suriname in the 1660s or in Holland on a spying mission during the Second Dutch War. See Janet Todd, *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn* 35-79. Behn's works are frequently discussed regarding the influence of European culture as well as the earlier English theatrical tradition, because of her adaptations. As for the problem of her adaptations, see Laura Rosenthal 105-61.

[4] *The Rover* appeared on the stage more than one hundred times for about thirty years from 1714. As for the popularity of this play, see Mary A. Schofield and Cecilia Macheski 325-54, and Frances Kavenik 119-20.

[5] Killigrew started as Page of Honour to Charles I, following the course of the court, fleeing from the Civil War to Paris to stay with the exiled prince, finally making a journey around Europe. When Charles II was restored to the throne, Killigrew, in the king's favour, was granted various privileges in the theatrical world as well as at court.

[6] As for Behn's going to Holland as a secret agent during the Second Dutch War, it was Killigrew who presented her with this mission to gather information helpful to the English Army. Back in England, Behn did not receive a reward for her spying mission, probably because her information was useless. She had to ask Killigrew and Charles II to help her from the financial distress that had been caused by her enterprise in Holland, but she was not able to receive their support. What we know is that she was actually put in debtor's prison, while Killigrew, as a king's favorite, lived a luxurious life. When Killigrew was proceeding with *Thomaso*, he married. His marriage was like a play itself, since his bride was an heiress to 10,000 pounds and seventeen years younger than himself. See Janet Todd, *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn* 80-134.

[7] At the end of the play, Angelica, to whom Thomaso returns her money, so much regrets her involvement in the trick that she is left out of the denouement with remorse about her life. Angelica is often analyzed from sexual or gender viewpoints, in that she herself displays her picture, "a sign of Angelica," in public, commodifing herself as an object of male sexual desire. Aphra Behn's Angelica is represented as a tragic heroine in the first part of *The Rover*. Another Angelica in the second part, La Nuche, is presented more complicatedly, as she discards her professional way of living to live together with the rover, but not to get married.

[8] In *The Rover*, new main characters appeared; the heroine Hellena, who was acted by Elizabeth Barry initially known as a comedienne; the faithful Belvile, who constantly loves the virtuous Florinda, the post-character of Serulina; and a brisk girl Valeria, who forms the third married couple. As a result, the play presents the courses of three couples, including a love triangle between the rover [Willmore], an heiress [Hellena] and a courtesan [Angelica Bianca].

[9] On English foreign policy, see Steven C. A. Pincus, "Republicanism, absolutism and universal monarchy: English popular sentiment during the third Dutch war" (MacLean 241-66). The politics of Charles, both as an exiled prince and as a king, are described in detail by Hutton.

[10] According to the record for the theatrical season 1680-81 in *A Register of English Theatrical Documents 1660-1737*, the phrase "forbid acting" appears as a "response to their attempt to disguise *Richard the Second* as *The Sicilian Usurper*" (218-22).

[11] Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Grafton, was the second son of king's mistress Lady Castlemaine, later Duchess of Cleveland. He was a young protestant like James Scott, Duke of Monmouth, a most beloved son of the king. This central figure of the Exclusion Crisis, an aspirant to the throne supported by the anti-Catholic party, would be executed after his rebellion in 1685.

[12] Antonia Fraser mentions women's public activities during the Commonwealth such as "The Ladies Parliament" or "The Commonwealth of Ladies" (222-43).

[13] See Catherine Gallagher 1-48.

[14] After the Restoration, some of the publishers could make a profit from printing rights mostly registered before 1640 or bought later. These rights were concentrated on a small number of the traders, so many of the publishers began trying to find popular new writers and to print their works. See Feather 50-63.

[15] For the situation of actors or playwrights during Civil Wars and after, see Smith 54-92.

Bibliography

Behn, Aphra. *The Works of Aphra Behn*. Ed. Janet Todd. 7 vols. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992-96.

Brown, Laura. *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.

Cibber, Colley. *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*. New York: AMS P, 1974.

Crawford, Patricia, and Laura Gowing. *Women's World in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Duffy, Maureen. *The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn 1640-89*. London: Methuen, 1977.

Feather, John. *A History of British Publishing*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Fisk, Deborah Payne, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994

Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace 1670-1820*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

Genest, John. *Some Account of the English Stage: From the Restoration in 1660 to 183*0. 10 vols. 1832; Tokyo: Edition Synapse, 1997.

Cranfield, G. A. *The Press and Society From Caxton to Northcliff*. London: Longman, 1978.

Harris, Tom. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Hotson, Leslie. *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. Cambridge, Mass.:

Harvard UP, 1928.
Howe, Elizabeth. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
Hughes, Derek. *The Theatre of Aphra Behn*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
Hutton, Ronald. *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.
Kavenik, Frances M. *British Drama 1660-1779: A Critical History*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.
Killigrew, Thomas. *Comedies, and Tragedie*s. London, 1663-64.
Langbaine, Gerard. *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*. Oxford, 1691.
Love, Harold. *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
MacLean, Gerald, ed. *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
Milhous, Judith, and Robert D. Hume eds. *A Register of English Theatrical Documents 1660-1737*. 2 vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.
Patterson, Layman Ray. *Copyright in Historical Perspective*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1968.
Picard, Liza. *Restoration London: From Poverty to Pets, from Medicine to Magic, from Slang to Sex, from Wallpaper to Women's Rights*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1997.
Rosenthal, Laura J. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1996.
Schofield, Mary A. and Cecilia Macheski eds. *Curtain Calls: British and American Women and Theater, 1660-1820*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1991,
Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.
Strazincky, Marta. "Restoration Women Playwrights and the Limits of Professionalism." *ELH* 64 (1997):703-26.
Styan, J. L. *Restoration Comedy in Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
Tatham, John. *The Rump, or The Mirrour of The late Time*s. London, 1660.
Todd, Janet. *The Sign of Angelica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660-1800*. New York: Columbia UP, 1989.
——. *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn*. New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1996.
Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
Weber, Harold M. *The Restoration Rake-Hero: Transformations in Sexual Understanding in Seventeenth-Century England*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986.

Ghosts and Money in *Great Expectations*

Takashi Nakamura

Quite recently, Catherine Gallagher has raised a question about *Great Expectations* in connection with *Hamlet*. As her invaluable study starkly shows, the structure of the play-within-the-novel turned *Hamlet* into a thing Victorian; phrased differently, the Shakespearian play in the novel assumes mid-Victorian and capitalistic significance.[1] Even trifling matters are overtly Victorian; a pair of Hamlet's stockings is, for instance, not "fouled" nor "ungartered" but a "fetish" costing as much as five-and-thirty shillings. When Wopsle, by whom *Hamlet* is rendered as downright farce, peels off his stockings after the performance, the owner of "that property" boasts that "Shakespeare never was complimented with a finer pair" (ch. 31, 256). More importantly, the Dickensian and Shakespearean *Hamlets* have one thing in common: both, as it were, love ghosts. Ghost-figures haunt such characters as Hamlet the prince of Denmark and Pip the narrator from beginning to end, and ghosts, more often than not, drive protagonists to various degrees of madness. It is of note that Miss Havisham's ghost which reappears "hanging to the beam" (ch. 49, 401) is particularly Victorian in that it reflects the so-called medical discourse of the day. In the mid-nineteenth century, doctors were generally troubled by the uncertainty of the life-death boundary due to notions of "suspended animation" and "apparent death."[2]

Moreover, "premature burial" in which humans resurrected like ghosts happened time and again. It is no wonder that those somewhat supernatural events resulted in the "Society for the Prevention of Premature Burial"; among members of this occult association we find at one extreme those who were fascinated by "zombies." Occultism of this sort in the late Victorian period, along with mesmerism,[3] alias animal magnetism, produced what might be termed "ghost discourse," hence the discourse orchestrated the rise of many phantoms in Victorian culture; sensation fictions of 1860s are thus abounding with ghosts, and so is *Great Expectations* written just after Collins's *Woman*

in White, one of the most celebrated sensation novels. In fact, a host of phantasmagorical ghosts appear and reappear in Dickens's novels so persistently from the Christmas stories through *Great Expectations* that his contemporaries considered Dickens's ghost to be a product of his psychopathetic hallucination. According to G. H. Lewes, Dickens once said that he could hear distinctly "every word said by his characters" even before they were written down, by which Lewes concluded that Dickens was "a seer of visions" (Forster Vol. II, 269-71).

I: The Numerals of Statistics

Great Expectations is full of ghost visions embodied by virtue of the collaboration between Miss Havisham and Pip; so, one might argue, the novel is a work of commentary on ghosts. With reference to the ghost motif in this novel, not a few critics have discussed it from multifaceted viewpoints; among others, Milbank deals with the novel in the Gothic tradition that dates back to the late eighteenth century. Notably, as seen in Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* or Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolfo*, favorite themes of the Gothic are incarcerated heroines, prisons, ruined abbeys, medieval castles, great labyrinthine houses, and the like. Milbank maintains that in *Great Expectations* the "female Gothic mode" is reversed, so that Pip comes to be the victim of confinement by women (Milbank 16-17, 127-29).[4]

Ghosts in Dickens are certainly prominent, and yet I would argue, the ghosts in *Great Expectations* still deserve to be further discussed. First of all, the novel has brought into question the troublesome relationship between ghosts and realistic fiction. The so-called English realist novels, which can be traced back to Richardson, Defoe or Charlotte Lennox,[5] are fond of, or on good terms with conceptions of specified time and place. As Ian Watt puts it, "the novel is a full and authentic report of human experience," and according to him, reading novels is "like reading evidence in a court of Justice" (Watt 35-37). Forensic particularities in the novel therefore contribute to "verisimilitude" or "lifelikeness" (Frye, *Anatomy* 134). For this very reason, English realist fictions are on bad terms with unrealistic, supernatural matters; ghosts are one of the most blatant examples of this antirealism or "super-realism."[6] However it seems also fairly certain that novels have great difficulty in describing "reality"; rather, for better or worse, novels are not without a distortion of reality. One possible and simple explanation for this is that the language of novels must be "figurative"

in order to appeal effectively to the reader's imagination.

Even George Eliot is no exception, despite the fact that she harshly criticized Dickens's unreality, while ironically praising "his precious salt of humor, which compels him to reproduce external traits, that serve, in some degree, as a corrective to his frequently false psychology" (George Eliot, *Essays* 271). Although Eliot admires the strength of Dickensian humor, she deplores the lack of elaboration in characters' psychological reality. Probably what Eliot implied was that Dickens was so preoccupied with characters' externalities — faces, bodies, clothes, jewels, shoes, boots, or what not — that he had no time to describe psychology and emotion. Indeed the realist novelist as a rule "is fond of synecdochic details." As Roman Jakobson's epochal study has shown, a multiplicity of details is the very character of the late-nineteenth-century realist novel. Its literary style is described as metonymic. By contrast, the language of poetry, especially that of the Romantics, tends to be metaphorical; a typical example would be Blake's powerfully rendered "The Tiger."[7] In this poem, the "tiger" is like fire "burning," and the poet sees in the tiger a "fearful symmetry." In this way, metaphor becomes the language of poetry, while metonymy that of the novel.[8]

Jakobson's formula is on the whole true, but it is not always applicable to all fictions without reservation, as Dickens's splendid works amply demonstrate. Dorothy Van Ghent and Hillis Miller, to name but two, illustrate how metaphors and metonymies are so interrelated that discrimination between metaphor and metonymy is all but meaningless. Miller goes so far as to say that in Dickens "metonymy is the foundation and support of metaphor" (Miller, "The Fiction of Realism" 97). The point is that novels are locked in words, which are inevitably figurative. Hillis Miller observes: "All language is beside itself. There is no 'true' sign for the thing."[9] Language of prose fiction is inescapably figurative, mainly because of its use both of metaphors and metonymies. Metaphor presents two different things simultaneously, providing the reader with reality (within the bounds of realism) on the one hand. However, on the other hand, metaphor gives us quite a different image by boldly saying A is B. What is remarkable is that when such tropes are employed, the deeper significance is often revealed, such as Eros, desire, passion, the Unconscious, or whatever. In the case of Dickens, who is extremely fond of extraordinary figures, a multitude of metaphors and metonymies invariably distorts reality. Dickens's ghosts are, I believe, an exemplum of

metaphor that constructs and deconstructs reality; this double movement betrays the paradox of the fictional real; the Dickensian ghost therefore never fails to produce discord between realism and supernaturalism.

George Eliot the radical realist is not free from this novelistic distortion of reality, whether she likes it or not. Gillian Beer has pointed out that metaphors are "culture-bound," and that "Web imagery is to be found everywhere in Victorian writing." Victorians were generally affected by Darwinian ideas that produced such culture-bound words as "web" and "labyrinth" (Beer 167-71). In Eliot's *Silas Marner*, for example, we can spot a "spider," when Silas Marner as a solitary weaver is likened to be a "spinning insect" (ch. 2, 64). Eliot's acute sense of metaphor is also working in her description of Silas's frugal supper in which the miser fancifully views his saved guineas as "golden wine" (ch. 5, 92). The color "gold" comes to be all the more important when Eppie, the fair little heroine, appears. In heavy snowfall, Eppie's mother has died in front of Eppie, and the motherless child unwittingly strays into Silas's cottage. In this scene, Eppie seemed at first "a heap of gold" (ch. 15, 167) to Silas. The author's sensitive treatment of Eppie is overtly figurative: ". . . the little golden head sank down on the old sack, and blue eyes were veiled by their delicate half-transparent lids." (ch. 15, 166). What's more, when Eppie is presented as "the bright living thing" (ch. 15, 165), there can be little doubt that she is likened to Jesus, the child, whereas Silas, like the Virgin Mary, saves Eppie from the wilderness of snow.

The double vision created by metaphors, or tropes in general, transforms reality into something else. At the same time, novelists, who are obsessed by *mimesis*, try to reproduce what their eyes actually witness. In this paper, I argue, ghosts in Dickens are a representative of unreality, and that ghosts are antithetical to "monetary realism," which is strictly represented by numerals, as will be discussed later on. In what follows, I will discuss the problems of reality and unreality in *Great Expectations* bearing in mind that this opposition is epitomized by the binary opposition between ghosts and money. It is evident that almost all novels are deeply concerned with money, and that money is always presented by arithmetical numbers. To Pip, money is one of the most important things, as exemplified in the scene where he was given "a bright new shilling" and "Two One-Pound notes" by the stranger in the pub (ch. 10, 78); still later on, money has exerted a decisive power over Pip to such an extent that his destiny is drastically

changed by it.

Similarly, numbers have to do with realistic facts as well as money, since facts are well embodied by numbers. The case in point is Gradgrind, for *Hard Time* begins with his famous, dogmatic key-note speech upon facts: "Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. . . " (book I, ch. 1, 47). Bitzer is a favorite pupil of the Gradgrind school because he can account for everything in terms of numerals, so when asked by Gradgrind to define a horse, he dwells dryly on numbers:

> Quadruped. Graminivorous. Forty teeth, namely twenty-four grinders, four eye-teeth, and twelve incisive. Sheds coat in the spring; in marshy countries, sheds hoofs, too. Hoofs hard, but requiring to be shod with iron. Age known by marks in mouth.
>
> (book I, ch. 2, 50)

Like Bitzer, novels are generally good at facts and numbers. What is remarkable about *Hard Times* is that this novel can be read as an implicit critique of novelistic enumeration. *Hard Times* abounds with numbers to such an extent that even a human being is turned into a number: Sissy Jupe is identified as "girl number twenty." By the same token, Gradgrind's daughter, Louisa is scolded by his father, as she happens to say, "I wonder." The father remarks snappishly to his daughter: "Louisa, never wonder!" (book I, ch. 8, 89). In this way, *Hard Times* by putting an emphasis upon arithmetical language, discloses little by little what is wrong with arithmetical people like Gradgrind; numerals are able to teach facts, but cannot tell what human emotions are. Neither Louisa nor Tom knows anything about their filial affection, and to Gradgrind's disgrace, Tom commits a crime and Louisa eventually flees from her husband Bounderby to reproach her father who had arranged her marriage.

Gradgrind's obsession with numbers and facts is, however, not accidental, because the character is evidently created against the background of one of the influential discourses of the day: namely, the ideology of statistics, of which Thomas Malthus is the father and Chadwick the son. As is well known, Malthus's *An Essay on Population*, the first version of which was published 1798, had an enormous influence on early- and mid-Victorian Britain. Malthus's general argument was simple enough to permeate the whole Victorian England; the following is his guiding principle: "Population, when unchecked,

increases in a geometrical ratio," but, "Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio." Accordingly "a redundant population" (i. e. the poor) has to be removed by means of war, pestilence and famine (Malthus [Penguin] 71, 90, 109-19). These evils are the positive checks, whereas Malthus also stresses the importance of "preventive checks," thereby "a man of liberal education" would delay his marriage if he considers that this would lower his rank in society.[10] A noticeable characteristic of Malthus's language is its reliance on numbers, his words are both arithmetical and algebraic:

> According to a regular census made by order of Congress in 1790, which there is every reason to think is essentially correct, the white population of the United States was found to be 3,164,148. By a similar census in 1800, it was found to have increased to 4,312,841. It had increased then, during the ten years from 1790 to 1800, at a rate equal to 36.3 per cent, a rate which, if continued, would double the population in twenty-two years and about four months and a half. (Malthus [Penguin] 227)

Malthus meticulously counts up the figures. This avid aspiration for numbers, counting and tabulation underlines Malthusian statistics; and this cult of numbers was handed over to Edwin Chadwick.

Chadwick was a leading figure, firstly, of the New Poor Law of 1834, and secondly of the Victorian sanitary reforms.[11] Political economy in the earlier half of the nineteenth century was represented by Malthus and Chadwick; and to put it briefly, the language of political economists was arithmetical, referring repeatedly to myriads of numbers. A predilection for numbers and numerals — of course, "facts" are composed of these — is reflected in a profusion of Blue Books, which filled Gradgrind's room to the extent that it appeared wholly "blue" (book I, ch. 15, 131). In this respect, Gradgrind is evidently a victim of the abuse of the political economists' worship of numbers and facts.[12] If Gradgrind is the victim of the Malthusian politico-economical discourse of the period, so is Pip, who is to be persecuted by Malthusian numbers throughout the novel, with money as a symbolic instrument of this Malthusian persecution.

II: Miss Havisham's Ghost

It is inevitable that characters of the novel are faced with time and money. As Frye has shown, novel creates "real people," whereas in romance, there are basically three stereotyped protagonists — hero,

heroine and villain, who correspond to libido, anima and shadow respectively. Unlike romancer, novelist deals with "characters wearing their *personae* or social masks" (*Anatomy* 304-05); consequently, characters in the novel are forced to live in a real, "capitalistic" society, if so, it becomes impossible for them to escape from the power of time and money. In the mode of romance, however, characters are neither aware of time nor money; in other words, they are essentially free from politico-economical reality that is restricted by arithmetic numbers. That romance is antithetical to novelistic numbers and money is illustrated paradoxically by *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, which is, broadly speaking, an English *Don Quixote*; like *Don Quixote*, *The Knight* is a travesty of old-fashioned chivalric romance. Beaumont's satire on romance is laid bare when the play, by referring to particular money, makes fun of Rafe, a would-be knight-errant who holds the "Burning Pestle" instead of a "Burning Sword."[13] In the sense that *The Knight* is anti-chivalry, I argue that *Great Expectations* is anti-romance, for in the novel Pip overtly fails as "the young Knight of romance" (ch. 29, 231) despite the fact that he fervently wishes to rescue Estella, "the Princess" (ch. 29, 231) who is imprisoned in a labyrinthine manor named Satis House. With no obvious reason at all, Estella chooses not Pip but Drummle, who has "a compound of pride, avarice, brutality, and meanness" (ch. 59, 482). To Pip's further misfortune, he loses both love and money. What is noticeable about Pip is that money is a curse upon him rather than a blessing.

But before discussing *Great Expectations*'s Mammon, the god of realism, let us turn to the ghost to see how antirealism functions in the book. In *Great Expectations*, it is Miss Havisham who from time to time appears as a ghost. She is described as the "Witch of the place" (ch. 11, 85) and for this reason, is endowed with power to transform herself into anyone she likes. She, as the mistress of Satis House, allures Pip into the house to give pain to Pip by means of the arrogant, ice-cold, pretty girl, Estella, to whom the step-mother whispers, "Well, you can break his heart" (ch. 8, 60). In every way, Miss Havisham is "the strangest lady" Pip has ever seen (ch. 8, 57). In her house, time is stopped, or suspended at the very moment she knew that she was betrayed by her fiancé (Compeyson) on the eve of her wedding ceremony: it was "twenty minutes to nine" (ch. 8, 59). Note that the indexed time is strictly registered referring to the minute hand; this suggests that Miss Havisham is not free of time altogether but rather is bound for ever by time, unlike a witch in a romance (or fairy tale).

She is no longer a young lady, but is now an old, ogress-like spinster, wearing a wedding dress of "rich materials." That dress might have been snowy white, yet Pip finds it "faded and yellow," which indicates the destructiveness of time (ch. 8, 58). One might say that Miss Havisham's existence is divided into two worlds: she is living in the world of fairy tale romance, whereas she remains partly in the world of novels and realism. The supernatural element connected with the mode of romance is patently dominant in Satis House, as embodied in the ghost-like lady, Miss Havisham. To Pip she looks as if she were a dead woman; she is a "corpse-like" woman, Pip thinks of her as a "waxwork and skeleton" (ch. 8, 58, 60).

The deadly image given to her enables her to metamorphose into a ghost. On the day when Pip is first invited to Satis House, he is struck by Miss Havisham's ghost. The haunted place is the decayed brewery which her ghost frequents hereafter:

> It was in this place, and at this moment, that a strange thing happened to my fancy. . . . I turned my eyes . . . towards a great wooden beam in a low nook of the building near me on my right hand, and I saw *a figure hanging there by the neck*. A figure all in yellow white, with but one shoe to the feet; and it hung so, that I could see that the faded trimmings of the dress were like earthy paper, and that the face was Miss Havisham's, with a movement going over the whole countenance as if she were trying to call to me. . . . *I at first ran from it, and then ran towards it*. And my terror was greatest of all, when I found no figure there.
>
> (ch. 8, 64, my italics)

The ghost of Miss Havisham thus appears and disappears. This female ghost becomes all the more horrible when Pip sees that she looks as though she has been hanged like a convict at Newgate Prison. It is of interest to note here that Pip paradoxically feels both repulsion and attraction towards the ghost, for he says, "I at first ran from it, and then ran towards it." He loves and dislikes it, because in half of himself, Pip is a "dreamer" who fancies himself living in a fairy tale world, while, on the contrary, in another half, he is a Victorian realist, who is not allowed to believe in ghosts. Accordingly the ghost of Miss Havisham disappears at the moment when he comes to himself. A vision of this kind, however, keeps on following Pip until it is felt to be all but omnipresent.

A vision of the ghost is seen again in chapter 49 where Pip catches a glimpse of "Miss Havisham hanging to the beam":

> A *childish* association revived with *wonderful force* in the moment of the slight action, and I *fancied* that I saw Miss Havisham hanging to the beam. So strong was the impression, that I stood under the beam shuddering from head to foot before I knew it was a fancy — though to be sure I was there in an instant.
>
> The mournfulness of the place and time, and the great terror of this illusion . . . caused me to feel an indescribable awe.
>
> (ch. 49, 401, my italics)

The repetitiveness of this ghost vision in Pip starkly shows that the ghost is Pip's "anxiety." Anxiety, in Freud's formulation, brings about a "traumatic neurosis" in which past uncomfortable, unpleasurable experiences are repeated in the form of dreams; this is what is called the "compulsion to repeat." The compulsion to repeat is, Freud argues, an index of the "death instincts." He simply says that "the aim of all life is death" (*Beyond* 311). Since Pip is frequently troubled by a Death-like ghost, he seems to encapsulate Freudian notions of the compulsion to repeat and the death instinct. Pip is tortured not merely by Miss Havisham's ghost but by the Freudian Thanatos. He is a dark figure who is enthralled by Death and by ghosts.

It is to be remembered that Miss Havisham's ghost does exist not in objective reality but in Pip's subjective and psychological reality. In this sense, the ghost vision is not incompatible with realism or *mimesis*, providing that ghost is confined exclusively to the realm of Pip's mind. A ghost, if it is only perceived by the mind, does not infringe the conventions of realism. Even in a sensation novel like Collins's *The Woman in White*, the ghost is not an external figure but is seen through one's mind's eye; in the novel, the recurrent ghost vision is not really a ghost but Anne Catherick's ghastly figure in white. For instance, there is a scene where a pupil, Jacob Postlethwaite claims that he "saw t' ghaist," "Arl in white," appearing "Away yander, in t' kirkyard" (110). At this clumsy insistence, the schoolmaster punishes the boy by making him stand on a "stool in a corner," asserting that there can not possibly be ghost. Collins's novel appears to disown the existence of ghosts in reality, but it is also true that there is a tinge of sarcasm when the author mentions the schoolmaster's matter-of-fact denial of the ghost: "There are no such things as ghosts, and therefore any boy who believes in ghosts believes in what can't possibly be. . . " (108). Here Mr. Dempster the schoolmaster is presented as hard-nosed and stubborn as Gradgrind, who does not make allowances for any fanciful ideas.

Another example in which an argument about ghosts is developed is in *Hamlet*. Hamlet's mother, Gertrude cries, "Alas! he's mad!" (3. 4. 105) when she sees her son talk to the vacuum where the son recognizes his father's Ghost. The mother laments that he is out of his mind to "hold discourse" with an empty space. The following is the dialogue between the son and the mother:

> HAM. Why, look you there, look how it steals away!
> My father, in his habit as he lived!
> Look where he goes, even now, out at the portal!
> *Exit Ghost*.
> QUEEN. This is the very coinage of your brain,
> This bodiless creation ecstasy
> Is very cunning in. (3. 4. 134-39)

Hamlet claims to see his father's ghost, while his mother sees nothing. The discrepancy between the two on the notion of ghosts testifies to the psychological gap between them; the son is internally accusing his mother of treachery, and the mother is lamenting her son's madness ("ecstasy"). Hamlet, like Pip and Jacob, is obliged to visualize the ghost. In this connection, it is to be noted that all the three are young; to be more precise, the three are by and large boys. Pip, even after growing up, is made a fool of by Estella: "you visionary boy" (ch. 44, 364); and Pip cannot but be a boy before Miss Havisham, who plays the role of an evil godmother. Hamlet is also rendered a boy in the scene because he is placed between his father and mother. In *The Woman in White*, Jacob, who persists in his seeing the ghost, is a boy pupil. Hence it becomes clear that only a boy or child is allowed to, or fain to, see ghosts. To put it another way, the ghost is often accessible to a (male) child. In the scene where Pip glimpses Miss Havisham's ghost, he says: "A childish association revived with wonderful force in the moment of the slight action, and I fancied that I saw Miss Havisham hanging to the beam." Obviously here is the equation of childishness and fancy, both of which enable Pip to see what does not exist in the outer reality. But why is it that the child is given a special power to "coin" the ghost?

The most essential quality of children is, I suppose, play; they play for pleasure and in earnest. As every child likes to play, a child is a typical example of "*homo ludens*" as Huizinga once put it. To follow his argument, though, not only children but people in general like to play; many games and races in a variety of different cultures are illustrations of this. Huizinga regards humans' play as "a cultural phenom-

enon," and remarks that "civilization arises and unfolds in and as play" (*Homo Ludens* "Foreward"). Literature is a major cultural phenomenon, so Huizinga writes:

> One of the basic features of lyrical imagination is the tendency to maniacal exaggeration. Poetry must be exorbitant. . . . The desire to make an idea as enormous and stupefying as possible is not peculiar to the lyric; it is a typical play-function and is common both in child-life and in certain mental diseases.
>
> (*Homo Ludens* 142-43)

He also observes that "Really to play, a man must play like a child" (*Homo Ludens* 199). It is certain that playing belongs to the proper sphere of children, and it is obvious that Dickens as a writer is engaged with, or fascinated by, playing himself in his works; in this respect, it is worth recalling that in *The Old Curiosity Shop*, Quilip plays with "a large fierce dog" in his "ecstasy" while "taunting the dog with hideous faces" and "hissing and worrying the animal till he was nearly mad" (ch. 21, 170). Quilp's extraordinary sport with the dog culminates in his queer dance "with his arms a-kimbo" in which he performs "a kind of demon-dance round the kennel, just without the limits of the chain, driving the dog quite wild" (ch. 21, 170-71). Quilp, the dwarf finds himself playing in earnest in the midst of a carnivalesque and grotesque space.[14] Such characteristics as excessiveness, madness, abnormality, cruelty and so forth are the distinctive features of Quilp's "serious" play. There is little doubt that Dickens's works as a whole tend to enter this Quilpean world: the play-field of madness, laughter and nonsense. Likewise, Miss Havisham's ghost is seen as an embodiment of madness, nonsense, and childish play.

III: Two Casts

The Dickensian ghost is an expression of children's play in which excessive, supernatural elements are more encouraged than condemned or discouraged. In this sense, the ghost in Dickens is a product of the ideology of a conventional fairy-tale dreamworld. It should be noted, however, that fairy-tale romance is made up of evil and devilish aspects as well as enjoyable wish-fulfilment elements. In addition to good-natured characters such as princes, princesses and fairies, fairy tales are full of such evil creatures as monsters, ogres, dwarfs, bluebeards, witches, godmothers, stepmothers or what not. These evil ones signal that they are the representatives of Death. To use Freud's

phrase, they embody the "death instinct," which is related to violence, destruction, murder and death. As Harry Stone's excellent study shows, Dickens was introduced to many fairy stories from his infancy by means of oral tradition, so that they formed "part of his life" (Stone 33). Two women played crucial roles in instilling the fairy-tale elements into the young Dickens: one was his paternal grandmother, Elizabeth Ball Dickens and the other was his nursemaid, Mary Weller, both of whom are said to have been gifted as exceptional story-tellers. The wickedness and demonic evil that fairy tale inherently contains influenced Dickens as a child through countless stories; in later years, the fairy-tale tradition helped Dickens create many characters who "are marvelously transmuted evocations of the nightmare component in the fairy-tale world of Dickens' childhood" (Stone 39).

In *Great Expectations*, this nightmarish component is reflected not only in such characters as Miss Havisham and Orlick, but in other things such as the two fearful "casts" in Jaggers's office. Jaggers is a lawyer who mainly deals with criminal cases connected with Newgate Prison. In every way, he is a grotesque person with "an exceedingly large head and a correspondingly large hand" (ch. 11, 83). When Pip sees Jaggers for the first time in Satis House, Pip senses that Jaggers's hand smells "of scented soap" (ch. 11, 83). The reason for this is that whenever the lawyer sees his clients — criminals — he washes his hands as if to scrape off the invisible blood. It is Jaggers that informs Pip of his "great expectations":

> "I am instructed to communicate to him," said Mr. Jaggers, throwing his finger at me, sideways, "that he will come into a handsome property, that he be immediately removed from his present sphere of life and from this place, and *be brought up as a gentleman* — in a word, as a young fellow of great expectations."
>
> My dream was out; my wild fancy was surpassed by sober reality; Miss Havisham was going to make my fortune on a grand scale. (ch. 18, 138, my italics)

This scene depicts the moment when the bond of apprenticeship between Pip and Joe is broken; Pip's dream seems to come true, though, of course, his fortune will turn out to be tainted afterwards. It is notable that the story of the "great expectations" is not detailed at all; instead, it is rather opaque: the reader is not given any idea how great that property is, nor who the benefactor is, although Pip speculates that Miss Havisham is the person who secretly gives him the Satis House property. It is Pip's habit that when facing "reality" — in

this case, monetary reality — he fabricates a "fiction" about money.

Believing in the fiction that he is to be a wealthy gentleman under the guardianship of Miss Havisham, Pip comes to London. Significantly, the first impression of the metropolis is odious to Pip: he had "faint doubts whether it [London] was not rather ugly, crooked, narrow and dirty" (ch. 20, 163). Jaggers's address is Little Britain "just out of Smithfield," in the neighborhood of Newgate Prison. Jaggers's office is, as it were, sandwiched between Smithfield and Newgate, both of which are evocations of the gloomy Death image. It is well-known that in the Victorian period, Smithfield was the place where live cattle were driven to "the huge central slaughter house" (Porter, *London* 193) offending urban sensibilities; Pip is surely one of the most offended, as he senses Smithfield to be "all asmear with filth and fat and blood and foam" (ch. 20, 165). After being made aghast by the grim picture of Smithfield, Pip is frightened by the gatekeeper ("minister of justice") of Newgate, who shows him the gallows and the Debtor's Door, explaining that four prisoners will be hanged "the day after to-morrow at eight in the morning, to be killed in a row" (ch. 20, 166).

Evil images of Death are thus made palpable when Pip arrives in London; above all, the "two dreadful casts" draw the reader's attention as they do Pip's. Pip's delineation of Jaggers's room indicates that the lawyer, who specializes in criminal cases, is by profession well versed in deadly crimes and severe punishments:

> Mr. Jaggers's room was lighted by a skylight only, and was most dismal place; the skylight, eccentrically patched like a broken head, and the distorted adjoining houses looking as if they had twisted themselves to peep down at me through it. There were not so many papers about, as I should have expected to see; and there were some odd objects about . . . such as an old rusty pistol, a sword in a scabbard, several strange-looking boxes and packages, and two dreadful casts on a shelf, of faces peculiarly swollen, and twitchy about the nose. Mr. Jaggers's own high-backed chair was of deadly black horsehair, with rows of brass nails round it, like a coffin; and I fancied I could see how he leaned back in it, and bit his forefinger at the clients. (ch. 20, 164)

In Jaggers's gloomy room, the most prominent things that correlate death with the agony of death may be the two dreadful casts, whose faces are "peculiarly swollen." The two casts are depicted as "swollen" and "twitchy" as if they were at that moment in the agony of death on the gallows; both casts were of clients in all probability executed in public at Newgate Prison. In addition, Jaggers's room

abounds in odious things and images; one can spot "a broken head," "an old rusty pistol," "a sword in a scabbard," "deadly black horsehair," a "coffin" and so forth. In the quotation, it is noteworthy that two modes of metaphors and metonymies are mutually utilized to disclose that Jaggers's office is the site where one must confront death.

As I mentioned earlier with reference to Jakobson's theory, metonymy is the language of realist fiction, in which details are delineated one by one through a series of close-ups; whereas, metaphor is a substitution of one thing with another, the most celebrated example of which is found in the poetry of Romanticism and symbolism. In Miller's phrase, metonymy is the "lie which says A leads to B," in contrast, metaphor is the "lie which says A equals B" (*Fiction of Realism* 124). Here, as elsewhere, realism is at least partly realized by metonymy that is designed to shed light on "odd objects" such as the pistol, sword, boxes, packages and casts point by point. At the same time, however, this *mimesis* is instantly shattered when it becomes clear that the narrator is as a whole ruled by the principle of metaphor, since Pip feels as though he were looked at by "the distorted adjoining houses" which, like humans, "twisted themselves to peep down at me," through the skylight overhead.[15] Pip's fancy equates the "high-backed chair" with a "coffin"; besides, this coffin-like chair conjures up a vision of Jaggers who is "real" enough to make Pip see Jaggers biting his forefinger and staring at the clients. By implication, Jaggers's office is a place where Death or deadly things come to reside. The invisible Jaggers is rendered visible by means of metaphor and metonymy. These tropes, as noted earlier, tend to become "maniacal exaggeration," disclosing the desire to "play." As Huizinga observes, the function of imaginative language is similar to that of child's play, because literature, perhaps of a Dickensian persuasion, likes to please itself with the "desire to make an idea as enormous and stupefying as possible" (*Homo Ludens* 143).

Pip as a fanciful child plays with words, and in this process he all but unwittingly tells a lie; namely, he fabricates a lot of "fictions." In this regard, Pip can be said to be a child who is driven by the compulsion to repeat his fictions and lies. One of Pip's distinctive traits is his willingness to invent his lies as chance directs him. It should be taken into account, however, that children generally like telling a lie as if it were a matter of fact. Children are fond of fanciful ideas, and childish fancy tends to generate a lie, as Freud comments on jokes.[16] Pip's fancy, which gives rise to Miss Havisham's ghosts, otherwise produces

an enormous lie when his sister asks him about Miss Havisham after his first visit to Satis House. Mrs. Joe Gargery and Pumblechook are too curious to resist flinging numerous questions at Pip. But Pip, being harassed by their inquisitiveness, begins in desperation to tell a series of lies, to their bewilderment. Pumblechook asks Pip how Miss Havisham was like in her room: "Now, boy! What was she a doing of when you went in to-day?" (ch. 9, 67). Pip gives a puzzling answer:

> "She was sitting," I answered, "in a black velvet coach."
> Mr. Pumblechook and Mrs. Joe stared at one another — as they well might — and both repeated, "In a black velvet coach?"
> "Yes," said I. "And Miss Estella — that's her niece, I think — handed her in cake and wine at the coach-window, on a gold plate. And I got up behind the coach to eat mine, because she told me to."
> "Was anybody else there?" asked Mr. Pumblechook.
> "Four dogs," said I.
> "Large or small?"
> "Immense," said I. "And they fought for veal cutlets out of a silver basket."
> Mr. Pumblechook and Mrs. Joe stared one another again, in utter amazement. (ch. 9, 67)

A polarity between child's fancy and adult's factualism is here comically presented, making fools of the confounded Mrs. Joe and Pumblechook, who are now discussing in earnest what the meaning of Pip's word might be. Grown-ups need logical and reasonable explanations, Pip's fancy, however, is so unbridled that he is able to invent anything he likes. Pip keeps on telling "a cock-and-bull story" as follows:

> "We played with flags," I said. . . .
> "Flags!" echoed my sister.
> "Yes," said I. "Estella waved a blue flag, and I waved a red one, and Miss Havisham waved one sprinkled all over with little gold stars, out at the coach-window. And then we all waved our swords and hurrahed." (ch. 9, 68)

In Pip's mind, he is even prepared to go so far as to say that there were "balloon in the yard" and "a bear in the brewery" (ch. 9, 69). In fact, this "maniacal exaggeration" is not brought forward because of a serious consultation between Pumblechook and Mrs. Gargery, who are preoccupied with "discussing the marvels." In the citations, some attributes are found in Pip's fancy; firstly, Pip's fancy and his lies are childish in that they are quite illogical, and have no meaning at all. In short, Pip's fanciful story about Miss Havisham and Satis House is

nothing but "nonsense," like Lewis Carroll's *Alice* stories. The Carrollian Pip is also apt to like animal images such as four immense dogs and a bear. It is worth remembering that in fairy-tale romance, animals are as a rule indispensable.

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland is an admirable example with a host of animals — from a rabbit, cat, dog, mouse, dormouse, fish, lizard, caterpillar through to a dodo; and moreover, in the mode of romance and fairy tale, it is fairly natural that these animals should talk. Needless to say, it is not impossible for Dickens to create such a talking animal: notably, Grip the raven, which now and then wildly pours out a shower of nonsensical words: ". . . Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah! I'm a devil, I'm a devil, I'm a ket-tle on, Keep up your spirits, Never say die, Bow, wow, wow, I'm a devil, I'm a ket-tle, I'm a — Polly put the ket-tle on, we'll all have tea" (*Barnaby Rudge*, ch. 17, 194). In this way, Grip transforms itself into various creatures and things; the raven is at once a "devil," "kettle," "Polly," and a dog. Pip, however, does not turn himself into anyone or anything, and yet he, by virtue of his power of fancy, can visualize what an ordinary eye can't see: a black velvet coach, huge dogs, a bear, colorful flags, a balloon, and Miss Havisham's ghost.

Animal images aside, things like flags and a balloon are of significance, in relation to the playfulness of fairy-tale romance. Both flag and balloon float in the air; similarly, floating or suspension in the air is a prominent characteristic of ghosts — just as Miss Havisham's ghost is "hanging to the beam" (ch. 49, 401). This aspect of floating, embodied by the flag, balloon and ghost, implies that the mode of romance is contrasted with "realism." Floating or hovering in a Dickensian novel is hence an expression of antipathy towards the earthly commonplace that is far from imagination and fancy. Curiously enough, the characters of romance are equally attracted to the underworld as well as the upper world; as is well-known, Alice's wonderful story begins with her fall into the underworld, the entrance of which is "a large rabbit-hole under the hedge" (8). If, in the mode of romance, characters enter the upper world, they must fly in the air; on the other hand, if they are placed at the bottom, they are to encounter grotesque creatures just as Alice does.[17] In any case, whether the stage is the world above or below, the structuring principle of romance is liberation from the bondage of earthly reality. That is why Pip's fanciful eye goes upward to find Miss Havisham's ghost in the air.

Pip is not the only person whose principle is fancy and playfulness;

in Wemmick we find another fanciful figure, a person of double personality. In the City, as a clerk in Jaggers's office, he wears a social *persona* so fixedly that he appears an unsympathetic, matter-of-fact person; his inflexible personality goes so far as to make him seem a kind of post-office: "His mouth was such a post-office of a mouth that he had a mechanical appearance of smiling" (ch. 21, 172). On the contrary, at his "Castle" home, he turns himself into quite a different person; he lives with his old father "the Aged" cheerfully. But Wemmick's tenderness and gentleness are only revealed in his Castle: his warmth is phrased as his "Walworth sentiments" (ch. 36, 291) upon which Pip relies when he is in jeopardy. Wemmick is positively an eccentric person, and his oddity is articulated by the strange structure of his house; it is a fortified house with a drawbridge and the "Stinger" (ch. 25, 206). While the house's hard front symbolizes the state of a man's strife in the city, with warlike drawbridge and gun ("Stinger"), at the back of it Pip finds an Eden-like small garden that recalls peaceful country life: there Wemmick breeds "a pig . . . fowls and rabbits," besides, he builds "a bower" and makes "an ornamental lake" and "a fountain" (ch. 25, 207). This division of the house between war-like hostility and idyllic country life mirrors Wemmick's dual personality. He is both a "hard" Victorian and a good-natured, amiable man.

Wemmick's eccentricity is linked with his playful character, for it is clear that his Castle — with drawbridge, gun, arbor, lake and fountain — is a manifestation of his childish and fetishist tendency to play with things. The fact that he calls his home "Castle" signifies that he too is a *homo ludens*, like Pip and Grip. The scene below exemplifies his fondness for play; he converses with the two "casts":

> "Pray," said I [Pip], as the two odious casts with the twitchy leer upon them caught my sight again, "whose likenesses are those?"
>
> "These?" said Wemmick, getting upon a chair, and blowing the dust off the horrible heads before bringing them down. "These are two celebrated ones. Famous clients of ours that got us a world of credit. This chap (*why you must have come down in the night and been peeping into the inkstand, to get this blot upon your eyebrow, you old rascal!*) murdered his master, and, considering that he wasn't brought up to evidence, didn't plan it badly."
>
> "Is it like him?" I asked . . . .
>
> "Like him? It's himself you know. The cast was made in Newgate, directly after he was taken down. . . ."
>
> (ch. 24, 200, my italics)

It is palpable that Wemmick, by comically conversing with the cast, parodies the famous scene from Shakespeare where Hamlet, faced with "Yorick's skull, the king's jester," laments: "Alas poor Yorick!" (5. 1. 156). Seen from another perspective, it may be that Wemmick alludes to the parody by Laurence Sterne. In *Tristram Shandy*, Yorick the parson is bemoaned by his friend Eugenius, who dedicates "three words of inscription, serving both for his epitaph and elegy, Alas, poor YORICK!" (vol. I, ch. 12, 61-62). Shakespeare and Sterne are, one might argue, parodied by the comical Wemmick; in this relation, it should be noted that parody functions as literary "play." If so, it is worthwhile remembering Bakhtin's theory of polyphony. Bakhtin reminds us that in parody there exist different voices or languages (*The Dialogic Imagination* 75). At least four different voices can be heard in the scene where Wemmick is talking to the cast: mixed together are the voices of Hamlet, Eugenius, Wemmick and the criminal, from whom the cast is "made in Newgate." These voices have something in common: they all refer to the motif of Death and ghosts. The linkage of the cast with ghosts is realized by Wemmick's playful remarks on the cast: "why you must have come down in the night and been peeping into the inkstand, to get this blot upon your eyebrow, you old rascal!" The death mask, which flies at night is certainly a kind of ghost; it does float in the air, being free of gravity. Gravity, as discussed earlier, is an emblem of earthly realism, contrasted with unrealistic fancy. The cast-ghost relationship, however, indicates also some realistic element: actual gruesome murders of the Victorian period. Wemmick gives an account of the murderer pointing at the cast: "this chap . . . murdered his master." The cast, as a ghost and murderer, is therefore divided into two realms: the antirealist realm of romance and the bloody criminal realism.

The motif of the skull (a death mask) and beheading is apparently one of the Dickensian themes; before dealing with the cast in *Great Expectations*, Dickens, in *David Copperfield*, highlighted the beheading of King Charles the First. A case in point is Mr. Dick, a mild lunatic. Dick's obsession with the late king's head is so strong that he cannot but pose a question to Pip: "Do you recollect the date . . . when King Charles the First had his head cut off?" (ch. 14, 194). For years Dick has been engaged with his Memorial of "the Lord Chancellor, or the Lord Somebody or other" (ch. 14, 197) but he has not finished his Memorial yet, because once the slightest idea of the late King's head comes across his mind, his pen is stuck; hence his writing is always far

from completion. Just like Pip's obsession with Miss Havisham's ghost, Dick is annoyed by the so-called "compulsion to repeat"; in this case, Dick is afraid of the head or skull of King Charles the First, which is associated with the cruel execution by which the Father of the nation was declared impotent.[18] We have seen the playfulness as regards Wemmick's conversation with the cast. By the same token, Dick's playful character is unmistakable; Dick is wont to play with his great kite almost everyday after his fruitless daily work: "Dick and I [David] . . . very often, when his day's work was done, went out together to fly the great kite" (ch. 15, 207) which was patched up all over with Dick's "manuscript, very closely and laboriously written" (ch. 14, 195). Seeing Dick's kite soaring high into the air, David would think thus: "I used to *fancy* . . . that it lifted his mind out of its confusion, and bore it . . . into the skies" (ch. 15, 207, my italics). David's comment on Dick's kite reminds us of the airy objects like ghosts, flags, balloons and the casts in *Great Expectations*, all of which are floating or hovering in the air.

IV: *Memento Mori*

It should be borne in mind that the motif of Death, as seen in the ghost scene of Miss Havisham and the casts in Jaggers's office, have to do with a certain European medieval tradition: *memento mori* ("remember you must die"), this thought is brought into focus in the fourteenth century, for the ideology of *memento mori* has been developed along with the spread of the Black Death. One of the most fatal epidemic is known as "the Great Pestilence of 1347-51" that killed around a quarter of Europe's population. Victims of the Black Death suffered various symptoms such as chest pains, vomiting of blood, high fever and dark skin blotches. The plague was so virulent resulting in millions of deaths that people were helpless in the face of the plague. As physicians had no power against the disease, many people counted on religious beliefs. Even some Protestants regarded the plague as "God-sent" or as a Job-like trial of faith. This is why the Black Death reinforced religion in a Christian society. Roy Porter writes:

> Religion retained its hold at the death-bed. How a person died was crucial, for it determined whether they went to heaven or hell. From medieval times the *ars moriendi* (the art of dying) had taught believers how to die well. (*Benefit* 241)

Ars moriendi caused by the plague is related to the ideology of the

fig. 1 Wolgemut, *Dance of the Dead* from *Nurenberg Chronicle (*1493)

memento mori; death was immanent, medieval European literature were therefore full of *memento mori* symbols. It goes without saying that *memento mori* developed with another medieval doctrine of death: *danse macabre* (dance of death). The motif of *danse macabre* enjoyed unusual popularity especially in the later Middle Ages, broadly, for the same reason as *memento mori* flourished. *Danse macabre* together with *memento mori* left their mark in the history of such medieval culture as woodcuts, paintings, sculptures, verses and dramatic performances.

In *danse macabre*, a dancing master leads living people of all kinds and professions — emperor, nobleman, monk, child, fool, etc. — to the grave. Originally, the dead person was drawn as a decayed body, however, "around 1500 does the figure of the great dancer become the skeleton" (Huizinga, *Autumn* 166). Wolgemut's woodcut (fig. 1)[19] produced in 1493 is of interesting, for it delineates skeletons with flesh, thereby indicating this is an intermediate form of drawing between the rotten body and "pure" skeleton. While in medicine, the notions of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* have been evolved, particularly, through the formation of anatomy in Renaissance. In those days, many books on anatomy were published with accurate anatomical drawings; among others, Andreas Vesalius's *De humani corporis fabrica* (*On the Fabric of the Human Body*, 1543) marked a watershed

fig. 2 A Renaissance anatomical illustration for *Historia de la composicion del cuerco humano* (1556)

in anatomy. Figure 2 is a celebrated example displaying the complete skeleton. As Roy Porter maintains, this skeleton lost in contemplation facing the skull prefigures Hamlet's meditation in a later, but largely contemporary period.[20]

After Shakespeare, the tradition of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* survived; the Hamlet who laments before Yorick's skull is reproduced by Sterne. As a contemporary of Sterne, Hogarth is important in relation to his *memento mori* engraving, *The Reward of Cruelty*, the fourth plate of *The Four Stages of Cruelty* (fig. 3).[21] In this plate, the protagonist, Nero receives public revenge upon his body. In the preceding plates, Nero has done such wrongs as abusing animals, theft, and the cruel murder of his lover (Ann Gill); consequently, Nero is forced to make atonement with his life, doubly, since he is not only executed but experiences public dissection. In the print, the motif of *memento mori* is realized through two skeletons at either side in the background, which seem to say, "Remember viewer, sooner or later, you must die."

After Hogarth, it is obvious that the ideology of death persists; for instance, the doctrine of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* is embodied in a *Punch* cartoon of 1858, "The silent highway man. Your money or your life!" (fig. 4)[22] This cartoon, contextualizing the public health question of the day, brings forward a skeleton in a black cloak, who juxtaposes life and death. The motif of death can be also traced in the Newgate novels of the 1830s,[23] *Oliver Twist* being a supreme example of the genre. Needless to say, *Great Expectations* also incorporates the ideology of the *memento mori*. Newgate Prison appears in the novel, first and foremost, as a reflection of the motto: "remember thy death."

As a site of discipline and punishment, Newgate Prison had long been notorious especially after the age of Tyburn. At Tyburn, a multi-

fig. 3 Hogarth, *Four Stages of Cruelty*, plate 4 (1750/51)

fig. 4 A *Punch* cartoon (10 July 1858)

tude of criminals were executed in public; as Paulson points out, though the origin of Tyburn dates back to the twelfth century, the first permanent gallows were set up in 1571. Apart from Tyburn, there were other places for executions like Smithfield, Newgate, Tower Hill and Execution Dock (Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* 136, Porter, *London* 153). Originally, public executions were held as a warning against crimes to instill the fear and agony of death in the spectator. It was therefore at Tyburn that the *memento mori* was highlighted. The story was not so simple, however; instead, as the phrase "Tyburn Fair" betokens, a day of public execution became a holiday, when a huge number of spectators gathered. Sometimes it amounted to as many as 100,000 (Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* 136). Among them there were pickpockets, harlots, hawkers, fanatic preachers and the like, as envisioned by Hogarth's drawing *The Idle 'Prentice Executed at Tyburn*. At Tyburn the gallows were demolished in 1783, and moved to Newgate. Still, Newgate Prison only proved to be another Tyburn, with many spectators preying upon public hangings. Dickens in his work describes how the crowd turned into a mob:

> Every window was now choked up with heads; the house-tops teemed with people — clinging to chimneys, peering over gable-ends. . . . The church tower, the church roof, the church yard, the prison leads, the very water-spouts and lamp-posts — every inch of room — swarmed with human life.
>
> At the first stroke of twelve the prison-bell began to toll. Then the roar — mingled now with cries of "Hats off!" and "Poor fellows!" and, from some specks in the great concourse, with a shriek of groan — burst forth again. It was terrible to see — the world of eager eyes, all strained upon the scaffold and the beam.
>
> (*Barnaby Rudge*, ch. 77, 691)

The narrator traces meticulously the crowd and the location with "heads," "house-tops," "gable-ends," "church tower," "church roof," "prison-bell," "water sprouts," "lamp-post," "eager eyes," "scaffold," "beam" and so forth. These parts and details are put together to reproduce the cries, the push and shove among the spectators.[24] As Dickens's vivid evocation testifies, in spite of the intention of invoking a *memento mori*, public executions in fact gave people official occasions to "enjoy" cruel executions. Nonetheless, it is undeniable that public executions affected some; for example, Dickens thought the Courvoisier execution "loathsome, pitiful and vile," whereas Thackeray felt himself "ashamed and degraded at the brutal curiosity which

took" him "to the brutal sight" (Philip Collins 225).

Dickens, again in *Great Expectations*, deals with prison and execution, but he changes the subject of *memento mori* from brutal sensationalism to pathetic sentiment. On one occasion, Pip visits Newgate Prison, where he is surprised to see Wemmick going to and fro among the convicts as if they were his friends. Seeing Wemmick among the prisoners, Pip's fancy transforms Wemmick into "a gardener" and prisoners into "his plants." Moreover, the prisoners are turned into "Wemmick's greenhouse" (ch. 32, 261). By this vegetable metaphor, a dark truth is paradoxically brought into open, for the metaphor reveals that the convicts are almost dead plants ruled by "disciplinary power" of the prison; to use Foucault's terms, Newgate Prison is a panoptical institution with prisoners under constant surveillance.[25] Wemmick's gaze is directed to one prisoner called "Colonel." The prisoner is a criminal not of the brutal type but of the intellectual: he is "A Coiner, a very good workman" (ch. 32, 262). Colonel is glad to have a chance to give a parting salutation to Wemmick, for the former is to be executed the following Monday:

> "I think I shall be out of this on Monday, sir," he said to Wemmick.
>
> "Perhaps," returned my friend, "but there's no knowing."
>
> "I am glad to have the chance of bidding you good-by, Mr. Wemmick," said the man, stretching out his hand between two bars.
>
> "Thankye," said Wemmick, shaking hand with him. "Same to you, Colonel."
>
> . . . "By-the-by; you were quite a pigeon-fancier." The man looked up at the sky. "I am told you had a remarkable breed of tumblers. Could you commission any friend of yours to bring me a pair, if you've no further use for 'em?"
>
> "It shall be done, sir"
>
> "All right," said Wemmick, "they shall be taken care of. Good afternoon, Colonel. Good-by!" (ch. 32, 262)

So far as Wemmick is on duty in London, he wears a novelistic *persona*; in this sense, he is a *locus classicus* for a Jekyll-and-Hyde type: he habitually splits himself into his public self — represented by "office sentiments" — and, conversely, into his private one, known as "Walworth sentiments." In the public sphere, he is a stern, stiff and dry person despite his fundamental good-heartedness. His "post-office" mouth is a remarkable emblem of his dry and "wooden" character: in the City "His mouth was such a post office of a mouth that he

had a mechanical appearance of smiling" (ch. 21, 172). He never betrays his soft, vulnerable heart to anyone except in his fortified home. And yet in the passage quoted, he seems unwittingly to show his "Walworth sentiments" giving a heartfelt valedictory salutation to Colonel. But, curiously, Wemmick abruptly changes the subject so as to talk about "a remarkable breed of tumblers" kept by Colonel, who is "a pigeon-fancier." Wemmick then offers to take care of Colonel's tumblers in case those birds should die owing to the death of their owner. Wemmick appears to say, "I cannot by any means save your life but can possibly save your pigeons." In this way, this valedictory scene becomes more and more sentimental, in spite of the fact that the *memento mori* motif is functioning in the background; the motif is implied by Colonel's death on the gallows on Monday.

Wemmick's conversation with Colonel is firstly sentimental because it points to pathetic emotions aroused by death and separation. Secondly, this scene shapes what may be termed "monetary realism," for the realistic meaning of money is disclosed by Wemmick's straightforward phrase: "Still you see, as far as it goes, a pair of pigeons are *portable property*, all the same" (ch. 32, 262, my italics). This mercenary statement reveals a hidden "realistic" meaning that the pigeons connote. His seemingly kind offer accomplishes a double significance as he is himself a complex, double figure. Wemmick proposes to save the "tumblers" not merely because he feels pity, but also because they are "portable property." That the comical Wemmick should pretend that he is a shrewd economic person signals the author's acute awareness that Wemmick is willy-nilly enmeshed into capitalist networks of value.

As many critics and historians point out, in the mid-century, money (or capital) was so ubiquitous as to be both divinized and fetishized. Following the lead of Bulwer-Lytton, Carlyle, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, J. S. Mill and Engels among others, after the ordeal of the "hungry forties," Grahame Smith notes that the mid-century was swayed by the capitalist cult of money-making. Concerning greed for money in the Victorian period, Smith quotes Ruskin's virulent critique of industrial capitalism: "The first of all English games is making money. That is an all-absorbing game; and we knock each other down oftener in playing at that, than at football, or any other roughest sport."[26] One might argue, in fact, that the desire for money had been a constant throughout history, but Smith claims that what is new in the nineteenth century is "the notion that greed for money lies at the very

heart of almost all personal and social evils" so that the traditional literary figure of the miser is not quite enough to cover the spirit of the age (Smith 64-65). Smith goes so far as to say that Wemmick is "a sinister scavenger, willing to take his last possession from a man who stands condemned to death" (Smith 207). Here the words "his last possession" refer clearly to Colonel's "tumblers." Gentle and good-hearted as he is, Wemmick has at one and the same time something distasteful and evil in him. As he is linked to the peaceful domestic life at his "Castle" living with his Aged P, so Wemmick is linked to a capitalist society full of strife and conflict. Similarly, Christopher Herbert focuses on the topic of the cult of money in Victorian Britain, demonstrating a destabilizing ideological schizophrenia in regard to money and wealth. In discussing Dickens's fictions and Mayhew's writings, Herbert has persuasively argued that both Dickens and Mayhew make it amply clear that money is holy and all-powerful as well as dirty and nasty. Mr. Merdle in *Little Dorrit* is a blatant example of this: Merdle, the great financier and money incarnate, is "one version of what would become the Freudian conundrum of the identity of money and excrement," for Merdle is an ironical pun on the word, *merde* (Herbert 206).

The evil inherent in a greedy money-making age is deeply instilled in Wemmick. Also, because of his split personality, Wemmick in his public life has to experience the bourgeois capitalist condition in which something of the Hobbesian dictum is at work: "every man is enemy to every man." The Janus-faced Wemmick is thus dehumanized to the extent that he finally sees pigeons as "portable property." In this context, it is noteworthy that tumblers are no ordinary pigeons but specifically developed, precious birds which "fanciers" valued highly in the mid-Victorian period. Pigeon-fanciers of the day gathered, for instance, in the "London Pigeon Clubs," as Darwin has shown in his illustrious book. To be strict, there were two kinds of tumbler: "the short-faced tumbler" and "the common tumbler," both of them artificially developed to acquire "the singular and strictly inherited habit of flying at a great height in a compact flock, and tumbling in the air head over heels" (Darwin 82). On this basis, one might say that the "tumblers" which Wemmick desired to possess were a commodity having a specific "use-value" and monetary worth. Of course, unlike Merdle, he is not an arch-villain of capitalist society; nevertheless, he commits himself to the so-called capitalist system in which what is of crucial importance are money, wealth, capital and "portable

property." Tumblers are more or less of great value; and value is, according to Marx, "human labor in abstract": "Value . . . transforms every product of labour into a social hieroglyphic" (Marx *Capital* Vol. 1: 166). As Wemmick regards pigeons as valuables, he is an economic man whose slogan may be, "Remember always money, sir!" This unscrupulous capitalist motto is mainly addressed to Pip; but the hero fails to become a sagacious capitalist; instead, it turns out that Pip is, as Smith points out, "the antihero of man's deluded involvement with money in capitalist society" (Smith 191).

Money appears before the young Pip as the ravager of freedom and the demolisher of his love for Estella. As a child, Pip is invited by Miss Havisham about once a week to play with the princess-like Estella; they play at cards, for instance. But the aim of Miss Havisham's invitation to Pip is to revenge herself upon men in general, and so Pip is made a sacrifice. Pretty Estella is designed to "break his heart" (ch.8, 60). Sure enough, as blueprinted by Miss Havisham, Pip becomes infatuated by Estella more and more in spite of her insulting manner towards him. After a series of such delightful but miserable relations with Estella, the time comes when Pip should be apprenticed to Joe. Inwardly, Pip does not want to be bound by "indentures" because his anxious dream is to be a gentleman in order to marry Estella. Upon hearing that Pip's apprenticeship is forthcoming, Miss Havisham invites not only Pip but Joe to hand the latter "five-and-twenty guineas" as a "premium," and says, "Good-by, Pip!" This farewell greeting sounds so distressing that Pip instantly asks her, "Am I to come again, Miss Havisham?" (ch. 13, 102). This question gives her a good occasion to say: "No. Gargery is your master now. Gargery! One word!" (ch. 13, 102). In this way, Miss Havisham cuts the thread spun between Pip and Estella, after recognizing that Pip is helplessly in love with Estella.

This day was bad for Pip in two ways; first, on that very day, he knew he was no longer a child, but an adult, who had to work for his master, Joe. Pip is put into the so-called master and servant relationship. He is not allowed to play with Estella any more, but must struggle to earn money in the matter-of-fact society. Secondly, Pip's Eros is checked, or shattered in front of the goddess-like beauty, Estella. However much he is abused by Estella, Pip adores her all the more. Nonetheless, from the time when Pip is bound as an apprentice to Joe, he is not able to see or talk with Estella, the only object of his adoration and love. Pip's estrangement from Estella is therefore due to two

adult persons. Miss Havisham prohibits him from coming to Satis House, and Joe, though with no malice, by means of the "indentures," makes Pip his apprentice. Worse still, Pip has to admit that he belongs to the working class, not the middle class, much less the landed class (the class of Miss Havisham). Pip as the first person narrator remembers the incident with bitterness:

> Finally, I remember that when I got into my little bedroom I was truly wretched, and had a strong conviction on me that I should never like Joe's trade. I had liked it once, but once was not now.
> (ch. 13, 106)

Pip is, so to speak, "castrated" by Miss Havisham and Joe, who close the door leading to Estella. To borrow Freud's term, Pip is under the influence of "censorship" imposed by adults who "repress" the child's sexual desire;[27] Pip's erotic desire directed towards the *femme fatale* Estella must be checked because he comes to the stage of adolescence. Given that the Freudian complex relationship between desire and repression, it seems significant that just when Pip's Eros is aroused, his desire is checked. In this relation, it deserves special attention that money plays an important role in splitting the Pip-Estella relation asunder. In the final analysis, it is the money — "five-and-twenty guineas" — that overpowers Pip. Indeed, as Marx says, money is "the almighty being" (*Manuscripts* 136). Pip succumbs to the almighty money whose absolute power is epitomized by two adults: Miss Havisham, the godmother, and Joe, the father figure.

V: Money

Money in realist novels more or less determines the lives and fortunes of characters. From the mid-eighteenth century onwards, novels have been largely concerned with "real" people living in capitalist society. Money is more plainly referred to in realist novels than preceding literary genres like romances.[28] This is true not only of novels but also of such novelistic prints as Hogarth's. His famous engravings known as *Marriage A-la-mode* (1745) show that marriage is a mercenary business dealing in terms of rank and wealth.[29] In Plate 1 (fig. 5)[30] of the *Marriage* prints, the young couple on the eve of their marriage turn away from each other in disgust, whereas their parents — the son's father is "Earl Squander" without money, and the daughter's is a merchant without class — are settling the marriage contract. The financial difficulty of the Earl is indicated by the lean usurer standing

fig. 5 Hogarth, *Marriage A-la-mode*, plate 2 (1745)

near the table, who hands the Earl the paid-up "Mortgage." As the many coins and banknotes laid on the table show, the daughter's father pays the debt for the Earl, which is probably more than a few thousand pounds. The parents are in pursuit of their own mutual profits, heedless of their children's feeling. Hogarth's print reveals that a marriage arranged by parents is based on the "cash nexus," the embodiment of which is the detailed representation of money on the table.

In the novels of the eighteenth century as well, the fact that marriage is a contract between families is repeatedly shown; notably, the tragedy of Clarissa Harlow is partly caused by her family's patriarchal greed for wealth. We notice that in Hogarth's *Marriage* print many coins and banknotes are drawn to signify that marriage is nothing more than an exchange of money. Similarly, many references to money are found in *Clarissa* in connection with marriages; for instance, Lovelace's "proposal" explains how much money Clarissa gains if she consents to the marriage:

> "In the first place, madam, I offer to settle upon, by way of

> jointure, your whole estate. And moreover to vest in trustees such a part of mine in Lancashire as shall procure a clear four hundred pounds a year, to be paid to your sole and separate use, quarterly.
>
> "My own estate is a clear £2000 *per annum*. Lord M. proposes to give me possession either of that which he has in Lancashire . . . or that we call The Lawn in Hertfordshire . . . I shall choose a clear £1000 *per annum*. (Letter 186, 596-97)

Like Hogarth, Richardson presents money in a realistic fashion. Money in such specific sums indicates again that marriage is a dealing with money, from Lovelace's point of view; at least, he believes in the sovereign power of money, by which woman is, whoever she is, overpowered.

Similarly, in Jane Austen's novels, characters are concerned with love, marriage, and money. In *Northanger Abbey*, which is a burlesque of contemporary Gothic romance like *Udolpho*, Catherine Morland the anti-heroine of the novel comes to know that Mrs. Tilney was given "twenty thousand pounds, and five hundred to buy wedding-clothes" when she married (ch. 9, 87). Moreover, the question of money comes to the fore as regards Catherine's marriage with Henry. Henry's father, General Tilney at first thinks, misled by John Thorpe, that Catherine is a wealthy lady as possessed of "ten or fifteen thousand pounds" (ch. 30, 241); and this is why he invites her to his manor (Northanger Abbey), but on discovering his misunderstanding he turns her out of his house. However, to Catherine's relief, Eleanor's marriage with a "man of fortune and consequence" makes the father so relieved that General Tilney consents to his son's marriage with Catherine, who eventually turns out to have "three thousand pounds" (ch. 30, 247). Wealth, as presented in specific numbers like Lovelace's "£2000 *per annum*" or Catherine's "three thousand," plays an important role in one's marriage. It is therefore no wonder that Emma, after facing an unexpected proposal by Elton, rejects him, reflecting that he, a mere vicar, is very impudent to intend to marry "Miss Woodhouse of Hartfield, the heiress of *thirty thousand pounds*" (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154, my italics). Emma thinks that Elton had better "try for Miss Somebody else with twenty, or ten" (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154). For Emma, Elton was out of the question because "in fortune and consequence she was greatly his superior" (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154).

References to money are thus indispensable when novelistic characters — hero, heroine and parent — are concerned with marriage. In Dickens, however, the circumstances attending money are a little dif-

ferent, for money in Dickensian novels is dealt with in the light of purely capitalistic aspects, rather than from matrimonial viewpoints. In capitalist society, Pip is idiosyncratic because he, like Timon of Shakespeare, seems to hate money. In this respect, Pumblechook, who is a merchant of "the corn and seed trade," is contrasted with Pip. One of Pumblechook's distinctive traits is his preference for arithmetical figures; he is so fond of doing accounts that he constantly asks Pip simple questions of reckoning. What follows is one of those questions: "First . . . Forty-three pence?" (ch. 9, 66). The right answer is three shillings and seven pence. Pip probably knows the answer, but thanks to his repulsion from Pumblechook, he is about to offer a wrong answer on purpose: "Four Hundred Pound." On second thoughts, however, Pip dodges the correct answer by being "about eight pence off" (ch. 9, 67). Delighted at Pip's wrong answer, Pumblechook commences a lecture on reckoning:

> Mr. Pumblechook then put me through my pence-table from "twelve pence makes one shilling," up to "forty pence make three and fourpence," and then triumphantly demanded, as if he had done for me, "*Now!* How much is forty-three pence?" To which I replied, after a long interval of reflection, "I don't know."
>
> (ch. 9, 67)

Pip knows the right answer, but he persists in saying, "I don't know" because, I think, his fanciful nature goes against the grain when he is aware that he is bound by capitalist realism. Numbers, as mentioned earlier in discussing Malthusian statistics, can represent hard reality. In the case of Pip, he is forced to confront more particularized figures — "forty-three pence" — than Lovelace's "£2000 *per annum*," Catherine's "three thousand," and Emma's "thirty thousand pounds." Pip is fond of "fancy" and so he dislikes numbers and money. Pip is, as it were, an anti-capitalist, but his tragedy is that he is encircled by hard capitalists like Pumblechook. Pumblechook reappearing in chapter 19 asks Pip condescendingly for "More Capital" on hearing that Pip has come into his great expectations. Pumblechook tries to insinuate himself into Pip's favor with his humble words and gestures. Pumblechook ventures to say that there is "an opportunity for a great amalgamation and monopoly of the corn and seed trade" (ch. 19, 155). But as he needs "More Capital" in order to realize his monopoly, he proposes that Pip should be a "sleeping partner" (ch. 19, 155). Although Pip manages to avoid his involvement with Pumblechook, the latter overshadows Pip as a cunning, greedy capitalist.

Pip's repulsion towards money and his dislike of numbers become all the more apparent when Magwitch (alias Provis) reappears in the novel. Magwitch, the transported convict, returns to England in secret in order to see Pip the gentleman, to whom Magwitch's wealth has been sent from Australia. Curiously enough, Magwitch's ambition is to make a gentleman. Pip is then chosen, since he once gave Magwitch a "file" and "wittles." Magwitch is, however, wrong in that he thinks money can turn anyone into a gentleman; Pip is by no means born with a silver spoon in his mouth; he is a mere village boy brought up at the home of a blacksmith. Moreover, since Magwitch's desire to make a gentleman is superimposed on Pip, he is turned into Magwitch's *alter ego*. For this reason, Pip is annoyed by the uncanny feeling of criminality through much of the novel despite the fact that he does not commit any criminal acts.[31]

It is also worth remembering that from the outset Magwitch functions as a ghost or apparition; in the opening scene of the novel, when Pip is in deep reverie at the churchyard where he fancies how the dead relatives were, he is abruptly aroused by a wild figure who "*started up from among the graves* at the side of the church porch" ferociously crying "Hold your noise!" (ch. 1. 4, my italics). Magwitch is presented as a corpse dancer in a *danse macabre*, who resurrects from the grave (or Hell) to this world in the form of a skeleton. When Pip was ordered by Magwitch to bring him a file and food, he was taken aback at dark vision in which the convict is metamorphosed into "the pirate"; Pip felt Magwitch looked "as if he were the pirate come to life" (ch.1, 7). In the scene of his first encounter with Magwitch, Pip's gruesome images, such as the savage convict, darkening marshes, graves, gibbet with chains, are so starkly evoked that a frightening vision of death is assigned to Magwitch and Pip at the very beginning of the novel.

After a long absence, Magwitch as a "great dancer" in a *danse macabre* starts up again from the bottom of the world — namely, Australia —, to Pip's great confusion and displeasure. But Magwitch in fact reappears before Pip so that despite his good intentions he may wreak havoc on his protégé. On the night when Pip again comes across Magwitch after a long interval, the weather is intolerably bad. A sort of apocalyptic vision is brought forth:

> When the rain came with it and dashed against the windows, I thought, raising my eyes to them as they rocked, that I might have fancied myself in a storm-beaten lighthouse. Occasionally, the smoke came rolling down the chimney as though it could not bear

to go out into such a night. . . ." (ch. 39, 313)

In the description of the storm, one might be surprised to find the narrative is serio-comic; the narrator is serious in that he brings London an Apocalypse; yet, on the other hand, the narrating Pip-Dickens is jocular and comical; Dickensian humorous personification is functioning with reference to "the smoke" that, like a human being, comes down the chimney as if to say, "I don't want to go out on such a hellish, stormy night." In the passage quoted, the smoke is not a man but a ghost or "spirit." It is to be noted that the "Spirit of Smoke" is not similar to Miss Havisham's ghost, because ghostly figures are in general characterized by the power of floating or hovering in the air. The spirit of smoke, however, comes down, instead of going up. This suggests that circumstances around Pip have changed; from now on, he must confront what is called monetary reality.

Monetary realism is closely linked with Magwitch the benefactor. What is remarkable about Magwitch is that he is a paradoxical figure, since, on the one hand, he is a ghost from the underworld, on the other he is in possession of "real" money. On the stormy night, Pip hears footsteps coming up from the bottom of the stair. He listens more carefully to perceive that someone is stumbling in the dark. He wonders who might be below:

> "There is some one down there, is there not?" I called out, looking down.
>
> "Yes," said *a voice from the darkness beneath*.
>
> "What floor do you want?"
>
> "The top. Mr. Pip."
>
> "That is my name — There is nothing the matter?"
>
> "Nothing the matter," returned the voice. And the man came on.
>
> I stood with my lamp held out over the stair-rail, and he came slowly within its light. It was shaded lamp, to shine upon a book, and its circle of light was very contracted; so that *he was in it for a mere instant, and then out of it*. In the instant, I had seen a face that was strange to me, looking up with an incomprehensible air of being touched and pleased by the sight of me.
>
> (ch. 39, 314, my italics)

In this scene of encounter in the dark, it is obvious Magwitch is made shadowy to underline his ghost-like attributes. He is here without substantial body, for he is a mere "voice from the darkness beneath," and besides, he momentarily appears in a faint light; but then he disappears all of a sudden; he is as fleeting as a ghost might be. He comes from

the bottom of the staircase, like the dead from the grave to take hold of Pip to whom Magwitch feels a fatherly affection; yet Pip cannot understand at all who the man is before him. To Pip, the situation becomes all the more embarrassing because the man looks "touched and pleased by the sight" of him. The truth is that this ghostly man is the real benefactor of his "great expectations" although Pip is alienated from the fact. This is why Magwitch has to tell that it is he who has made Pip the gentleman. In what follows, Magwitch discloses the truth little by little referring specifically to two small signs:

> "Could I make a guess, I wonder," said the Convict, "at your income since you come of age! As to the first figure now. *Five*?"
>
> With my heart beating like a heavy hammer of disordered action, I rose out of my chair, and stood with my hand upon the back of it, looking wildly at him.
>
> "Concerning a guardian," he went on. "There ought to have been some guardian. . . . As to the first letter of that lawyer's name now. Would it be *J*!"
>
> All the truth of my position came flashing on me; and its disappointments, dangers, disgraces, consequences of all kinds, rushed in. . . . (ch. 39, 318-19; my italics)

In the quotation, metonymy is significant in relation to monetary realism. Magwitch calls attention to the letter "Five" which is in fact the first figure of Pip's annual income: five hundred pounds. The first revelation sends a chill over Pip so that he feels his heart beating violently. The next word touches upon the first letter of the lawyer's name: "J" of Jaggers. These two small figures, as Freud puts it, are the mere "dregs of world of phenomena," but, the dregs, as Freud argues, contain deep significance.[32] In fact, it is these small signs that communicate the painful truth to Pip. One could say that the small letters — "Five" and "J" — help shape the machinery that sets the "monetary realism" in motion. This capitalist realism embodied by money is opposed to antirealism which gives birth to fanciful objects like ghosts; in contrast, monetary realism, once put in motion, drives Pip, the seer of visions, to the world of money and capital that rejects playfulness and childishness.

It is important, however, to remember that capitalist realism is not necessarily incompatible with "play" elements, for, as shown by such economic terms as "speculation," capitalism has an aspect of play in which everyone vies for victory. Historically speaking, it is well-known that in the mid nineteenth century, there occurred the "railway

mania." In Britain, the railway — since the opening of the Liverpool-Manchester line — had appealed to a wide range of investors from George Hudson, the "Railway King" to ordinary citizens such as shopkeepers, clerks and widowers; all of them were carried away with the prospect of unlimited profits from the railway industry. As Altick points out, the railway mania dominated *Punch*'s pages, in which the boom was presented as an extraordinary burst of speculation turning anyone into a small capitalist.[33]

The stock market in the Victorian era had been providing people with an opportunity to become a greedy shareholder. In this connection, it is convincing that Huizinga correlates the prize in games with price in economy; the words, prize and price, have the same root etymologically (*Homo Ludens* 51), so it is clear that the capitalist economy comes to have a play element; investment can be seen as gambling in the market. Capital paves the way for economic risk in quest of a mercenary prize. However, Pip is intentionally remote from capital as it would make him fully aware of monetary reality. Monetary realism is first and foremost ruled by the detailed descriptions of numbers (or signs) that Pip detests. His antagonism for numbers is, as I noted earlier, manifested in his refusal to solve a simple question of accounting. In this sense, number as a sign in monetary economy is placed in sharp contrast with the novel's fairy-tale elements with the ghost occupying the center. After half way through the novel, money rather than the ghost plays an important role in making Pip face hard financial reality.

Pip pretends to be indifferent to minutely specific money and numbers; and by doing this, whether conscious or not, he distorts the exactness of monetary numbers in order to undermine an overwhelming economic reality. Undoubtedly Pip is irrational and childish in that he does not wish to be faced with such a reality; his childishness is antithetical to rationalism as exemplified in mathematical rigidity. This binary opposition between economic reality and Pip's irrational disbelief in economy mirrors a familiar Dickensian dichotomy between fact and fancy. To play in earnest, as Huizinga has argued, "we must be more than merely rational beings" (*Homo Ludens* 4), and Pip is an irrational being full of fanciful nonsense. Pip's irrational antagonism to money is well illustrated by his casual attitude toward his debt that keeps on increasing almost day by day on account of his wasteful expenditure. Pip's bad pecuniary habits begin with, for example, his "election" into a club called "The Finches of the Grove"

in which the members of the club "spent their money foolishly. . . " (ch. 34, 273). Pip becomes stuck in heavy debt because he spends beyond his income. In short, Pip is another Micawber, whose advice to David is too famous but, I think, worth quoting: ". . . Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery. . ." (*David Copperfield*, ch. 12, 170). Pip like Micawber feels that his fortune turns out to be an outright misery, and for this reason, Pip creates for himself a fiction wherein the rigid framework of money and numbers is destroyed so that money is made unstable and wavering.

A fiction about money is fabricated when he realizes his debts and Herbert's are so enormous that it is by no means possible to overlook them. On one day when Pip proposes to Herbert that they should examine how much they owe, they work on a "Memorandum of Pip's debts" and a "Memorandum of Herbert's debts" separately. In the process, Pip says to Herbert, who complains that he has lost some bills, "Then, Herbert, estimate; *estimate it in round numbers*, and put it down" (ch. 34, 276, my italics). Pip knows that estimating is a useful method to distort monetary reality. At this point, it is symbolic that they find their bills scattered about here and there in the room; the disorder of the bills reflects the confused situation of their economy.

> Each of us would then refer to a confused heap of papers at his side, which had been thrown into drawers, worn into holes in pockets, half-burnt in lighting candles, stuck for weeks into the looking-glass, and otherwise damaged. . . . I sometimes found it difficult to distinguish between this edifying proceeding and actually paying the money. In point of meritorious character, *the two things seemed about equal*. (ch. 34, 276, my italics)

Pip is so confused that he is unable to distinguish writing down the debt from paying it; that is, in Pip's mind, registering his debts is equivalent to their payment. His pecuniary manipulation transforms the amount of money into something less exact; money is made vague as "round numbers": ". . . supposing Herbert's debt to be one hundred and sixty-four pounds four-and-twopence, I would say, 'Leave a margin, and put them down at two hundred'" (ch. 34, 277). Once Pip casts a spell over the money, it turns into just two hundred. In monetary realism, by contrast, spells no longer work effectively; instead, capitalist reality overpowers Pip's frail fiction; Pip and Herbert "ran into new debt immediately, to the full extent of the margin" (ch. 34, 277).

Given *Great Expectations* is a "novel," Pip's strategy about money which aims to destroy its exactness is all but exceptional, since realist fictions, in general, as Ian Watt once put it, overemphasize their involvement with detailed numbers to suggest that the story is not fictitious but real.[34] Hence in the eighteenth century, Defoe and Richardson, to name two, had been concerned with a meticulous factuality in numbers. The reader of those authors knows, for instance, that Robinson Crusoe was born on September 30, and that on his birthday he was shipwrecked on the coast of a deserted island in the Caribbean Sea where he was to live for "eight and twenty years, two months, and 19 days," and thereafter he "left the island, the nineteenth of December" in the year 1686 (*Robinson Crusoe* 274). Similarly, we know that Clarissa was born on July 24, and that she died at six thirty in the evening on September 7 at the age of twenty. Numbers in novels are useful to register novels' historicality. Likewise, realist fictions are fond of money; to be more exact, in realist novels, it is a great necessity to dwell upon every figure of money, as seen in Herbert's supposed debt: "one hundred and sixty-four pounds four-and-twopence." Pip, however, does not make much of numbers; on the contrary, he seems to ridicule the rigidity and fixedness that those novelistic numbers are likely to suggest. Nonetheless, Pip's fiction about money discloses its inability to rule over realism and capitalism; Pip's debts increase more and more, making him insolvent. Although Joe as *deus ex machina* rescues Pip at the very moment when he is being arrested for debt, Pip is obviously undermined by his monstrous capital. Even when Joe comes to rescue Pip, the omnipotence of money is brought into the open as Pip's debt is shown, significantly, in detail: "Hundred and twenty-three pound, fifteen, six. . . " (ch. 57, 462).

Pip is not the only person who is faced with the harsh reality of money and capital; Estella too experiences the violent fluctuations of the economy after her marriage with Drummle. It is mentioned that she had even been on the brink of the bankruptcy. She reappears in the novel after a considerable absence to meet Pip in the premises of Satis House. Pip, now "an old bachelor," revisits the place to find that every building has gone; only the ground and "the wall of the old garden" (ch. 59, 482) are left. Estella, the owner of the Satis House estate, is deprived of properties such as the house and brewery. Pip and Estella are now standing, as it were, in the solitude of primeval nature; nature around them is both Eden-like and "Paradise Lost"-like. On the ground "some of the old ivy had struck root anew" and over-

head, Pip sees that "the stars were shining beyond the mist, and the moon was coming. . . " (ch. 59, 482). Green plants and the heavenly bodies thus evoke a romantic image. As Frye notes, the "wood-world" has been providing literature with the settings for dream visions in which lovers are united; in the romantic wood-world, "enchantment," "illusion," and "random desire" have been brought into focus (*Frye on Shakespeare* 44-47). Pip and Estella happen to meet again in this romantic wood-world that seems to stimulate their mutual "random desire." Significantly, Estella says to Pip, "I have often thought of you" (ch. 59, 484), while Pip, aroused by the sight of Estella, says to himself: "The freshness of her beauty was indeed gone, but its indescribable majesty and its indescribable charm remained" (ch. 59, 483). In fact, she is still a *femme fatale* to Pip, who is spellbound by her "indescribable charm" as soon as he glimpses her.

Finally both Pip and Estella are brought face to face in the wood-world romance atmosphere; moreover, stars and the moon overhead appear to cast their astrological influence over the two. It is often the case that star motifs are related to the fortune of lovers as in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. In the drama, the young couple of tragic destiny are described as "star cross'd lovers" (Prologue. 6). Whereas in *Hamlet*, there are such astrological allusions as "stars with trains of fire" (1. 1. 117) and "Disasters in the sun" (1. 1. 118).[35] In Dickens too, in the opening of *David Copperfield* there is an unmistakable echo of astrology; when David was given birth to "on Friday, at twelve o'clock at night," his nurse and some "sage women" claimed "first, that I was destined to be unlucky in life; and secondly, that I was privileged to see ghosts and spirits" (ch.1, 11). Then, is Daivid similar to Pip in that he is destined to "see ghosts and spirits"? Anyway, it is clear that in the garden of Satis House the romantic image is amplified by astrological allusions. Pip is indeed both romantic and spellbound. However, it is revealed that Estella, unlike Pip, does not look at nature or even at Pip.

What matters, as regards Estella, is that in this "Paradise Lost"-like garden, she eagerly speaks of her properties as though she were a "landed gentleman" whose best means is land:

> "The ground belongs to me. It is the only possession I have not relinquished. Everything else has gone from me, little by little, but I have kept this. It was the subject of the only determined resistance I made in all the wretched years." (ch. 59, 483)

Although she has lost the buildings of Satis House and brewery, she insists that she still holds the land. In the end she comes back to the retained land with a view to rebuilding Satis House, the brewery and the garden. Almost a half of her dream is coming true, as her answer attests to Pip's question: "Is it to be built on?" (ch. 59, 483). She answers to Pip: "At last it is. I came here to take leave of it before its change. . ." (ch. 59, 483). Estella returns to Satis House not merely as a landed person, but as the modern factory owner of a brewery; that is, she reappears as a Victorian entrepreneur who aims to invest capital and oneself in an industrial enterprise in pursuit of money; it is natural for her that she should take up the brewery business since, as Herbert once told Pip, Miss Havisham's father, Mr. Havisham "was a country gentleman . . . and was a brewer," who was "very rich and proud" (ch.22, 180). Mr. Havisham, seeing his son was a "prodigal," disinherited him, so that Miss Havisham became the heiress of the family. Estella as the adopted daughter of Miss Havishm is now the successor to the family, who must protect the Satis House estate. Estella is now standing on her own ground, to start afresh as a Victorian entrepreneur.[36] Pip cannot abide by this capitalist rule, but Estella well understands the capitalist ethic; her words, "I have kept this," testifies that she is, as it were, a capitalist heroine.

If the novel is split into two worlds, the one is occupied by such capitalists and realists as Pumblechook, Wemmick, and somewhat dubiously Estella, while Pip the dreamer and anti-realist is a solitary inhabitant of the other, alienated and alone. One can argue that Pip is a definite disclaimer of capital, since he deserts his home, severing the bond of his apprenticeship to Joe, and besides, he rejects the "great expectations" brought to him by the transported convict. What's more, as an "Idle Apprentice,"[37] he spends money like water taking advantage of his fiction about his wealth. In sum, Pip transforms everything economic, monetary, and capitalistic into the fanciful. He eventually finds himself alone, estranged from everything and everybody he either loves or dislikes. Estella becomes a hard capitalist Victorian, whereas Pip is a failed gentleman, who has lost all capital, being deprived of his divine but material "Princess" Estella.[38]

Notes

[1] In discussing *Great Expectations*, Gallagher draws attention to the boundary between life and death "which was remarkably controversial in the nineteenth century" especially in the discourse of medicine. She argues that the problematic discourse on the boundary of life and death gave birth to numerous "spectral projections" like, for example, Magwitch and Miss Havisham. The ghost in *Hamlet* overshadows the novel, for Pip like Hamlet is assigned to avenge his father figure, Magwitch. Pip is driven by his painful class struggle to become a gentleman; and this wish is shared by Magwitch. See Gallagher and Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* 163-210. Meanwhile Susan Walsh in reading *Great Expectations* notices the metaphorical correspondences between medical discourse and economy in the mid-Victorian period; she argues that commercial crises or a disordered economy, such as the 1840s' railway crisis and the Depression of 1858, were expressed by use of "medical language," more specifically, those crises were represented as the aged, "climacteric" female body. Miss Havisham is a victim of this maltreatment. The linkage of a bad economy with a disordered female body was so prevalent in the mid-century that artist for *Punch* carried time and again what may be called gendered cartoons in which, by implication, old women are related to financial crises. Susan Walsh 73-98.

[2] At the end of the eighteenth century, Dr. James Curry claimed that he found an essential difference between "*Absolute* and *Apparent Death*," but Gallagher points out that "there was in fact very little consensus about the essential difference." *Practicing New Historicism* 195.

[3] Soon after attending Dr. John Elliotson's demonstrations of mesmerism at London University, Dickens discovered he had the ability to mesmerize people; in fact, he regularly practiced this new therapeutic science upon his family and friends. Dickens tried mesmerism for the first time on his wife during his trip to America in 1842; Catherine was magnetized "into hysterics" and then into a "mesmeric trance" when Dickens made hand passes about his wife's head for several minutes. Kaplan 182-83.

[4] As to Gothic tradition in Victorian fiction, see also Wiesenfarth's study, in which he discusses the development of Gothic fiction from the eighteenth century onward. He maintains that in the old Gothic novel the question is "who your parents are," but that in the new Gothic the question is turned into "who you are." *Great Expectations* is, he argues, a new Gothic fiction in the form of a *Bildungsroman* that incorporates a mystery story. Wiesenfarth 16, 83-100.

[5] Doody insists that if the novel is defined as a fiction in prose of a certain length, its origin traces far away back to ancient Egypt or the age of Augustus. According to her argument, what Ian Watt described as the English novel is the product of what she calls the "new Realism"; she contends that the advent of the new genre is to be found in Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1752). Doody 288.

[6] With reference to Rabelais, Auerbach comments on the revolutionary mode of Rabelais's "super-realistic" *mimesis*. In Rabelais, triumphant earthly life is revealed with "the freedom of vision, feeling, and thought" and thereby supplies the reader with a "wealth of phenomena." Dickens's vision of the ghost seems to have an affinity with this Rabelaisian representation of the world "in utter confu-

sion." In the Dickensian type of description, superficial reality and the internal reality of one's more or less mad psychology are confused. Bakhtin recognizes the Renaissance folk culture tradition in the "grand style" of realistic novelists like "Stendhal, Balzac, Hugo, and Dickens." See Auerbach 276 and *Rabelais* 52.

[7] This poem gives us a supreme example of metaphor, beginning with the following lines:

> Tiger, tiger, burning bright
> In the forests of the night,
> What immortal hand or eye
> Could frame thy fearful symmetry? ("The Tiger" 1-4)

[8] By analyzing two types of aphasia Jakobson discovers two aspects of literary language; in the mode of realism, novels are bound by metonymy — especially synecdoche —, whereas in poetry, notably of Romanticism, metaphor is predominant. Hence the realistic novelist "is fond of synecdochic details," and, in contrast, the "principle of similarity underlines poetry." In metonymy, the principle of contiguity is working, while in metaphor that of similarity functions. Jakobson 69-96. Following the metaphor and metonymy formulation thus proposed by Jakobson, Lodge observes that in *Bleak House* many metaphors are felt to prevail so that the novel marks a "shift from a metonymic to a metaphoric mode of writing." Lodge 101-02.

[9] See Miller, "The Fiction of Realism" 124. Concerning Dickens's complex use of figures, Dorothy Van Ghent pays attention to Dickens's peculiar use of metaphor and metonymy; in Dickensian tropes, lifeless objects become humans, whereas humans lifeless objects. Van Ghent, "The Dickens World: A View from Todgers's" 419-20. Moreover, it should be remembered that not only literature but science is sometimes overtly metaphorical, because scientific descriptions cannot help being dependent on language which is more often than not figurative. In the case of Darwin, for instance, it was inevitable for him to personify "Mother Nature" however criticized for his dependence on metaphors. See Beer 69.

[10] Malthus in the second edition of his *Population Essay* introduced the new category known as "moral restraint," which meant that during the period of the delay of marriage man was expected to abstain from "irregular" conduct — namely, sexual intercourse in brothels. See Malthus (Cambridge) 23; Cambridge edition uses the second edition of 1803, while Penguin edition makes use of the first edition published in 1798.

[11] Chadwick and Nassau Senior were the two main characters of the Royal Commission for the Poor Laws set up in 1832. See Briggs 275.

[12] To promote various social reforms such as the Poor Laws or the Reform Bills, many Royal Commissions were established in the 1830s, consequently by 1849, "more than 100 Royal Commissions had been set up." Mid-Victorian England was therefore "an age of Blue Books, the reports of the Commissions," some of them being "best sellers." See Briggs 275.

[13] The Inn Scene of the play (3. 148-78) is a parody of *Don Quixote*. Asked by the innkeeper if he has any money, Don Quixote replies that "he did not have so much as a single real, because he had never read in histories of knights errant that any of them had ever carried money" (Part I, ch. 3, 29). On the other hand, Rafe

is required by the landlord of the Bell Inn to pay "twelve shillings":

> HOST. Thou valiant Knight of the Burning Pestle, give ear to me: there is twelve shillings to pay, and as I am a true knight, I will not bate a penny. (3. 158-60)

Surprisingly, seeing his apprentice in jeopardy, Rafe's master ("Citizen") pays the money despite the fact that he, together with his wife, is a spectator at the play. The introduction of money with specific numbers is designed to criticize the convention of romance which is basically free from money. For the relationship between *The Knight* and *Don Quixote*, see Hattaway xviii.

[14] As opposed to the official feast, carnival is a spectacular festival which celebrates temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established orders. In carnival all are only temporarily rendered equal; the site of carnival is the open "marketplace" where "laughter" transcends gloomy seriousness. As Rabelais's world is full of images of the flesh and belly, Bakhtin calls this type of description "grotesque realism." Bakhtin explains it as follows:

> The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity. (*Rabelais* 19)

[15] For Van Ghent's argument about Dickens's personifications and the "pathetic fallacy," see note no. 9.

[16] A child's lie is perhaps closely linked with a child's nonsensical play with words in the forms of rhymes, alliterations, refrains, and the like; in discussing the relationship between jokes and pleasure, Freud argues that child's nonsensical word games are the reflection of his withdrawal from "the pressure of critical reason." However, education in general suppresses child's "nonsense" in favor of "logical thinking," and for this reason, in children, especially in boys, "the rebellion against the compulsion of logic and reality is deep-going and long-lasting." Freud's observation is remarkable in that it explains Pip's predilection for nonsense: ". . . the characteristic tendency of *boys to do absurd or silly things* seems to me to be directly derived from the *pleasure in nonsense*" (*Jokes* 175, my italics).

[17] Bakhtin points out that "grotesque realism" is accompanied by a downward movement, like "Pantagruel's descent into hell." *Rabelais* 370, see also note no. 14.

[18] Dick's anxiety may be translated into his fear of the oppressive father. Freud's accounts of Hans's "castration complex" and "Oedipus complex" in the father-son relationship is relevant enough to explain Dick's anxiety about King Charles's head — a familiar symbol of the phallus. As Freud points out, Hans's anxiety about horses is equivalent to his fear of, and antipathy to his father, who loves his mother and has a big "widdler." See "Little Hans."

[19] See Panofsky 19 and figure 9. It is certain that Dickens was well versed in the subject of the *danse macabre*, as Slater points out; as early as 1841 he had bought *The Dance of Death* containing Holbein's wood engravings, and in his "A Small Star in the East" (1868) the narrator remembers the Dance of Death on seeing the impoverished lives of the poor around Ratcliff.

[20] Valverde de Hamusco's *Historia de la composicion del cuerco humano* (1556) carries this print. See the cover illustration of Porter, *Benefit*.

[21] See Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. III, figure 6 (British Museum).

[22] See *Victorian Punch*, ed. Koike, Vol. 2, figure 1-64, and Matsumura 138-39.

[23] The tradition of the Newgate novel or the Newgate school of fiction was forged by, among others, writers such as Bulwer-Lytton and Ainsworth. This genre is connected with sensation novels of the 1860s, because of its overt interests in crime. For a comprehensive study of the Newgate novels, see Hollingsworth and Hojo. As to related genres such as the Newgate Calendar, broadsheets and the "penny dreadful," see Mayhew 213-39, Altick, *Studies in Scarlet* 70-72, Altick, *Punch* 236, and Altick, *Deadly Encounters* 6-7.

[24] Philip Collins explains that this scene in *Barnaby Rudge* is shaped through Dickens's witnessing the execution of Courvoisier in July 1840 — the Courvoisier case was one of the most famous murders of the century. Later, in 1846, Dickens complains in a letter to the *Daily News* of the appalling bestiality of the crowd as regards the Courvoisier hanging; a great many people made a merry-making of the execution. As to Dickens's attitude toward public execution, see Collins 224-26, Edgar Johnson 177, 352.

[25] Foucault argues that disciplinary power was formed around the beginning of the nineteenth century; this power carries out "the great confinement on the one hand; correct training on the other." The locations where a panoptical gaze is alert are the prison, asylum, penitentiary, reformatory, school and hospital. Above all, the panopticon prison is the most typical: "The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which . . . produces homogenous effects of power." See Foucault 195-228. Tambling discusses the power relationships within *Great Expectations* in the light of Foucault's subject of disciplinary technology. Tambling 11-31.

[26] This passage is quoted in Smith, 63.

[27] Censorship is a figure of speech whereby Freud meant the functions of dream-work in which desire, or the Unconscious is disguised and repressed, because evil libidinal desire is always checked even in our dreams by the "guardian of sleep." In other words, censorship brings about "dream-distortion." *Interpretation of Dreams* 168-81.

[28] Frye defines romance as a "quest" in which the ageless hero and heroine experience "a sequence of minor adventures leading up to a major or climactic adventure." In romance, characters are wholly emancipated from the laws of nature, which keeps them evergreen. As regards the relation between romance and the novel, both Bakhtin and Frye have a common notion that the novel has been developed as a parody of other preceding, canonical genres such as epic or romance; probably one of the finest examples of novelistic parody would be *Don Quixote*, in which the conventionality of chivalric romance is exposed. From a historical perspective, Lucács considers *Don Quixote* as a work produced "at the beginning of the time when the Christian God began to forsake the world." Armstrong correlates the rise of the English novel with conduct books in the eighteenth century; they taught women to be "domestic." Similarly, Gallagher notices the problematic relationship between the ideology of domesticity and that of social paternalism in the novels of the nineteenth century. See *Anatomy* 186-87, 306, *Dialogic Imagination* 6-11, Lucács103, Armstrong, and *Industrial Reformation* 113-84.

[29] Lawrence Stone argues that in the eighteenth century decision-making power was transferred to the future spouses themselves, and that "companionate marriages" instead of arranged ones had their effect in society. Lawrence Stone 219-20. Paulson also points out that "the *Spectator* habitually argued that marriage can only be based on love." Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. II, 214. One might say that companionate marriage was an ideal, and that it was in vogue from the eighteenth century onward.

[30] See Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. II, figure 91 (British Museum).

[31] This is not to deny Julian Moynahan's claim that Orlick is Pip's *alter ego* or "shadow." Pip's repressed desire is indeed transferred to the bestial Orlick. Van Ghent, though, focuses on Pip's affinity with Magwitch, stating "Magwitch, from a metaphysical point of view, is not outside Pip but inside him." See Moynahan 60-79 and *The English Novel* 165.

[32] Freud, referring to "a slip of the tongue," says that an error of this kind often signifies the repressed desire. Freud compares the work of a psychoanalyst to that of a detective who is supposed not to expect that the murderer left "his photograph behind at the place of the crime, with his address attached," hence, he maintains: "So do not let us under-estimate small indications." *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* 52-53.

[33] See Altick, *Punch* 455, More 90, Briggs 296, Hobsbawm 109-119, and Koike, *Eikoku Tetsudo Monogatari* 45-58.

[34] In Watt's classic view, the English novel is concerned with individual experience that requires particularity of description, especially of time and place. The realist novel is therefore "under an obligation to satisfy its reader with such details . . . which are presented through a more largely referential use of language than is common in other literary forms." Watt 35.

[35] As Tillyard explains, in Elizabethan literature, there was a wealth of reference to the stars. He notes, however, that the power of the astrological doctrine was rather restricted, and that people thought their wills were basically their own. Tillyard 65.

[36] Poovey discusses the relationship between commerce and virtue, linking *Our Mutual Friend* with the English economy of the 1850s and 60s, when capital came to the fore because limited liability legislations — such as the Limited Liability Act of 1855, the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 and the Companies Act of 1862 — were passed so as to reduce risks to the shareholder. These legislations provided "unscrupulous individuals" with speculative opportunities to invest more freely than before. Greed for capital pervading the period caused the hitherto unprecedented speculative boom, which set the stage for "the dramatic triumphs and the tragic collapses" that Victorian novelists often envisaged. Poovey argues that *Our Mutual Friend* betrays paradoxical interactions between speculation and morality. See Poovey 156-57. In my view, *Great Expectations* enacts a hunger for more capital; the prevalence of company floatations of the period can be seen through such characters as Pumblechook, Herbert, and probably Estella.

[37] In reading *Great Expectations*, Eiichi Hara discusses a "self-destroying" movement in which mutually opposing stories of various kinds are superimposed upon Pip by other characters; stories of the Prodigal Son, Lillo's George Barnwell, the penitent Idle Apprentice, the fairy-tale prince, and so forth strike against each other, so that Pip in fine finds himself alienated from such stories as "he himself

can never be the author of." Hara 593-614.

[38] Though the question of the novel's ending has been a classic problem that many critics have commented upon, it seems fairly certain that the altered close as it stands does not necessarily show a happy ending of great promise nor rebirth of Pip, but instead, the couple's future is darkly overshadowed by, in a symbolical way, the somewhat evil stars and moon looming over the mist, and also realistically, by the hard materialist, Estella, who is not, I believe, romantic at all however much Pip the frustrated lover is romantic. The original brief ending where Estella in Piccadilly wishes to shake hands with Pip and to kiss "little Pip" is revised following Bulwer-Lytton's advice. For the controversies over the ending of the novel, see, for instance, Forster Vol. II, 289, Miller, *Dickens* 270-78, Rosenberg 87-115, and Gilmour 445-47.

Works Cited

Altick, Richard. *Victorian Studies in Scarlet*. New York: Norton, 1970.

——. *Deadly Encounters: Two Victorian Sensations*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.

——. *Punch: The Lively Youth of a British Institution 1841-1851*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1997.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 87.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Trans. Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.

Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. Ed. Anne Ehrenpreis. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

——. Emma. Ed. Ronald Blythe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

——. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Beaumont, Francis. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. London: A & C Black, 1969.

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. London: Ark, 1983.

Blake, William. *The Poems of William Blake*. Ed. W. H. Stevenson. Harlow: Longman, 1971.

Briggs, Asa. *The Age of Improvement 1783-1867*. London: Longman, 1959.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice in Wonderland*. Ed. Donald Gray. New York: Norton, 1992.

Cervantes, Saavedra. *Don Quixote* (Part I). Trans. John Rutherford. London: Penguin, 2002.

Chadwick, Edwin. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965.

Collins, Wilkie. *The Woman in White*. Ed. Julian Symons. London: Penguin, 1974.

Collins, Philip. *Dickens and Crime* Third Edition. London: Macmillan, 1994.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. Ed. J. W. Burrow. London: Penguin, 1968.
Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965.
Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Ed. Steven Connor. London: Dent, 1994.
——. *Old Curiosity Shop*. Ed. Angus Easson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
——. *Barnaby Rudge*. Ed. Gordon Spence. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
——. *David Copperfield*. Ed. Jeremy Tambling. London: Penguin, 1996.
——. *Hard Times*. Ed. David Craig. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.
——. *Bleak House*. Ed. Andrew Sanders. London: Dent, 1994.
——. *Little Dorrit*. Ed. John Holloway. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
——. *Great Expectations*. Ed. Robin Gilmour. London: Dent, 1994.
——. *Great Expectations*. Ed. Charlotte Mitchell. London: Penguin, 1996.
——. *Our Mutual Friend*. Ed. Adrian Pool. London: Penguin, 1997.
Doody, Margaret Anne. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997.
Eliot, George. *Silas Marner*. Ed. Q. D. Leavis. London: Penguin, 1967.
——. *Essays of George Eliot*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. London: Routledge, 1963.
Flew, Antony. "Introduction." *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
Flinn, M. W. "Introduction." *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965. 1-73.
Forster, John. *The Life of Charles Dickens* Vols. I and II. London: Dent, 1966, 1969.
Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Trans. Allan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
Freud, Gigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 1. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
——. *The Interpretation of Dreams: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 4. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
——. *Jokes and their Relations to the Unconscious: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 6. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
——. "Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy ('Little Hans')." *Case Histories I: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 8. Trans. Alix and James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1977.
Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
——. *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. Ed. Robert Sandler. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.
Gallagher, Catherine. *The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form 1832-1867*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985.
——, and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000.
Ghent, Dorothy Van. "The Dickens World: A View from Todgers's." *Sewanee Review* 58 (1950): 419-38.
——. *The English Novel: Form and Function*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1953.

Gilmour, Robin. "Appendix: The Two Endings." *Great Expectations*. London: Dent, 1994. 445-47.
Hara, Eiichi. "Stories Absent and Present in *Great Expectations*." *ELH* 59 (1986): 593-614.
Hattaway, Michael. "Introduction." *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. London: A & C Black, 1969. ix-xix.
Herbert, Christopher. "Filthy Lucre: Victorian Ideas of Money." *Victorian Studies* 44 (2002): 185-213.
Hobsbawn, E. J. *Industry and Empire*. London: Penguin, 1990.
Hojo, Fumio. *Newgate Novel*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1981.
Hollingsworth, Keith. *The Newgate Novel 1830-1847: Bulwer, Ainsworth, Dickens, and Thackeray*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1963.
Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
——. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Trans. R. J. Payton and U. Mammitzsch. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
Jakobson, Roman. *Fundamentals of Language* Second Edition. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
Johnson, Edgar. *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
Kaplan, Fred. *Dickens and Mesmerism.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
Koike, Shigeru. *Eikoku Tetsudo Monogatari* (The Story of Railways in Britain). Tokyo: Shobunsha, 1979.
——. *Victorian Punch* Vol. 2. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1995.
Lodge, David. *The Modes of Modern Writing*. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.
Lucács, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel*. Trans. Anna Bostock. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1971.
Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
——. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Donald Winch. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
Marx, Karl. *Capital* Vol. 1. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin, 1976.
——. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*. Trans. Martin Milligan. New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.
Matsumura, Masaie. *Punch Sobyoshu* (Collections of *Punch*'s Prints). Tokyo: Iwanami, 1994.
Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour and the London Poor* Vol. I. New York: Dover, 1968.
Milbank, Alison. *Daughters of the House: Modes of the Gothic in Victorian Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
Miller, Hillis. *Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958.
——. "The Fiction of Realism: *Sketches by Boz*, *Oliver Twist*, and Cruikshank's Illustrations." *Dickens Centennial Essays*. Ed. Ada Nisbet and Blake Nevius. Berkeley: U of Califronia P, 1971. 85-153.
More, Charles. *The Industrial Age: Economy and Society in Britain 1750-1985*. London: Longman, 1989.
Moynahan, Julian. "The Hero's Guilt: The Case of *Great Expectations*." *Essays*

in Criticism 10 (1960): 60-79.
Panofsky, Erwin. *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1955.
Paulson, Ronald. *Hogarth's Graphic Works* (Third Edition). London: The Print Room, 1989.
——. *Hogarth Volume II: High and Low, 1732-1750*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
——. *Hogarth Volume III: Art and Politics, 1750-1764*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1993.
Porter, Roy. *London: A Social History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1995.
——. ed. *Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
——. *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind*. London: Harper Collins, 1997.
Poovey, Mary. *Making a Social Body British Cultural Formations, 1830-1864*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Ed. Bonamy Dobrée. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966.
Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa or the History of a Young Lady*. Ed. Angus Ross. London: Penguin, 1985.
Rosenberg, Edgar. "Last Words on *Great Expectations*." *Dickens Studies Annual* IX (1981): 87-115.
Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Black Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974.
Slater, Michael, and John Drew, eds. *Dickens' Journalism: 'The Uncommercial Traveller' and Other Papers 1859-70*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2000.
Smith, Grahame. *Dickens, Money, and Society*. Berkeley & Los Angels: U of California P, 1968.
Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. Ed. Graham Petrie. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
Stone, Harry. *Dickens and the Invisible World: Fairy Tales, Fantasy, and Novel-Making*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977.
Tambling, Jeremy. "Prison-bound: Dickens and Foucault." *Essays in Criticism* 36 (1986): 11-31.
Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Pimlico, 1998.
Walpole, Horace. *The Castle of Otlanto*. *Three Gothic Novels*. Ed. Peter Fairclough. London: Penguin, 1968.
Walsh, Susan. "Bodies of Capital: *Great Expectations* and the Climacteric Economy." *Victorian Studies* 37 (1993): 73-98.
Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957.
Wiesenfarth, Joseph. *Gothic Manners and the Classic English Novel*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1988.

The Changing Distance between Jude and Sue: Cousinship and Hardy in *Jude the Obscure*

Machiko Fujita

I

It is widely acknowledged that the questioning of what brings human misfortune is a lifelong theme for Thomas Hardy (1840–1928). Against the controversial theory of Darwinism which positively presented the evolutionary process, and the idea that surviving organisms were the best, Hardy, who hesitated to accept this perspective despite his earlier approval of the theory, continuously turned his eyes towards the weak, who are not in harmony with surrounding circumstances.[1] This is clearly represented through his protagonists who can not settle themselves in society. His fundamental concern, therefore, naturally directs itself towards man-made fetters such as social systems and conventions, the avoidable causes of suffering. Inequalities under which women are forced to suffer because of their sex also arise from these. Hence the pursuit of his theme coincides with his aspiration to emancipate women from sexual discriminations. *Jude the Obscure* (1895), his last novel, can be read as the concluding work relating to his aim. For, as it is well known, Hardy renounced the writing of fiction and turned to poetry after *Jude*.[2]

Hardy's conversion from prose to poetry has been interpreted in various ways that contrast with his own assertion that it was because of the abuse accorded both to *Tess* and *Jude*. J. Hillis Miller describes how 'the series of novels. . . brings the narrator and the protagonists closer and closer together,' concluding that there is no longer a disjunction between these two with which to construct the fiction (ix-x). H. M. Daleski, on the other hand, believes that Hardy reached 'a dead end, a blank wall' after dealing with the problem of relations between the sexes. *Jude* leaves no positive possibilities to explore (203-205).[3] There has, however, been no argument that links this issue to the

cousin-relationship between Jude and Sue, one which I propose to consider in this essay.

In *Jude*, the protagonists Jude and Sue are cousins. Yet, hardly anything has been discussed regarding their cousin-relationship. As Hardy reveals in his letter dated 10 November 1895 to Edmund Gosse, what he intends to write is 'the contrast between the ideal life a man wished to lead, and the squalid real life *he was fated to lead*' (my italics).[4] Such a fate also possesses significance for *Jude*. When we consider the fact that Hardy has a strong interest in the idea of heredity, the lack of critical discussion concerning their cousinhood becomes yet more surprising. The condition of cousinship seems to fulfil an obvious function in the novel: it strengthens the tone of fatal tragedy by bringing about a more miserable marriage between Jude and Sue, a marriage between relatives who are of the same blood, to add to each of their individual unhappy fates. The idea of heredity is a useful device for leading the protagonist into a destined life. Yet, it is important to consider that the relationship between Jude and Sue is based on some peculiarities: they are cousins and, at the same time, they resemble each other so closely that '[t]hey seem to be one person split in two!'[5] They are a singular pair. At the end of the novel, however, their "married life" collapses completely despite their extraordinarily strong ties. Jude dies alone while Sue experiences self-renunciation. Hence we naturally come to wonder why Jude and Sue, who seem to embody an entire oneness even physically, have to face so much misery. This seems to be Hardy's dilemma, his deadlocked circumstance, one which compelled him to abandon the writing of fiction.

In this essay, therefore, I will examine how the characteristics of cousinship function in *Jude the Obscure*. The first section will consider the positive effect that the cousinship produces. Being situated at an unstable standpoint between a relative and a lover, Jude and Sue introduce a pendulum-movement into the plot. They create a space of suspense, a space situated between two extremes. Yet, once they begin to share a life together, the distance between them changes. One could connect this with the argument that the focus of the novel shifts beyond the author's expectations. Therefore, in the second section, the negative effect of the introduction of cousinship will be examined. This is also in accord with the process in which the plot loses its possibilities for further development. Then, the last section will consider what Hardy has to face despite the ambitious aspirations that he allows his main characters, and Sue in particular. As a result

of the varying distances that the cousinship produces, another distance—the perpetual difference between man and woman—is revealed as Hardy's dilemma. The introduction of the cousin-relationship between Jude and Sue, in this way, constitutes the foundation of the novel, effectively and ineffectively, altering the distance between the protagonists. *Jude* can not be properly appreciated without an intensive consideration of their cousinship.

II

Cousinship, which is neither as close as immediate family nor as distant as being unrelated, creates an ambiguous link situated between closeness and detachment. Furthermore, it is a marriageable relationship. This is the basis for *Jude*, in which the protagonists Jude and Sue are cousins of different sexes. The ambiguous distance of cousinship throws Jude and Sue into different sorts of intimacy and separation and produces a space where tragedy and comedy overlap. In the abnormal closeness and detachment that appear by turns, Jude is urged to sway right and left continuously as if he were the swing of a pendulum. Both Sue and Jude move between extremes. Beyond the fatal family tragedy of blood, the condition rather functions to create the in–between space of the novel.

As a cousin, Jude has a rightful excuse to call on Sue. Yet as her relative, he is also deprived of a chance to confirm what he is to her or whether they are in love. Making an ironical contrast with Arabella, with whom Jude once ascertained his relationship by asking her directly '[a]re we lovers?' (71), Jude and Sue's cousinship prevents them from simply being lovers. In spite of his desire to hold the definite relationship of lover, Jude suffers greatly for her, who hides her own feelings under the kinship. As a result, when Sue sways, Jude is also urged to sway. They are confined in instability. This, for example, can be seen in the movements of their hands. As if they were wishing to look closely into each other's heart, or even trying to obtain something definite in their ambiguity, they often hold the other's hand. It even seems that they are like blind people, groping their way in complete darkness:

> Jude impulsively placed his hand upon hers; she looked up and smiled, and took his quite freely into her own little soft one, dividing his fingers and coolly examining them, as if they were the fingers of a glove she was purchasing.

> 'Your hands are rather rough, Jude, aren't they?' she said.
> 'Yes. So would yours be if they held a mallet and chisel all day.'
> 'I don't dislike it, you know. I think it is noble to see a man's hands subdued to what he works in.' (153)

Soon after this, however, Sue, who carefully conceals her true feelings, reveals that she is to marry Phillotson in two years' time. On hearing this, Jude immediately 'drew his hand quite away from hers,' saying, 'O, Sue! . . . But of course it is right — you couldn't have done better!' (153-154). This situation once more forms a contrast to Jude's relationship with Arabella. Their staying together and holding hands in this way does not lead directly to the conclusion that Jude and Sue are in love. They might be in love, yet, they still can not do anything about it—because they are cousins. In *Jude*, however, this jocular going back and forth shown by the movements of their hands is suggestive; for it indicates the amplitude within which the protagonists are obliged to sway. Namely, the dramatic possibilities for things to develop either towards tragedy or comedy are symbolically represented in these unstable spaces that Jude and Sue's cousinhood produces.

Within the space in suspension that the cousinhood creates, the relationship of Jude and Sue further displays various aspects. Contrary to the general acceptance of *Jude* as a plain tragedy, their relationship gives the plot other possibilities. When the time for Sue's marriage with Phillotson approaches, it first confines Jude in his emotional confusion when she asks Jude in a letter to give her away on the grounds that he is 'the only married relation' (189). Despite his reply that 'I am, as you say, the person nearest related to you in this part of the world' (189), Jude feels entirely bewildered. Being afflicted by the opposing standpoints of relative and lover, he has no clue to recognizing her intention at all. Here the narrator describes Jude's inner feeling:

> What had jarred on him . . . was . . . the phrase 'married relation'—What an idiot it made him seem as her lover! If Sue had written that in satire, he could hardly forgive her; if in suffering—ah, that was another thing! (189)

Jude's vexation brought on by Sue's incomprehensible behaviour reveals a tragic tone. Here it seems that the swing of the pendulum considerably leans towards tragedy. The narrator who assimilates his

standpoint with Jude further strengthens this impression: the two men are suffering here from the condition of cousinship.[6]

However, to provide the space in–between, relative and lover, tragedy and comedy, the condition of cousinship once again makes the pendulum recover its swing. With the arrival of Sue's wedding day, *Jude* comes to bear an alternative aspect, bringing into question the general acknowledgement of the work as a tragedy. This produces the most striking matrimonial farce in the novel. During Jude and Sue's last private morning walk, they happen to come to the church where she is going to marry Phillotson within two hours. Here Sue, who had never taken Jude's arm before, now takes it and induces him to go in:

> They strolled undemonstratively up the nave towards the altar railing, which they stood against in silence, turning then and walking down the nave again, her hand still on his arm, precisely like a couple just married. The too suggestive incident, entirely of her making, nearly broke down Jude.
>
> 'I like to do things like this,' she said in the delicate voice of an epicure in emotions, which left no doubt that she spoke the truth. (191)

This behaviour, as if they were celebrating their own wedding, has a dismal aspect. Yet beyond Jude's—and perhaps Sue's—anguish, it makes the reader feel rather frustrated.[7] What is more, this is another representation of their mingled relationship of relative and lover. For, due to the fact that the actual wedding scene is not clearly described in the novel, their going half way to the altar acts as a substitute for Jude taking on the role of giving her away and instead being her married relation. They go the first half way as relatives and then come back the latter half as lovers. Because they are cousins of different sexes, Jude and Sue are in this way forced to sway between their unsettled standpoints, producing the overlapping space of tragicomedy in the novel.

After Sue's marriage, Jude is given another opportunity to hold Sue's hands. This moment shows a significant advance in their relationship: for they embody a "middle," the distinctive space in-between. Here, they hold the other's hands not alternately, but mutually. The following quotation is from the scene in which Jude visits Sue in Shaston where she lives as Phillotson's wife. Waiting for her, Jude plays the piano in the schoolroom. Then, 'the person came close and laid her fingers lightly upon his bass hand. The imposed hand was a little one he seemed to know, and he turned' (219). Notic-

ing Sue's approach from her familiar hands, Jude asks her to play the piano for him:

> Sue sat down, and her rendering of the piece, though not remarkable, seemed divine as compared to his own. She, like him, was evidently touched—to her own surprise—by the recalled air; and when she had finished, and he moved his hand towards hers, *it met his own half-way*. Jude grasped it — just as he had done before her marriage. (219 my italics)

Their hands are thus clasped again. Yet it is significant that they meet at a mid-point of the distance between them. What this scene indicates is that Jude and Sue figuratively take the middle ground after having swayed from right to left in their varying distances. This is when the pendulum seems to stop its swaying. Moreover, as becomes clear later, this is the very scene that Phillotson observes, hiding himself in the school. He discloses it to Gillingham, his friend, with great surprise: 'the extraordinary sympathy, or similarity, between the pair. He is her cousin, which perhaps accounts for some of it. *They seem to be one person split in two!'*(245 my italics). Hence the fact of Jude and Sue's being cousins helps to form a physical oneness beyond their biological differences. Because of this peculiarity, it is often argued that there is a reversal of roles for Jude as a man and Sue as a woman.[8] Yet this seems insufficient: for this can be rather understood as a symbolic representation of the overlapping space of tragedy and comedy, the characteristic of Hardy's artifice in writing inevitable "splits" in life which humans are destined to experience.

After making Jude sway right and left in his relationship with Sue, the condition of cousinship creates their peculiar oneness that leaves a most lasting impression in the novel to readers. All the potentialities of the protagonists' going towards tragedy or comedy are condensed into their entire oneness, withholding a great energy to re-swing the pendulum at this stage. This embodiment of the Hardy outlook makes us wonder in which way the plot is going to develop with further sways of the pendulum.

III

The introduction of Jude and Sue's cousinhood originally seems intended to intensify the fatal aspect which the protagonists are led to face. Yet, we hardly receive the impression that their tragedy is rooted in the destined, family obsession. Rather, it is the condition of cousin-

ship that torments Jude, causing him to oscillate between the position of the relative and the lover, between the tragic and comic standpoint. Moreover, there exists a shift of focus in the novel as *Jude* was mainly regarded as dealing with marriage problems beyond the author's expectations.[9] Here we see another significant aspect of cousinhood that is related to the divergence of views between Hardy and the novel's reader.

It is the condition of cousinship that allows Jude and Sue to live together in the same house. Being relatives justifies them in sharing a life though they have not yet become man and wife in a lawful sense. Once Sue is free from Phillotson, therefore, the penultimate part in the novel can begin with the narrator's description of Jude and Sue's life. Here, 'Sue and Jude were living in Aldbrickham, in precisely the same relations that they had established between themselves when she left Shaston to join him the year before' (271). The emphasis is thus on the fact that they still remain in the same relationship, the ambiguous distance of cousin-relations, which maintains this Hardy-like space in suspense. They keep their peculiar pendulum-movements between opposing extremes. We need to consider, however, that their present relationship differs in its quality from that embodied in their oneness—as if they had lost the energy to develop the plot further. Unlike their former situations that maintained an oscillating space, 'the little house with Jude's name on it' (271) this time confines them in its restricted space, depriving them of free movements. Their house functions as an outer frame here corresponding to the man-made fetters in society. Jude and Sue are kept in close confinement.

As their life continues, therefore, the distance between Sue and Jude, which basically contains the ambiguity of the relative and the lover, transforms itself into the more problematic one of "man and wife." In the confinement of the house, their relationship comes to be practically indistinguishable from an ordinary man–wife relationship. Though their way of living is fundamentally based on their authentic cousinship, here a serious gap develops that leads to their isolation from society. For people around them suspect their relationship: they have doubts about the justness of being married cousins. The earlier episode at the Training College in Melchester had indicated as much. A year before when Sue went out for an excursion which obliged her to stay overnight with Jude, 'a lamentable seduction of one of the pupils' (160) is said to have occurred with the same mitigation that the student and her lover were cousins. Owing to this, their cousinship

loses its sense of justness, bearing unfavorable meanings instead: convenience, dubiousness, and moral corruption. Jude and Sue's case is not an exception. The following is a dialogue between one of the mistresses and a girl in the College. Not only do the mistresses not accept it as mitigation, they also pervert the truth of the situation:

> 'I may as well tell you that it has been ascertained that the young man Bridehead stayed out with was not her cousin, for the very good reason that she has no such relative. We have written to Christminster to ascertain.'
> 'We are willing to take her word,' said the head girl. (162)

Considering what Jude and Sue are to face in the future, this conversation is ominous. As the girl's word ironically echoes, this implies an approaching gap between Jude and Sue, which actualizes their cooperative life under the condition of cousinship, and the people around them, who cannot accept their relationship as it is. In this respect, Little Father Time's sudden appearance is fatal: for '[t]he curious fact of a child coming to them unexpectedly, who called Jude father, and Sue mother' (310) encourages undesirable rumors about them. The spread of these rumor can be confirmed by another, the conversation between Arabella and Dr Vilvert, a physician, at the Great Wessex Agricultural Show. Arabella remarks: 'They *say* they are cousins' (306) and Dr Vilvert answers: 'Cousinship is a great convenience to their feelings, I should say?' (306). Even though their cousinhood is genuine, it is now presented as nothing but a simple "excuse" for them. Hence, they are completely caught and begin to stagnate in their dubious "man and wife" relationship. Within the house, the meaning of their being cousins is lost, and so is the peculiar distance between Jude and Sue, the overlapping space of tragicomedy in the novel.

Being deprived of this Hardy–like space in suspension, their confinement continuously leads Jude and Sue into further deadlocked circumstances. Without intending to advance their relations, they aggravate conflict with the people around them. Their space comes to be all the more figuratively limited, even outside of their house. This is symbolically represented in the repetitive walks that repeat their comings and goings without achieving any progress. For '[t]hey started arm in arm for the office' (296) to receive the marriage certificate, yet, instead of having this done, 'in the street they turned into an unfrequented side alley, where they walked up and down as they had done long ago in the Market-house at Melchester' (297). This is an

indication of their approaching impasse, one in which they are fated to a deadlocked exclusion from society. Soon after this, therefore, Jude and Sue enter on 'a shifting, almost nomadic, life' (320) without having any definite place in which to settle. In this respect, the narrator's description of their relations—their distance—at this time is suggestive: 'they had become such companions that they could hardly do anything of importance except in each other's company' (293). With the disappearance of distance between the two, with the restricted movement of Jude and Sue, there is no movement in the plot between relatives and lovers, tragedy and comedy. Instead, an atmosphere of complete tragedy, a serious conflict between the protagonists and society, begins to pervade the latter part of the novel. The focus of the novel now turns to the modern issue of a man and woman's relationship without marriage. At this point there arrives the harshest element in the novel: Little Father Time, the child of Jude and Arabella, commits suicide after having killed the children from Jude and Sue's relationship.

It has been widely acknowledged that Little Father Time—not a realistic representation, but a 'fanciful allegory' (Buckley 183)—is an embodiment of Hardy's pessimism.[10] Within the monotonous tone of the novel, however, this peculiar figure has a practical justification. His sudden suicide and murder of the other children, which conclusively destroys the controversial relationship between Jude and Sue, functions as a breakthrough in the plot.[11] This great tragedy seems to swallow up everything in a moment; it breaks down the sense of stagnation, and sets up the final closing movement of the plot. It also brings an end to Jude and Sue's cohabitation which has been the cause of the confrontation between the protagonists and society in the novel. The dramatic event, therefore, seems to pass judgement on Jude and Sue. The following is a description of the face of Little Father Time after he has committed suicide:

> The boy's face expressed the whole tale of their situation. On that little shape had converged all the inauspiciousness and shadow which had darkened the first union of Jude, and all the accidents, mistakes, fears, errors of the last. He was their nodal point, their focus, their expression in a single term. For the rashness of those parents he had groaned, for their ill-assortment he had quaked, and for the misfortunes of these he had died. (346)

Hence Jude and Sue are punished by Little Father Time, who records their indecisive way of living and their ambiguous relationship as

"man and wife" based on cousinship. Their confrontation with society ends at this point. Owing to this, what we have after this fatal episode is the tiresome and almost inconceivable process by which Jude and Sue return to their respective married lives: Jude to Arabella, and Sue to Phillotson. With this triggering device, the plot leaves us with an impression that it somehow manages to close the novel in a still monotonous and changeless tone.

Parallel to the process in which Jude and Sue are confined in their dubious relationship, potential varieties of a plot suspended between tragedy and comedy are also distinguishable. In its inclination towards tragedy, the plot comes to lay emphasis on a confrontation between Jude and Sue and the people around them. This involves no more artifice of Hardy's, who shapes a space in suspension, a tragi-comedy. Therefore, what we have after their cohabitation, their radical form of a married life, is a disappearance of 'Hardy-ness' and a bitter discord between the protagonists and society. Everything that has happened has its origin in their kinship. Yet Jude is still right to say: "'We have wronged no man, corrupted no man, defrauded no man!' Though perhaps we have 'done that which was right in our own eyes'" (319). In this respect, it can be understood that the judgment of Little Father Time is passed on to Hardy, the plot–maker, who leads his protagonists and his novel into an impasse. For the introduction of Jude and Sue's cousinship seems also related to Hardy's dilemma, a dilemma which leads him to abandon writing fiction after *Jude* and to turn to poetry.

IV

It is often said that Sue represents an image of the 'New Woman' of the late nineteenth century, and as such is the most lively and intellectual heroine of Hardy characters.[12] Yet we see Sue gradually losing her brightness after each turn in the novel. Sue's deterioration seems to reflect the dilemma that drove Hardy finally to give up writing novels after *Jude*. It has been confirmed that Hardy has been on the weak, especially on women, who suffer from several inequalities. Yet while dealing with Sue, Hardy confronts the question of whether making her free from conventions would directly result in her happiness. The condition of cousinship is again related to this issue. The cousin-relationship between Sue and Jude created the Hardy-like space in suspense and removed it again by confining them to their house, a symbol

of man-made fetters in society. Then, from their separated space, a new distance between Jude and Sue arises so as to produce further free movement. This involves a biological difference—a perpetual distance—between man and woman. It also manifests Hardy's dilemma.

Jude and Sue are an unusual pair, who show a number of remarkable resemblances. Before forming a oneness, they discover several factors that emphasize their similarity. In each case, the condition of being cousins more or less seems to be of influence on their similarity. As cousinship — neither as close as immediate family, nor as distant as those unrelated — still reveals something in common, their several affinities are attributed to it. This is demonstrated when Jude becomes enchanted by Sue's face in a photograph. Her face 'haunted him' (102), and Jude is captured by his strong and unusual link to her. Without knowing why, he kisses the photo and feels at home; or, on hearing Sue speak to others, he acknowledges in her accent 'the certain qualities of his own voice; softened and sweetened, but his own' (111). Cousinhood thus connects them somewhere deep in their relationship. Then, further, Jude comes to see his own figure in Sue. This is when Sue seeks refuge with Jude by swimming across a river to escape from the Training School. Being startled by the coincidence that she asks for refuge with Jude as he had done before, the narrator cries: 'What counterparts they are!' (163). Then, after suggesting Sue wear his Sunday suit, what Jude sees is 'a slim and fragile being masquerading as himself on a Sunday, so pathetic in her defencelessness that his heart felt big with the sense of it' (164). Sue's vulnerable figure captures Jude completely. Yet, at this moment, Jude also stares at his own figure reflected in Sue. In this scene, the 'two Judes'—or the 'two Sues'—confront each other. Jude and Sue thus gradually approach their oneness through physical resemblance.

In the case of Sue, cousinship reveals their inner similarity. A letter that Sue first directs to Jude gives us a clue to this. Knowing that he lives in Christminster, the town she is going to leave, Sue writes a little note to Jude that begins with the opening 'dear cousin Jude':

> She addressed him as her dear cousin Jude; said she had only just learnt by the merest accident that he was living in Christminster, and reproached him with not letting her know. They might have had such nice times together, she said, for she was thrown much upon herself, and had hardly any congenial friend. But now there was ever probability of her soon going away, so that the chance of companionship would be lost perhaps for ever. (122)

This small note condemning Jude for his unkindness is written in haste and directed to him unreservedly. Yet this too unveils a similarity between the two: Sue bears something corresponding to Jude. Disclosed here is a peculiarity in the blood of the Fawleys that is somehow related to the difficulties for them in finding friends among people who are not relations. Without having close friends, Sue expects Jude to be the one whose existence must be 'congenial' with her's. Cousinship supports both their external and internal closeness.

Jude and Sue's oneness can thus be fully appreciated only when these similarities are pointed out. In this respect, Phillotson's utterance of their extreme closeness, '[t]hey seem to be one person split in two!,' comes as a climax to their relationship in the novel. This unusual image reminds us of another peculiar pair, Catherine and Heathcliff, in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847). Catherine cries, 'I *am* Heathcliff.'[13] Yet a significant difference exists between these two couples. Unlike Catherine and Heathcliff, who remain in their ideological world, our pair in *Jude* are compelled to live on in a harsh reality. Jude and Sue have a subsequent life after consummating their relationship: Sue becomes pregnant.

Pregnancies are the physical revelation of a woman's sexuality.[17] It is therefore ironical that Sue, who has the least femininess among Hardy heroines, bears the largest number of children. As Penny Boumelha argues, "[i]t is Sue, not Jude, who is the primary site of that 'deadly war waged between flesh and spirit' of which Hardy speaks in his Preface" (Boumelha 144-45), because sexuality brings no physical change to Jude. Though she has formed her oneness with Jude, even to the extent that they are physically alike, she cannot be equal of Jude because of pregnancy. Their physical similarity thus undesirably comes to reveal the biological difference between the two. The closer they are, paradoxically the more conspicuous the difference between them becomes. Thus Hardy finds himself confronting the question of a true equality between man and woman; for Jude and Sue cannot be the same no matter how Hardy wants them to be so.

As the episode of the '*new* New Testament' (171) which Sue broke into pieces and reconstructed again symbolically indicates, Sue is the prototype of the new woman who desires to be entirely free from any fixed conceptual thinking.[14] She is a representative of Hardy's attempts to emancipate women from the fetters of social conventions. This also accounts for her refusal to proceed with her marriage contract with Jude, so as to be united with Jude by law. As Aunt Drusilla

explains, '[t]here's sommat in our blood that won't take kindly to the notion of being bound to do what do readily enough if not bound'(94). Thus, the root of her free will is defined as a hereditary characteristic. It is as if Hardy intended to evade his responsibility for creating Sue, a controversial figure, by attributing her individual character to a genetic peculiarity. Yet, as we have considered, it is the condition of cousinship itself—not their hereditary characteristics—that torments Jude and Sue. Moreover, Sue's refusal to proceed with the marriage contract has its more specific explanation. In his letter of 20 November 1895 to Edmund Gosse, Hardy explains Sue's fear for the marriage contract as follows:

> one of her reasons for fearing the marriage ceremony is that she fears it would be breaking faith with Jude to withhold herself at pleasure, or altogether, after it; though while uncontracted she feels at liberty to yield herself as seldom as she chooses. This has tended to keep his passion as hot at the end as at the beginning, and helps to break his heart.[15]

Beyond the peculiarity of the Fawley blood, Sue's rejection of being bound to Jude originates also in the idea of having Sue keep Jude and his passionate love perpetually unsatisfied. Hence Hardy's handling of Sue seems to go beyond the simple category of family tragedy. The controversial distance of "man and wife" is the cause of their exile; nevertheless, it is one of Hardy's most ambitious attempts to represent a complex distance between man and woman.[16]

Despite this highly motivated testing, Sue comes to lose her brightness while practising Hardy's idealism. Sue is originally freer than any of Hardy's other heroines, yet the pregnancy damages her remarkable character. Sue can not be free from being a woman. In this respect, Phillotson's utterance, when he allows Sue to go to Jude, sounds ironical: 'What I was going to say is that my liberating her can do her no possible harm, and will open up a chance of happiness for her which she has never dreamt of hitherto'(268). Though Sue has freedom even in her sexuality and her controversial distance from Jude is one ideal representation of Hardy's ambitious attempts, she is still obliged to have her miserable breakdown after the tragedy of Little Father Time.

Sue's breakdown has been interpreted in a variety of ways. Boumelha attributes it to 'social forces that press harder on women in sexual and marital relationships'(153), whereas Merryn Williams sees

it as 'a very long tradition in English literature of making women break down' (57). These different interpretations result from their different views of Hardy's attitude to the writing of *Jude*. While the former recognizes it as radical, the latter understands it as conservative. It cannot be denied that Sue is burdened heavily by social pressures. Yet if this were the only way of explaining her miserable end, then, it is to be presumed that Hardy might have continued writing fiction even after *Jude*, producing other works that blamed society in the hope of renewing it. Yet Hardy could not do this. From the author's point of view, *Jude* may not appear to be a positive challenge to society, rather it seems a disclosure of the dilemma that he faces in the process of composition. The understanding of its first readers and of the author's may differ greatly. It is important, therefore, to consider the tragedy of Little Father Time once again.

As we have already noticed, this unrealistic little figure has his role in bringing about a breakthrough in the monotonous tone of a plot that has already lost its appeal. By punishing the relationship of Jude and Sue, it resolves the harsh confrontation between the two and society. However, this also discloses the novelist Hardy, trapped in a dead end. What Little Father Time swallowed up by his death is not only the present of Jude and Sue, but also their future. After the tragedy, Jude and Sue have no heirs. This has been argued to be a representation of degeneration, the widely accepted idea used to explain the cause of anxieties about poverty and crime in the late Victorian England; for marriage between cousins can be regarded as incest.[18] Yet it is Little Father Time, the child of Jude and Arabella's marriage, who was born deformed.[19] In *Jude*, neither of Jude and Sue's children is even called by their names and Sue seems to bear her two children 'only to find them hanged' (Pinion 148). Gillian Beer has observed that:

> The death of their children (murdered by little Father Time in a late Malthusian tragedy, 'Done because we are too menny') leaves Jude and Sue as aberrant, without succession, and therefore 'monstrous' in the sense that they can carry no cultural or physical mutations into the future and must live out their lives merely at odds with the present. (Beer 257)

The tragedy of Little Father Time thus makes Jude and Sue abnormal in regard to the biological concept of Darwinism. Yet it is rather *Jude* itself that is 'monstrous,' for it represents the impasse in which Hardy is confined.

Succession and inheritance is not simply denied to Jude and Sue,

but also to the development of the novel. Considering that Hardy often ends his novels with the deaths of his heroes and heroines, representing his homage to an individual life-span against the cosmic scale which Darwinism brought in, Jude's death at the end is not so striking.[20] His dead body lying on the bed 'straight as an arrow' (411) can suggest that he dies in vain. Yet it is rather significant that his death interrupts the succession of the Fawleys, as if representing Hardy's deadlocked circumstances. Unlike his other works in which we usually feel some suggestions of hope through, for example, other characters' marriage or anticipations of new childbirth, with Jude's death, the inheritance descended from the Fawleys is banished from *Jude*. After all, *Jude* ends by negating the succession of the human race, which opposes the fundamental principle of Darwinism. In spite of Hardy's attempts to make Sue equal with Jude, there is nothing left which can forward his trials to the future.

If succession and inheritance are the core of Darwinism, it is also succession and inheritance which 'organise society and sustain hegemony'(Beer 210). As we have seen, however, they are suddenly cut off by the disastrous intervention of Little Father Time in *Jude*. Hence Hardy's dilemma. Williams concludes her essay as follows:

> Hardy sympathised with any moves which were likely to improve the status of women, but ultimately he could not believe that legal or social changes would help them, seeing that 'the unalterable laws of nature are based upon a wrong.' (William 59)

The barren world of *Jude* symbolically indicates Hardy's impasse, his recognition that men and women can not be equal. This is what Hardy faces at the end of his lifelong struggle creatively to emancipate the weak, especially women, from unfair treatment. The cousinship of Jude and Sue discloses this in their varying distance.

V

In *Jude the Obscure*, the cousin-relationship between the protagonists Jude and Sue is the device which produces the Hardy-like space in suspense, the indefinite space between two extremes. The ambiguous distance created by cousinship throws Jude and Sue into different sorts of intimacy and separation, and it urges them to sway right and left continuously as if they were the swing of a pendulum. Once they start sharing a life together, however, the surrounding situation changes the focus of the novel. It was the cousin-relationship between

Jude and Sue that enabled them to live together. Yet the same condition transforms the meaning of their relationship into the more dubious and controversial one of "man-wife" relations, causing Jude and Sue to come into conflict with the people around them. It also deprived them of that Hardy-like space of tragicomedy in the plot. This produces the stark confrontation between the protagonists and society concerning their radical style of living. Jude and Sue's cohabitation reveals the inevitable distance between them through Sue's pregnancy. Due to their earlier sense of oneness, this biological difference becomes paradoxically conspicuous. Despite the ambitions that Hardy allows Sue in particular, at the end she turns into a weak, featureless woman. Hardy is compelled to recognize a limit in emancipating women from sexual discrimination: for men and women cannot be equal.

Here is the narrator's description of Jude and Sue meeting each other for the first time:

> The broad street was silent, and almost deserted, although it was not late. He saw a figure on the other side, which turned out to be hers, and they both converged towards the cross-mark at the same moment. Before either had reached it she called out to him:
>
> 'I am not going to meet you just there, for the first time in my life! Come further on.' (122)

Knowing that they were approaching 'the spot of the Martyrdoms' (122), a cursed place, Sue urged Jude to walk further on his side. As a result, '[t]hey walked on in parallel lines' (123). In the context of what we have considered in this essay, their first meeting assumes a significance. The tragedy of Jude and Sue seems condensed into this tiny scene. The place she rejected is the intersection: it is the intersection of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and more significantly, of life and death. In Hardy's fiction, crossroads or street corners can be often recognized, for they are all boundaries which symbolize the Hardy-like space, the overlapping space in suspense between opposing extremes. Sue's avoidance of the place of cross-mark, therefore, can imply the coming loss of this space. In their accidental walk in parallel, Hardy's stagnation is also symbolized. As things in parallel will never meet no matter how far they go, Jude and Sue's walk seems to represent the perpetual distance between man and woman.

Owing to the introduction of the cousin-relationship between Jude and Sue, Hardy has come to an impasse, a recognition of inequality between man and woman. In this respect, the way that the narrator

describes Sue observing Jude is suggestive: '[i]t was evident that her cousin deeply interested her, as one might be interested in a man puzzling out his way along a labyrinth from which one had one's self escaped' (157). Cousinship is the labyrinth in which Hardy himself has come to a deadlock together with his protagonists Jude and Sue.

Notes

[1] See Florence Emily Hardy 153, 259; see also, Roger Ebbatson 19.

[2] Some critics consider that Hardy's revisions to *The Well-Beloved* (1897) should be regarded as his last novel. Yet there is also an argument that the revised text does not represent a radical departure from the original written before *Jude*. See H. M. Daleski 186.

[3] See Daleski 204-205. Daleski's argument is close to mine, yet there is no discussion of the cousin-relationship between Jude and Sue.

[4] Letter to Edmund Gosse, Nov. 10, 1985, in *Collected Letters*, 93.

[5] Thomas Hardy, ed. P. N. Furbank, *Jude the Obscure.* The New Wessex Edition (London: Macmillan, 1974), 245. All the quotations taken from the novel in my essay refer to this edition.

[6] By examining Hardy's shifts from narrational sentences to Represented Speech sentences, Christine Brooke-Rose points out that one of Hardy's indeterminacies results from this 'dissolution of the boundaries between author and character' (29-46). On the other hand, Penny Boumelha regards it as 'a kind of collusion,' for they share 'a man's picture of a woman' (147).

[7] Ronald P. Draper also discusses *Jude* as a comic tragedy. He points out that a 'continuing impatience' is what distinguishes the novel from traditional tragedy. Yet again there is no argument about Jude and Sue's cousinship. See Draper 243-254.

[8] As to the reversal of roles, see Anne Z. Mickelson 133, or Ellen Lew Sprechman 107-108.

[9] In his letter to Edmund Gosse, November 20, 1895, Hardy writes that the novel was regarded as dealing mainly with 'the marriage question' against his will. See *Collected Letters* 99.

[10] See, for example, Robin Gilmour 180.

[11] H. M. Daleski also regards this as 'a catastrophe in the narrative' (204).

[12] See, for example, Lloyd Fernando, *"New Women" in the Late Victorian Novel* (London: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977); Gail Cunningham, *The New Woman and the Victorian Novel* (London: Macmillan, 1978). Fernando considers Sue's self–realization of her sex as Hardy's originality and Cunningham subsequently examines Sue's unconventionality.

[13] Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*, 82.

[14] Kathleen Blake, by mentioning Sue's liking for books, claims that she represents an emancipated woman in the later nineteenth century.

[15] Letter to Edmund Gosse, Nov. 20, 1895, in *Collected Letters*, 99.

[16] The same idea can be also traced to his earlier work *Far From the Madding Crowd* (1874). In this novel, one of the characters describes the way to sustain the love of a husband towards his wife after marriage. Going back to their earlier stage of being lovers and reevaluating their distance was the device recommended to revitalize already too familiar hearts.

[17] When the public had hardly any knowledge of contraception in the Victorian Age, sexual intercourse all the more usually meant pregnancy. See Boumelha, *Thomas Hardy* 22.

[18] See William Greenslade 159-160.

[19] In *The Heavenly Twins* (1893) by Sarah Grand, a monster child appears as a result of venereal disease. Merryn Williams considers further similarities between these novels. See Williams 52. In the context of feminist fiction, Elaine Showalter regards Little Father Time as 'the prematurely aged and psychologically disturbed syphilitic child' (108).

[20] See Roger Robinson 28-43; Beer 239.

Works Cited

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 1983; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2000.

Boumelha, Penny. *Thomas Hardy and Women: Sexual Ideology and Narrative Form*. Sussex: Harvester, 1982.

Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Ian Jack. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

Brooke-Rose, Christine. "Ill Wit and Sick Tragedy: *Jude the Obscure*." *The Alternative Hardy*. Ed. Lance St. John Butler. London: Macmillan, 1989. 26-48.

Cunningham, Gail. *The New Woman and the Victorian Novel*. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Daleski, Hillel Matthew. *Thomas Hardy and the Paradoxes of Love*. Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1997.

Draper, R. P. "Hardy's Comic Tragedy: *Jude the Obscure*." *Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels*. Ed. Dale Kramer and Nancy Marck. Boston: Hall, 1990. 243-54.

Ebbatson, Roger. *The Evolutionary Self*. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982.

Fernando, Lloyd. *"New Women" in the Late Victorian Novel*. London: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977.

Gilmour, Robin. *The Novel in the Victorian Age: A Modern Introduction*. London: Edward Arnold, 1986.

Grand, Sarah. *The Heavenly Twins*. Ann Arbor Paperbacks. U of Michigan P, 1992.

Greenslade, William. *Degeneration, Culture and the Novel 1880-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Hardy, Florence Emily. *The Life of Thomas Hardy: 1840-1928*. London: Macmillan, 1962.

Hardy, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure*. The New Wessex Edition. Ed. P. N. Furbank. London: Macmillan, 1974.

——. *Far From the Madding Crowd*. Penguin Classics. Ed. Ronald Brythe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
Kramer, Dale., ed. *Critical Approaches to the Fiction of Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
Merryn, Williams. "Hardy and 'the Woman Question.'" *Thomas Hardy Annual*. Vol.1. Ed. Norman Page. 44-59. 5 vols.
Mickelson, Anne Z. *Thomas Hardy's Women and Men*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1976.
Miller, J. Hillis. *Thomas Hardy: Distance and Desire*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1970.
O'Toole, Tess. *Genealogy and Fiction in Hardy*. London, Macmillan, 1997.
Pinion, F. B. "*Jude the Obscure*: Origins in Life and Literature." *Thomas Hardy Annual*. Vol. 4. London: Macmillan, 1986. 5 vols.
Purdy, Richard Little, and Michael Millgate, ed. *The Collected Letters of Thomas Hardy*. Volume Two: 1893-1901. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
Robinson, Roger. "Hardy and Darwin." *Thomas Hardy: The Writer and His Background*. Ed. Norman Page. London: Hyman, 1980. 128-50.
Showalter, Elaine. "*Syphilis, Sexuality, and the Fiction of the Fin de Siecle*." Ed. Ruth Bernard Yeazell. *Sex, Politics, and Science in the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.
Sprechman, Ellen Lew. *Seeing Women as Men: Role Reversal in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1995.

Ideas Floating on Their Causes: *Purgatory*, *Endgame* and the Irish Dissentient Tradition

Miki Iwata

The dramatic works of W. B. Yeats have exerted a strong influence on the Irish stage. The foundation of the Abbey Theatre was an epoch-making event and it is not too much to say that Yeats was an initiator of modern Irish theatre as its founder and co-director. Yet he is generally taken to be one of the greatest poets of twentieth-century Ireland, and consequently most critics have regarded his drama as a sideline.[1] When they pay it attention, their remarks are mostly directed to Yeats's dance plays in their relation to Japanese Noh theatre.[2] The problem of this sort of analysis is that his drama is regarded as a handmaiden to, or — at best — an instance of his poetic art. As early as the late 1950s, Frank Kermode interpreted "Among School Children" with an appropriate reference to Yeats's discovering the Noh plays (49-91). Critical assessments of Yeats's dramatic works in themselves have as a result suffered relative neglect.

Purgatory (1939), the last of his dramatic works to be performed before his death, is counted as one of these dance plays, and ranked with *At the Hawk's Well* (1917) and *The Dreaming of the Bones* (1919)—on the basis of stories similar to a major theme in Noh which focuses on travellers' encounters with the supernatural, often with shadows of the dead.[3] However, almost twenty years separate the period when he engaged in writing dance plays and *Purgatory*. After the publication of *Four Plays for Dancers* in 1921, Yeats's theatrical activities came to a halt. *The Cat and the Moon*, which appeared in *The Criterion* in July 1924, is the only new play published in the 1920s, and it was actually written shortly before his marriage in 1917.[4] Thus, he produced virtually no new plays during the 1920s. It appears

he may have reached an impasse with the dance plays, and, therefore, that to consider *Purgatory* on the same basis as the other dance plays is straining the point.

What illustrates the change in Yeats's taste most eloquently is his enhanced interest in philosophical texts during this period, especially those of George Berkeley, whom he initially criticized in a controversy with Edward Dowden about Irish literature (*Uncollected Prose* 351-52). In fact, a close reading of *Purgatory* reveals a pessimistic version of subjective idealism in the work, an outlook which cannot be seen in the earlier dance plays. Furthermore, observed from the Berkeleian point of view, *Purgatory* will reveal a hidden affinity with Samuel Beckett's *Endgame* with all its characteristics of the post-modern world where man, deprived of any communication or religion, is at a loss in a huge void of uncertainties.

Yeats introduced a new current in Irish theatre and a study of modern Irish drama cannot hold good without due consideration for his contribution to it. To put it more concretely, while his works exemplify an attempt to establish an Irish drama unique to his own people (and his dramatic materials were therefore often chosen from the Irish myths), they also afford ample scope for interpretation as harbingers of absurdist plays written by Beckett in the mid-twentieth century. Berkeley's dissentient theory of ideas and their causes forms one key link between the two Irish dramatists. The artistic adaptation of subjective idealism paves a way for an approach to the absurdist's world. Thus, by reconfiguring his dramatic achievement in this fashion, a clearer picture of Yeats the writer will emerge.[5]

I

Yeats's middle-aged cultivation of the mind bore fruit first in prose and poems, a little ahead of his plays. In publishing the final version of *A Vision* in 1937, he added to the opening section of the introduction comments on Lady Gregory's credit for his educational development. She told him that he had become "a much better educated man . . . and much more powerful in argument." Thus the poet proudly "put *The Tower* and *The Winding Stair* into evidence to show that my poetry has gained in self-possession and power" (8). In subsequent sections, he explains that this change has its inception in the esoteric communications with unknown spirits via his wife's automatic writing, though whether such supernatural communication was a sham or

not is a question beyond the scope of the present discussion. What is more important here is that he regards his self-education in this period as a creative force which will help his art gain "in self-possession and power." *A Vision* offers the figure of a poet who "seeks in book and manuscript/ What he shall never find" in a lone tower (59). This is a caricature of the Yeats who refashioned himself in Thoor Ballylee, "[beginning] with Berkeley" (19). Looking at the tower from the ground, the hermit-like Michael Robartes and his friend Aherne carry on a dialogue about the truth the poet has not yet found. Lines from Robartes's song, "All thought becomes an image and the soul/ Becomes a body," is antagonistic to the Cartesian dualism by which mind and matter are two distinct entities (61). Robartes's argument rather shows a slight affinity with Spinozan monism in that these lines make equivalences between soul and body and, consequently, negate the body's substance. The juxtaposition of the body with thought, image and soul reminds a reader of the monist idea that nothing finite has any substance except the infinite, which illustrates Yeats's inclination towards a pantheistic idealism inherited from Spinoza and Hegel. Indeed, in the introduction which he wrote for *Bishop Berkeley, his Life, Writings and Philosophy*, published in 1931 by J. M. Hone and M. M. Rossi, Yeats expects that the writings of Spinoza and Hegel will be counted as "the greatest of all works of intellect" in several generations, and demonstrates his dislike for the "mechanical philosophy" of Isaac Newton and John Locke (*Essays* 396-411). But it is Berkeley who most radically dissented from the physicists' scientific worldview when it was in the first flush of a triumphant vogue.

A major motive of Berkeley's works is to refute Locke's doctrine by which consciousness is merely one of the properties of matter, and therefore dependent on the maintenance of physical conditions. His theory regards the whole universe as, in a sense, a huge machine. For Berkeley, however, such a notion of the universe would ruin morality and, to confute this scientism, he took surprisingly drastic measures, that is, to deny the existence of matter by suggesting that we can never be truly aware of anything but our own ideas. According to him, the objects of human knowledge consist of "either ideas actually imprinted on the sense" or "ideas formed by help of memory and imagination" and thus sensible things have no existence outside the mind (*Treatise* 103). However, one may oppose, these ideas must have their causes, as we do not invent our own ideas with our will. Berkeley manipulates this probable opposition, turning it to his advantage:

> But besides all that endless variety of ideas or objects of knowledge, there is likewise something which knows or perceives them, and exercises divers operations, as willing, imagining, remembering about them. This perceiving, active being is what I call *mind, spirit, soul* or *my self.* . . . [T]he existence of an idea consists in being perceived. (*Treatise* 103)

Since to cause is to act for him, and since nothing is really active but the will of an intelligent being, Locke's material bodies cannot be the causes of anything. In *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, Philonous, the philosopher's advocate, broadens the idea. Since sensible things "depend not on my thought, and have an existence distinct from being perceived by me, *there must be some other mind wherein they exist.*" Therefore, "I . . . immediately and necessarily conclude the being of a God, because all sensible things must be perceived by him" (97). Interestingly, Berkeley sets his own logical consequence prior to belief in God: he appreciates the necessity of the perceiving self of human beings throughout.

The reason why Berkeley's subjective idealism strongly attracted Yeats largely depends upon its disowning the objective existence of matter and privileging subjective perception so as to restore the power of human subjectivity and therefore, as the poet assumes, "[t]he romantic movement seems related to the idealist philosophy." However, it is also because Berkeley contributed immensely to establishing an Irish intellectual lineage when the country was yet only on its way to becoming a nation (*Essays* 404). His brief letter to Hone, presumably dated 20 November 1930, declares his fascination with the philosopher:

> You have set Berkeley in his Irish world, and made him amusing, animated and intelligible. He is of the utmost importance to the Ireland that is coming into existence, as I hope to show in my introduction. I want Protestant Ireland to base some vital part of its culture upon Burke, Swift and Berkeley. (*Letters* 779)

What the passage makes clear at once is that he more or less exclusively admires Berkeley's achievement in establishing a culture for the nation "coming into existence." In fact, many of Yeats's later works offer a Berkleian reliance on human perception based on experience. In "The Tower" (1928), for instance, the poet sings his confidence in his own perception; though, in the first section, he insinuates that he should be Neoplatonic and treat pure ideas, the clause expressing this

idea is subordinate to, and therefore marred by, the main clause: "it seems" (*Collected Poems* 194).[6] Thus, the poet is expected to reject the Neoplatonic world of ideas, which he fulfils in the third section, declaring that "Death and life were not/ Made lock, stock and barrel/ Out of his bitter soul,/ Aye, sun and moon and star, all,/ And further add to that/ That, being dead, we rise,/ Dream and so create/ Translunar paradise" (198). He here exposes a near-solipsism: when the poet proclaims that man made death and life by his feeling them, it reminds readers of Berkeley's simple assertion that "The table I write on, I say, exists, that is, I see and feel it" (*Treatise* 104). The truth of things depends not on theoretical comprehension but on direct human perception of them. Along with the poet in "The Tower," Yeats himself shares this idea with them. He reveals his determination to repudiate abstract ideas in his diary entry for 19 June 1930:

> Those spiritual beings seem always as if they would turn me from every abstraction. I must not talk to myself about 'the truth' not call myself 'teacher' nor another 'pupil'—these things are abstract—but see myself set in a drama where I struggle to exalt and overcome concrete realities perceived not with mind only but as with the roots of my hair. (*Explorations* 301-02)

It is interesting that he compares himself to a person "in a drama," for the figure of the poet struggling to face realities as an actor plays his part in a drama overlaps considerably with the persons in his own last plays. The spirit of Jonathan Swift, for example, in *The Words upon the Window-Pane* (1934) acts out again and again in his agony "some kind of horrible play," until he wholly understands the consequences of what he had done before his death (*Collected Plays* 603).[7] Yeats likewise presses himself to attain knowledge of real life not only with his metaphysical intellect but with his bodily existence, even to the "roots of [his] hair."

However, the more Yeats aged, the more he was haunted by the difficulty of living experientially. In "The Circus Animals' Desertion," one of his last poems, the poet compares himself to the manager of a circus and his literary themes to the circus animals. As the title word "desertion" shows, the retrospect of his own works is apparently pessimistic. The poet loudly deplores his having permitted himself the indulgence of seemingly self-complete images "in pure mind," and evokes their underlying origins (347). By the importunate enumeration of the banal sundries that are all "old" or "broken," he emphasizes the commonness from which his poetic themes derived. The centre of

his regret does not lie in that they had such commonness but in the fact that the poet himself overlooked the process of perceiving these objects. His ideas have, as it were, left behind their causes—the genuinely active part of the mind. The isolation of ideas from things by way of oblique perception seems the impasse to which Yeats came in his last years. That such an interpretation is by no means outlandish can be gathered from the fact that Yeats in this period still demonstrates a detestation for scientism. Yeats begins "Private Thoughts," an essay in *On the Boiler*, published in the same year as "The Circus Animals' Desertion," with the following proclamatory sentence: "I am philosophical, not scientific, which means that observed facts do not mean much until I can make them part of my experience" (*Explorations* 429). Consequently, in his probing for a human perception, he has to face the same problem of wrongly perceiving again and again. Growing ever older, he seems obsessed by the idea:

> I have a one-act play in my head, a scene of tragic intensity. . . . I am so afraid of that dream. My recent work has greater strangeness and I think greater intensity than anything I have done. I never remember the dream so deep. (*Letters* 907)

This is a letter written only a year before his death. The one-act play that he mentions in the letter is *Purgatory.* His great fear of the play shows that he was terribly anxious about how human beings should surmount the danger of falling into passionless abstraction. He was distressed by the idea that one might not overcome this erring recurrence to the end just like the Old Man in *Purgatory,* even immediately before his own death. Indeed, the figures of afflicted spirits who endlessly repeat their trespasses form a motif that Yeats himself repeatedly used in plays such as *The Dreaming of the Bones* (1919) and *Purgatory*.

II

In every respect, *Purgatory* is the most intensely minimized of his one-act plays. With a mere 223 lines and only two characters, the father and son, the play unfolds a great family saga of decline and fall. Stage properties are also curtailed to a bare tree whose leaves were once "thick as butter,/ Fat, greasy life" (682), but which is now shattered as a thunderbolt rived it. An Old Man tells his bastard son that he is from a grand family which once flourished but now is ruined in just the same way as the tree is. The house's decline was brought

about by a mismatched marriage between a mean groom and a landlady, the Old Man's own father and mother. Explaining to the indifferent son that souls in Purgatory must suffer the eternal recurrence of their sins, he awaits the ghosts of his parents. When the shadows appear and repeat the sexual intercourse on their bridal night, the Old Man stabs his son to death using "the same jack-knife" with which he killed his father so as not to pass the "pollution on" (688). Nevertheless, having murdered the Boy and congratulated himself on terminating the consequences, he hears the hoofbeats of his dead father riding to his bridal bed and realizes in despair that he cannot relieve his mother.

The play has occasionally been compared with Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* because of the characteristics they have in common: a simple stage set with a withered tree, two beggar tramps as protagonists, and the circulating structure of the story. Katherine Worth, for instance, pointed out the similarity of the tree in the two plays and connected them with Maeterlinck's "drama of the interior" (258-60). In recent studies too, the two playwrights are linked via these formal characteristics. Brenda Maddox's explanation of *Purgatory*'s set provides an example: "The setting is a bare stage with a stone and a tree, and the suggestion of a ruined house—the minimalism learned from the Japanese that Yeats handed on to Samuel Beckett. (Beckett, then thirty-two, living in Paris, had not yet begun to write plays.)" (360) Her argument is of course reliable, though, too much attention to formal similarities may lead critics miss another continuity between Yeats and Beckett. Eminent scholars including M. L. Rosenthal have appropriately pointed out that in *Purgatory* there is Yeats's eugenic fear of the degeneration of the Irish race which also appears in such poems as "Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen," "The Gyres," "A Bronze Head," and "Under Ben Bulben"—though they do not connect this fear with Beckett's curse on procreation. However, applying only these senses of form and the eugenic idea to *Purgatory* may straiten the meaning of the work. Elizabeth Butler Cullingford, for instance, finds in the play Yeats's lament for Maud Gonne's "disastrous eugenic choice in mating with the base blood of John MacBride" (282). It is curiously noteworthy that Martin Esslin's warning against too minute interpretations of *Endgame* holds good for Cullingford's reading of Yeats as well. After introducing an analysis which regards Hamm and Clov as the equivalents of James Joyce and Beckett himself, Esslin immediately rejects the idea: "Yet on closer reflection this theory surely becomes unten-

able . . . because, far from illuminating the full content of a play like *Endgame*, such an interpretation reduces it to a trivial level" (68). Though he deals with Yeats as a kind of ancient man of letters who could not appreciate Alfred Jarry's *Ubu roi* (359), what Esslin takes as the characteristics of the theatre of the absurd is true of *Purgatory*.[8] Thus, I will treat the play from the viewpoint of subjective idealism, a viewpoint which will show, in Esslin's phrase, the "far more universal nature" of the play (69).

As regards idealist interpretations of the work, as early as the 1960s Thomas R. Whitaker made several important statements involving the Romantic idea of remorse. According to Whitaker, the key to the release from the helplessly repetitive nightmare in the play is in the conscious refusal of "remorse" itself, which the characters fail to realize. In the Shelleyan vision, remorse is a form of self-contempt and therefore destroys the imagination. Casting out remorse itself serves to end the repetitive agony. The Old Man's murders are based on hatred of his blood and have the same roots as "the remorse of the dead." Consequently, there's no escape in *Purgatory*. He carries out this analysis in relation to Yeats's dance plays:

> The true perspective on the action of Yeats's other plays of "dreaming back" is not provided by the consciousness of . . . the soldier or Diarmuid and Dervorgilla. As in *Purgatory*, the release is implicit in the consciousness which can accept in contemplation the terrible vision of the play. (272)[9]

Here, he attempts to make a comparison between the treatment of remorse in *The Dreaming of the Bones* and in *Purgatory*. In *The Dreaming of the Bones*, a Young Man who joined the Easter Rising and ran away from Dublin comes across the shadows of the legendary couple Diamuid and Dervorgilla, who first "brought the Norman" into Ireland through their love and consequently led the country towards English possession (442). The shades tell the Young Man that they will be eternally earth-bound unless the living can forgive their sin, but he fails to relieve them as he is also bound by a narrow nationalism that is a mere inversion of the remorse of the couple. Indeed, this play and *Purgatory* have a striking similarity in their plots, but Whitaker overlooks the important difference between the two plays. The remarkable characteristic of *Purgatory* in comparison with other Noh-like plays by Yeats is that the agony of the dead is expressed not by the ghosts themselves but by the living. Diarmuid and Dervorgilla are

performed by actual persons and they call themselves "that most miserable, most accurst pair/ Who sold their country into slavery" (442). They express their remorse for themselves. Similarly, the intense moment of remorse is represented by *their* dance, which causes the Young Man to become violently disturbed. His interrogative screams ("Why do you dance?/ Why do you gaze, and with so passionate eyes,/ One on the other; and then turn away,/ Covering your eyes, and weave it in a dance?/ Who are you? what are you?") underline the non-verbal power of the shades (443).

On the contrary, in *Purgatory*, the ghosts are represented only as silhouettes projected onto a screen. A stage direction ("*A window is lit showing a young girl*") is all that the text suggests about the ghost of the Old Man's mother (685).[10] Being unable to speak or dance, the silhouettes are to do nothing but be there. Consequently, "the remorse of the dead" is spoken out only in the mouth of the living. Therefore, the key to the play is not the ghosts as objects but the Old Man's perception of them. The dubiousness of the Old Man's agency is made clear from his very calling to appease the remorse: "Release my mother's soul from its dream! / Mankind can do no more. Appease / The misery of the living and the remorse of the dead" (689). Indeed, he is incorrect in calling his mother's repeating of sexual intercourse "the remorse"; it is rather an act of pursued pleasure.[11] His words reveal the danger that he may speak erroneously. The existence of the ghosts depends on the Old Man's perception of them, and yet it is not entirely reliable. Besides, the Old Man often uses sentences in a subjunctive mood to revise uncertain facts. When he is reproached by the Boy for his keeping the money to himself, for instance, he makes the hastily decisive judgement that "had I given it . . ./ You would have spent it upon drink" (686). Likewise, his subjunctive excuse that "I killed that lad because had he grown up/ He would have struck a woman's fancy,/ Begot, and passed pollution on" can by no means justify the horrible fact of filicide (688). In short, we can say that the structure of *Purgatory* is fundamentally monological and highly arbitrary. In terms of subjective idealism, as the perceiving self itself is deformed, the world outside the mind, entirely remote from any foundations, becomes nothing more than a vast uncertainty. Thus, as Worth sees it, "we should receive an oppressive sense of the outer world being invaded and distorted by an inner drama" from *Purgatory* (183).

This can be gathered also from the fact that the conversation between the Old Man and the Boy is quantitatively quite out of pro-

portion. The Boy speaks a little less than twenty per cent of all the lines: the rest are all the Old Man's. Moreover, the Boy's small part does not seem entirely meaningful. The Boy obviously begrudges having this talk with his father and his response to the father consists almost only of jeering at his narration. Thus, their talk does not produce much dialogic meaning:

> *Boy*. I have had enough!
> Talk to the jackdaws, if talk you must.
> *Old Man*. Stop! Sit there upon that stone.
> That is the house where I was born.
> *Boy*. The big old house that was burnt down?
> *Old Man*. My mother that was your grand-dam owned it,
> This scenery and this countryside,
> kennel and stable, horse and hound— (682)

What is immediately apparent from this extract is that the Old Man is as indifferent to his son as the son is to his father. When the Boy laughs at him, the Old Man tries to keep him silent. Even when the Boy gives a straight reaction to the father's story, the Old Man imperviously takes no notice of his confirming question. The Boy is on the stage as if he were only needed, despite his important role in being killed, in order to *listen* to the Old Man's self-righteous story. The pattern is similar to that of Beckett's plays in which silent listeners are the last resort of the speaker suffering from a sense of nothingness, as Willie is for Winnie in *Happy Days*. The relationship between the Mouth and the Auditor in *Not I* is a perfect example of this.

The arbitrariness of the Old Man's speech becomes salient in the poor diction he uses. As regards the style of this verse drama, some critics, including Bloom, have pointed out Yeats's intentionally awkward and unpleasant verse (427). This reaches its culmination with the play's catastrophic event. The Old Man stabs his son to death with a repetitive murmur:

> That finishes—there—there—there—
> [*He stabs again and again. The window grows dark.*
> 'Hush-a-bye baby, thy father's a knight,
> Thy mother's a lady, lovely and bright.'
> No, that is something that I read in a book,
> And if I sing it must be to my mother,
> And I lack rhyme. (688)

At the most intense moment of the play's action, the Old Man's song goes entirely wrong: though he tries to chant a requiem for his mother,

he confusedly sings a lullaby for children; the song is not an original of his but borrowed; besides, as he himself admits, his lines "lack rhyme" and their rhythm is awkward. The Old Man's failure to shape his speech reduces the authenticity of his words all the more for the fact that he is almost the only speaker in *Purgatory*, a verse drama. His habit of explaining the connotations of things adds a similar effect to his speech. He attempts forcefully to convince the Boy that the bare tree is a symbol of the fallen family. However, expressed by such officiously interpretative phrases as "Study that house," "study that tree," and "that's symbolical," the symbolism of the tree is paradoxically weakened and loses its significance. Indeed, having killed his son, the Old Man applies the purgation of the mother's soul to the tree in the sentence "It stands like a purified soul" (688). Nevertheless, immediately after his self-complete interpretation, he hears his father's ghost riding on horseback. Consequently, the tree becomes a floating signifier that is isolated from its signified—itself a conspicuous characteristic of post-modern literature. The tree in *Waiting for Godot*, for instance, has a similar role in that its apparently being suggestive of growth between the two acts comes in the end to nothing.

Observations in the last few paragraphs have implied some distinctive features of *Purgatory*: the impossibility of communicative dialogue, the devastating arbitrariness and terribly imperfect mastery of monologue, and a thoroughly pessimistic view of human life. These features are equally Beckettian, and they remind us of his drama in and after *Waiting for Godot*, given the many critical remarks which claim a formal similarity between *Purgatory* and that play. However, in my opinion, *Purgatory* is more highly akin to *Endgame* in that both plays have a fear of the continuity of bad blood, offer arbitrary stories of a protagonist, and inherit a Berkeleyian idea of human perception.

III

In *Endgame* (1958), there is only a bare room with two windows and the world outside seems extinct. The persons in the play are assumed to be the only survivors who live by waiting or not waiting for something. Noteworthily they are closely interdependent so that we hardly sense the multiplicity of human beings but an obsessive and obsessed soul, in spite of there being four people. The names of Clov, Hamm, Nagg, and Nell are all identical to each other in that they all originate in the word "nail" and these names in *Endgame* implicitly

suggest the dense family sequence evident in *Purgatory*, which exposes on the stage a suffocatingly enclosed inner world isolated from anything beyond it.[12]

Hamm's swearwords to his own father, Nagg, "Accursed progenitor!" and "Accursed fornicator!," fiercely denies even legitimate love-making with a wife (96). His denial is based on the fact that the act sent him forth into this world. The idea is reminiscent of the Old Man's oedipal cry to the shadow of the mother, "Do not let him touch you! It is not true/ That drunken men cannot beget,/ And if he touch he must beget/ And you must bear his murderer" (686). Both plays epitomize the curse on human life via the curse in a single family's blood and both families fail to achieve any real communication. Clov hates Hamm and repeatedly expresses his desire to leave him:

> CLOV: I'll leave you.
> HAMM: No!
> CLOV: What is there to keep me here?
> HAMM: The dialogue. [*Pause*.] I've got on with my story. [*Pause*.] I've got on with it well. [*Pause*. *Irritably*.] Ask me where I've got to. (120-21)

To keep Clov back, Hamm can give no excuse but that there are two persons needed to make the dialogic form. Even the dialogue does not work well. Hamm's story proceeds not by the natural development of a conversation but by his own impatient reminder to ask him to tell his story. Hamm and Clov are alienated from each other as are the Old Man and the Boy in *Purgatory*. Moreover, in the same way as the Old Man, Hamm is a poor narrator: though he imagines himself as a story-teller and tries to go on with his story (a sort of his autobiography), it does not work. In such a helpless situation the ideas emerging from the active process of perceiving are inversely connected with a negative sense. Hamm is afraid of the possibility that they might "mean something":

> HAMM: We're not beginning to . . . to . . . mean something?
> CLOV: Mean something! You and I, mean something! [*Brief laugh*.] Ah that's a good one!
> HAMM: I wonder. [*Pause*.] Imagine if a rational being came back to earth, wouldn't he be liable to get ideas into his head if observed us long enough. [*Voice of rational being.*] Ah, good, now I see what it is, yes, now I understand what they're at! (108)

Beckett's idea of perception is undoubtedly based on that of Berkeley

though here the ultimate eye of God is revised into the grotesque eye of "a rational being" from outer space evocative of science fiction. Thus, the Beckettian perception becomes absurd, being released from the panopticon of God. However, what is important is that both Yeats and Beckett owe their ideas to Berkeley, and consequently, they are of the same Irish line. In both, what makes their plays helplessly moving has relation to a digression from the due course of human perception that should give our ideas appropriate causes. We can see the shadow of Berkeley cast across a wide range of Beckett's work: one of his early novels, *Murphy*, refers to Berkeley; his exchanges on art, "Three Dialogues," are probably a reflection of Berkeley's *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*; furthermore, for the epigraph to his movie, *Film*, Beckett uses Berkeley's proposition "*Esse est percipi*." Despite his own excuse for the epigraph, "No truth value attaches to above, regarded as of merely structural and dramatic convenience" (323), Beckett's interest in Berkeley is in fact not less than that of Yeats. Thus Beckett ingeniously named his little play for television, . . . *but the clouds* . . ., after a phrase from Yeats's near-solipsist poem, "The Tower," which I mentioned above, for in the play only the male voice tries to create the pseudo-identity of a woman whose appearance in pictures on television is so uncertainly closed up as to be "reduced as far as possible to eyes and mouth" (417).

Both in *Endgame* and *Purgatory*, the two protagonists alike tell their own stories in the third person. In *Purgatory*, the Old Man narrates various biographies of the dead, though they are at the same time his autobiography. To put it plainly, he tries to revise a story of his own under the guise of one about others only to fail. Such speech as his anticipates the Mouth of *Not I*, which desperately denies the first person in her fragmentary reminiscences: ". . . what? . . . who? . . . no! . . . she! . . . SHE! . ." (382). Certainly, reminding an audience of the decline of the Irish Ascendancy, *Purgatory* is within an Irish context, but it has much in common with the Beckettian world where any social specifications are stripped away and a vast indeterminacy stretches off.[13]

Yeats's dramatic career represents a complex network of involvement with and evolution in the theatre movements of the twentieth century, as well as with his own literary explorations. Thus, when Richard Ellmann discusses the literary background to Beckett's art, he never fails to mention Yeats's later drama: "An ardent attender of plays at the Abbey Theatre in Dublin, Beckett admired the late plays

of Yeats. He liked especially the one about Swift in *The Words upon the Window-Pane*, in which the voice of Swift utters the devastating final line, 'Perish the day on which I was born'" (112). Ellmann's evidence that Beckett liked Yeats's later plays will help endorse their Beckettian interpretation.

T. S. Eliot's enthusiastic praise for Yeats as a playwright is far from groundless . After commenting on Yeats's struggle as an Irish poet to master his own poetic language despite so much influence from English and the historical legacy of the English Romantic Movement, Eliot refers to his toil with drama as an entirely different kind of struggle:

> With the verse play, on the other hand, the situation is reversed, because Yeats had nothing, and we have had Yeats. . . . I do not know where our debt to him as a dramatist ends—and in time, it will not end until that drama itself ends. (256-57)

When we examine Yeats's absurdist aspects, we tend to connect them retrospectively with Beckett's thanks to the work of his great successor. Nevertheless, as Eliot asserts, "Yeats had nothing," and we should not ignore the simple fact that Beckett had not begun to write plays when Yeats died in 1939. Justice should be done to Yeats's achievement as a playwright. Just as Berkeley dissented from Locke's doctrine when it was in the ascendancy, so Yeats confronted the naturalistic drama of his day with Irish verse drama. When we recall the recently reformulated concept of a minor literature—the literature written by ethnic minorities in major languages—Yeats's influence upon Beckett may appear greater within this dissentient tradition.[14] Both of them experienced a peculiar problem of bilingualism in Irish writers. For all the enthusiasm of language revival movements such as the Gaelic League founded in 1893, the first language of modern Irish writers has been for the most part English—the enemy's language, as it were—and they have not often been native to their *native* language. Perhaps, for them, the issue of writing in the ruling language involved just such a separation of ideas and their causes. Though their plays were radical and news, they have common roots in Berkeley's idealism, and have a share in the Irish dissentient tradition. In this respect, as a playwright who first adopted the Berkeleian viewpoint in his work, a viewpoint later developed by Beckett, Yeats, in a sense, created modern absurdist drama where unhinged ideas will float forever on their tenaciously insistent causes.

Notes

[1] Interestingly, however, Yeats never regarded himself as a poet alone. Declaring that "I believe myself to be a dramatist," he was concerned that his plays be performed on the stage throughout his life (*Variorum Plays* 417). Moreover, in his Nobel Prize speech at the Royal Academy of Sweden, he infers that "the English committees would never have sent you my name if I had written no plays, no dramatic criticism, if my lyric poetry had not quality of speech practised upon the stage. . ." (*Autobiographies* 559).

[2] Among such critics as Eric Bentley, Sylvia C. Ellis and Nancy Ann Watanabe, Richard Taylor is typical. In his *The Drama of W. B. Yeats: Irish Myth and the Japanese No*, he concludes that Yeats's turning-point as a playwright is "the discovery of the Japanese No, which . . . made possible the full expression of his perennial themes. . ." (200).

[3] To take a notable example, Peter Ure juxtaposes *The Dreaming of the Bones* with *Purgatory* in that "the adherence [to the cyclical system of reincarnation] is fairly close" in them (97).

[4] Furthermore, when it comes to staging drama, he also remained silent during the 1920s. Every reliable record shows that it was not until 21 November 1931, that *The Cat and the Moon* was first performed, despite the fact the poet gives the date as 9 May 1926. The Abbey Theatre had to wait almost exactly six years from the performance of *The Player Queen* on 9 December 1919 to that of a new play, *Sophocles' King Oedipus*—performed on 6 December 1926—not an original work but an adaptation of the Greek tragedy.

[5] In the field of modern Irish theatre studies, Katharine Worth's research has been highly significant in that it first appropriately valued Yeats's plays and brought "Yeats, Synge and Beckett, Wilde and O'Casey under the same light" (1). Her point is to rearrange a series of Irish playwrights in the dynamics of world theatre from the Symbolist movement to the theatre of the absurd. However, her use of the Belgian playwright, Maeterlinck, as the glue to stick together a range of Irish dramatists sometimes seems far-fetched.

[6] Subsequent references to Yeats's poems are cited to this edition.

[7] All further references to Yeats's dramatic works are to this edition.

[8] It is true that Yeats was horrified with the performance of *Ubu roi*, in which a King "carries for a sceptre a brush of the kind that we use to clean a closet," and was in a sad mood over the coming of "the Savage God" (*Autobiographies* 348-49). But this event took place in 1896 and, as Richard Allen Cave correctly points out, Yeats's later plays such as *The Herne's Egg* (1938) are under the influence of Jarry. Terence Brown also espouses Cave, "to whose interpretation I am indebted" (357).

[9] "Dreaming back" is in quotation marks because it is a Yeatsian term used in *A Vision* to explain a soul in the period between birth and death. According to Yeats, the spirit should shift from "*Passionate Body*" to "*Celestial Body*," but "If the *Passionate Body* does not disappear, the *Spirit* finds the *Celestial Body*, only after long and perhaps painful dreams of the past" (223-24). He calls this state "*Dreaming Back*."

[10] Cave criticizes the fact that recent performances have followed the experimental stage effect without any projection of the shadows--a neglect of "the com-

plexity of Yeats's theme about perception" (378). It seems that his attack hits the mark because the direction would lead an audience to so facile an interpretation as that the ghosts are mere products of the mad old man's fancy.

[11] Harold Bloom also takes notice of the slip in the Old Man's prayer. However, he regards the playwright in the same light as the Old Man to such an extent that he calls *Purgatory*'s quality "a rhetorical survival, based on our deception," to justify his evil act. Consequently, Bloom declares: "perhaps we ought to resent a work that has so palpable a design upon us" (428-29).

[12] Clov, Hamm, Nag, and Nell are derived from the French, Latin, German, and English respectively. Hamm is also interpreted as a hammer that beats and oppresses the rest of the three by many critics.

[13] The reverse is also true of Beckett. In *Not I*, for instance, the Mouth twice refers to "Croker's Acres"—an existing open field near Beckett's home in Ireland. In all the devastating ambiguity of her speech, the definiteness of the proper name has an overwhelming power.

[14] According to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Beckett, (an Irishman who wrote in English and French) is typical of the writers who fall within this category. The two scholars focus on the political power of minor literature which subverts major languages from within. Theodor W. Adorno also interprets Beckett politically. He discusses how *Endgame*, with its anarchic world, represents a counterblow against modern rationalistic totalitarianism.

Works Cited

Adorno, Theodor W. "Trying to Understand *Endgame*." Trans. Michael T. Jones. *Samuel Beckett*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Modern Critical Views. New York: Chelsea House, 1985. 51-82.

Beckett, Samuel. *The Complete Dramatic Works.* London: Faber and Faber, 1986.

Bentley, Eric. "Yeats as a Playwright." *W. B. Yeats: Critical Assessments*. Ed. David Pierce. Vol. 2. Mountfield: Helm Information, 2000. 363-71.

Berkeley, George. *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous.* 1713. Ed. Jonathan Dancy. Oxford Philosophical Texts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

——. *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge.* 1710. Ed. Jonathan Dancy. Oxford Philosophical Texts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Bloom, Harold. *Yeats*. 1970. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.

Brown, Terence. *The Life of W. B. Yeats: A Critical Biography*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1999.

Cave, Richard Allen. Introduction and notes. *Selected Plays of W. B. Yeats*. Ed. Cave. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997.

Cullingford, Elizabeth Butler. *Gender and History in Yeats's Love Poetry.* 1993. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1996.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. Dana Polan. Theory and History of Literature 30. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986.

Elliot, T. S. *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot.* Ed. Frank Kermode. San Diego: Harcourt, 1975.

Ellis, Sylvia C. *The Plays of W. B. Yeats: Yeats and the Dancer*. New York: St. Martin's, 1995.
Ellmann, Richard. *Four Dubliners: Wilde, Yeats, Joyce and Beckett.* 1982. New York: Braziller, 1988.
Esslin, Martin. *The Theatre of the Absurd.* 1961. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.
Jarry, Alfred. *Ubu the King*. Trans. Maya Slater. *Three Pre-Surrealist Plays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. 49-149.
Kermode, Frank. *Romantic Image.* 1957. London: Routledge, 1961.
Maddox, Brenda. *Yeats's Ghosts: The Secret Life of W. B. Yeats.* New York: Harper, 1999.
Rosenthal, M. L. *Running to Paradise: Yeats's Poetic Art*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.
Ure, Peter. *Towards a Mythology: Studies in the Poetry of W. B. Yeats.* 1946. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1986.
Watanabe, Nancy Ann. *Beloved Image: The Drama of W. B. Yeats 1865-1939*. Lanham: UP of America, 1995.
Whitaker, Thomas R. *Swan and Shadow: Yeats's Dialogue with History*. 1964. Critical Studies in Irish Lit. 1. Washington, D. C.: CUA, 1989.
Worth, Katharine. *The Irish Drama of Europe from Yeats to Beckett.* 1978. London: Athlone, 1986.
Yeats, William Butler. *Autobiographies*. 1955. London: Macmillan, 1961.
——. *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. 1983. London: Macmillan, 1993.
——. *The Collected Plays of W. B. Yeats.* 1934. London: Macmillan, 1982.
——. *Essays and Introductions*. London: Macmillan, 1961.
——. *Explorations.* London: Macmillan, 1962.
——. *The Letters of W. B. Yeats*. Ed. Allan Wade. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954.
——. *Uncollected Prose*. Ed. John P. Frayne. vol. 1. London: Macmillan, 1971.
——. *A Vision.* 1937. London: Macmillan, 1981.

SHIRON No.41 (2003)

Excess of Vision: Modernity and the Body in Pynchon's *V.*

Shizuka Hayasaka

In the epilogue of *V.* the narrator says: ". . . sometime between 1859 and 1919, the world contracted a disease which no one ever took trouble to diagnose because the symptoms were too subtle"[1]. This novel, as may be supposed from the quotation, grapples with and depicts the disease of modernity and its effect on political, social, and cultural aspects of the modern Western world. In this essay, the representation of the essence of modernity in the novel is to be studied, focusing on the corporeal constituents of its characters. The dominant New Critical and post-structuralist studies of human bodies in Pynchon's works have inscribed them as "perpetually empty space marking the play of signification within the text" (Kemeny 259).[2] However, the materiality of the body is accepted and considered as important in my discussion.

First, a summary of the generally accepted account of modern Western bodies will be introduced, as the basis for an exploration of Pynchon's descriptions of human bodies in their socio-cultural context. Then the predominance of visual sensation is examined, involving the motif of physical and psychological mechanization — voyeurism, tourism, the image-directed body option of a young Jewish girl, and the use of the traditional poetic device, the blazon. It is expected ultimately to elucidate the crucial link between the precedence of eyesight and modern violence depicted in the novel.

Pynchon's first novel *V.*, published in 1963, consists of two main narratives which alternate with each other and are intertwined with several common motifs. The historical chapters move from 1898 to 1943, narrated and edited by an Englishman, Herbert Stencil. He is

obsessed with a woman mentioned in his father's diary only as V. who may be his biological mother. He tries to reconstruct his father's life in order to find more out about this V. The other series of chapters centers on an American character, Benny Profane, an aimless wanderer, and takes place mainly in New York, from 1955 to 1956. The historical or diachronic and contemporary or synchronic chapters are arranged alternately, so that the whole novel skips around in time, and is not chronological in shape.

Before entering on the analysis of the novel, a brief outline of the plot will perhaps be in order. As to the historical episodes, five chapters draw out the story from various sources and documents concerning V. and Stencil's father. They are connected with events of international violence or warfare. This part begins with the Fashoda incident, moving to riots in Florence connected with a plotted Venezuelan rebellion, other international cabals, spying, then to a native revolt in German South-West Africa in 1922 which leads to the German colonizers' long and decadent siege party, and finally to the bombing of Malta during the Second World War. The last two chapters of the historical narrative disturb the chronological order. The last but one chapter is set in Paris in 1913 when the First World War is imminent, and the Epilogue is set in Malta at the time of the disturbances of 7 June 1919. In these apparently random historical episodes, V. has five verifiable incarnations. She is the young and beautiful Victoria Wren in Cairo and Florence, who experiences the excitement involved in international spying and plots by means of her sex appeal; she is the 33-years-old known only as V., who causes a riot and has a surreal lesbian love affair with a young ballet dancer and, in addition, one of whose eyes has become an artificial, clock-eye; then she is Vera Meroving at the German colonizers' siege party in 1922, also with the artificial eye; then in 1943 the Bad Priest, a disguise assumed to be the half-mechanized lady V. with artificial hair, eye, legs and a star-sapphire navel; finally Veronica Manganese, who seems to have something to do with the Malta disturbances of June in 1919. As is made explicit above, the process by which V. becomes more and more involved with cruelty and violence goes hand in hand with the increasing incorporation of artificial objects into her body.

In the contemporary American episode, the central character Benny Profane wanders aimlessly from place to place, frequently changing his job, often involved in barroom brawls with sailors or young Puerto Ricans. He fears and avoids intimate relationships with women,

although women seem to like him supposedly because of his slow, passive, but gentle character. He is obsessed with a destructive nightmare in which he is gradually dismantled as if he were an automaton: ". . . here that it would turn into a nightmare. Because now, if he kept going down that street, not only his ass but also his arms, legs, sponge brain and clock of a heart must be left behind to litter the pavement, be scattered among manhole covers" (35). With all these characteristics, Profane finally gets acquainted and associates with a group of decadent New York artists known as the Whole Sick Crew. He meets Herbert Stencil there, and happens to travel with him and a Maltese girl named Paola Maijstral to Malta at the end of the novel where Paola's father Fausto witnessed V.'s death in 1943. However, Stencil leaves Profane alone in Malta, setting off for Stockholm, to investigate another clue, in fact a piece of rather uncertain information, about the mystery of V. Finally, Profane runs through the darkness of the night "toward the edge of Malta, and the Mediterranean beyond" (491) with Brenda, an American university student, who seems to embody modern materialism.

1. The Historical Context

During the 1950s, the mainstream of the United States enjoyed postwar prosperity—increases in wages, employment, population growth (a one-third rise over the 1930s), and the industrial boom, which continued through the Korean War and the Cold War into the early years of the Vietnam War. However, despite this apparent prosperity, American life was full of discords: unequal distribution of wealth, devastated urban areas, ravages to the natural environment, and the discriminations of race and sex. Besides, because of the globalization of the Cold War, begun straight after World War II, science and technology were being promoted and granted importance by governments for the purpose of national defense. In this postwar atomic age, technology and science were increasingly felt not only as serviceable but also potentially life-threatening, as they were associated with memories of the holocausts from Auschwitz to Hiroshima. As Vincent B. Leitch points out: "Despite the apparent mobility, comfort, and wealth of American life, many intellectuals saw in contemporary mass society as well as postwar technological science much decadence and danger, much alienation and absurdity, much repression and sickness" (149). He further surveys a significant feature of numerous influential

sociological studies in the 1950s:

> What emerged from such analyses, among other things, was an urgent historical narrative about the dispossession of rugged individualists in favor of outerdirected conformists who were manipulated by government bureaucracies and corporations and stripped of political and psychological potency. Mass man was puny, weak, dependent, repressed, controlled, and absurd. The subduers of man were corporate capitalism, big government, mass advertisement, rampant technology, rigid social conventions, coopted science, and total administration—all of which tamed forms of opposition and fostered docile conformity. (150)

The American novelists sympathized with this tendency in sociological studies. Frederick Karl gives an account of American fiction in the 1950s:

> While the country went one way—toward prosperity, cold war obsessions, national security and world power, industrial growth, egalitarian participation, school integration—fiction seemed to go another: toward rejection, withdrawal, aggressive hostility to systems, imitation as a mode of life, disintegration of acceptable behavior. Implicit in the literature of the 1950s is a foreshadowing of nearly every aspect of social and political behavior of the 1960s; in literary terms, the two decades are seamless . . . (176)

American fiction in the 1950s tends to attack modernity, technology, or everything having to do with systems. Pynchon, too, criticizes modernity in his novel, *V.*, placing its eponymous heroine, a gradually mechanizing woman, as the key figure in the plots — which concern various international modern riots and violence.

2. Modern Western Bodies

Having looked at the historical context of the novel, and noted its crucial concern with the nature of modernity, its corporeal constituents are to be studied since they have been neglected or denied in earlier criticism. Close attention should be paid to the emphasis and the predominance of the visual sensation of characters in the description of human bodies.

The modern Western body is evidently the basis of the characters' communication in the novel. Phillip Mellor and Chris Shilling explain that "there has long been consensus on the dynamic nature of modern forms of embodiment, specifically with regard to the classical modern project's dependence on the 'disciplined individual' able to

make rational decisions on the basis of 'autonomous self-interest' (Smith, 1950 [1776]), and to the prioritization of cognitive thought expressed through the pervasiveness of plans, projects and designs (Bauman, 1995)" (41). The influential idea in this consensus is René Descartes' conceptualization of the mind/body dichotomy: "His [Descartes'] *Cogito ergo sum*, ('I think, therefore I am') was linked at one level to a complete devaluation of all the body's senses" (Mellor and Shilling 6).

Here, in order to explicate further what constitutes the modern Western body, a general theory advanced about the important connections between Western modernity and Protestantism will be introduced. V. J. Siedler argues that modernity is "a secular form of Protestantism" which tells people to distrust nature, that is, their emotions, feelings and desires, and, to listen instead to "the clear voice of reason" (25-26). Modernity, especially modern instrumental reason, has been achieved by controlling the workings of one's own emotions conceptually and producing a mechanical nature out of the empirical one, thus also repressing desire and irrationalism. Ann Swidler asserts that "the essence of [Max] Weber's concept of rationality resides in the methodical control over the individual's life, then the high degree of affinity between Weber's concept of personality and the archetype of the ascetic Puritan becomes apparent.Å@One can then understand why Weber—going against the spirit of his age—established a connection between religion and rationality" (39). Furthermore, Friedrich Nietzsche notes: "Both of them, science and the ascetic ideal, are still on the same foundation . . ." (120). It seems reasonable to suppose that the essence of Protestantism is common to that of modernity, in their attitudes towards desire and irrationalism.

Bearing this account of the close connection between modernity and Protestantism in mind, I would like to introduce Mellor and Shilling's detailed study of modern Protestant bodies. They explain that Protestantism has made linguistic symbols and narratives (which could be thought with, spoken and read) a central source of people's self-identity, by seeking to dislocate people from their natural, supernatural and social environments. Therefore, "the Protestant flesh was something which had to be made subordinate to these (religiously justifiable) narratives; the body had, in other words, to be controlled by the mind" (42). This meant that "Protestants gave priority to their 'distant contact' senses. These enabled individuals, distanced from their surroundings, to visually and aurally monitor, judge and antici-

pate natural and social phenomena before making close contact with them (Falk, 1994)" (Mellor and Shilling 44).

To put the whole issue briefly, modern Western people tend to regard the flesh as inferior to and separate from the mind, and prioritize such 'distant contact' senses such as the sense of seeing and hearing. This attitude entails the danger of considering others as mere flesh, that is, mere objects, and is crucially connected with the mechanistic view of the world we have seen above. Besides, it encourages people to keep their distance from others and rigidifies their individuality and, furthermore, it may lead to unsympathetic and inhuman acts inflicted upon others.

In view of this account of the modern body, it is appropriate to review and summarize the predominance of eyesight in the modern age. It is pointed out that modern Protestant bodies tend to prioritize the visual and auditory senses. Additionally, Mellor and Shilling note that "the emphasis on mind and sight has been an extremely influential aspect of the conceptualization of the links between culture and bodily forms in the West", particularly exemplified by Descartes' mentality, "I'll believe it when I see it" (7). They go on: "In a similar vein, John Locke devalued the senses other than sight and his *Essay on Human Understanding* expressed an emphasis on the visual basis of mental understanding (Classen, 1993: 27; see also Jenks, 1995: 3; Rorty, 1980)" (7). The sight is generally regarded as one of the most "distancing senses". It maintains a distance between the seer and the seen, the subject and the object. As Michel Foucault defines it, sight is the basis of the modern power system, that is, the modern disciplinary society founded on surveillance, the visual sense which distinctly separates the ruler and the ruled.

An analysis of a passage in one of Ralph Waldo Emerson's essays will provide another example of the modern consciousness of eyesight and the dichotomy between mind and body.

> When the eye of Reason opens, to outline and surface are at once added grace and expression. These proceed from imagination and affection, and abate somewhat of the angular distinctness of objects. If the Reason be stimulated to more earnest vision, outlines and surfaces become transparent, and are no longer seen; causes and spirits are seen through them. (Emerson, 25)

This quotation reveals a characteristic romantic attitude which gives priority to the spirit over the material. Eyes are here used as a

metaphor for reason. What is apparent is the connection between mind and eye. The object for the working of reason will be appreciated in its spiritual essences beyond the physical world of appearances. Here, the metaphoric eye erases materiality. Even the romantics, who criticized the modern idea which regards rationality as important, have accepted the modern dualism of mind and body.

All these examples suggest that the precedence of eyesight has a tendency towards a distancing of the subject from the object, a decreasing of people's close and humane contact with each other, leading finally to an unsympathetic attitude to others' bodily, and physical sensation.[3] Indeed, Pynchon associates various kinds of modern personal or collective violence with the attenuated and neglected sense of the body and decreased compassion for others caused by the romantic and modern priority of eyesight, mind, and the spiritual. He indicates the potentially violent nature of the romantic and modern body in his novel, *V.*

My discussion of the novel will be focused firstly on some characters' voyeuristic attitudes that often reveal their moral non-involvement. Secondly, the motif of tourism will be examined: its commitment to surface, to the visual of the world. The third observation considers the image-directedness and the objectified state of a young girl called Esther who undergoes cosmetic surgery. Finally, the essence of the literal and the parodies of the poetic "blazon" which recur in the novel will be discussed.

3. Voyeurism

Tonny Tanner points out that "various forms of voyeurism are part of the normal behaviour patterns of a world where any attempt at human inter-subjectivity has been replaced by the disposition to regard people as objects—inside the field of vision but outside the range of sympathy, if indeed any such range exists" (*Pynchon: A Collection of Critical Essays*. 25). As it is explained in this passage, several voyeurs, often involved in some kind of violence are depicted in the novel. In chapter 9, "Mondaugen's Story", one of the historical episodes, Herbert Stencil tells his friend Dudley Eigenvalue a story he heard from Kurt Mondaugen long after the event. Mondaugen, one of the 'voyeurs' in the novel, has been posted to South-West Africa in 1922 to conduct observations of radio signals known as sferics.[4] He

has been alarmed by undertones of an uprising of the native Bondels (Bondelswarts or Bondelswartz) tribe of the region and is told by a local administrator that he would be safer if he took refuge in the villa of a German colonist called Foppl, a veteran of von Trotha's genocidal army. So Mondaugen stays at Foppl's farm, where the people from various colonial nations gather, holding a Siege Party for two and a half months. Presently he enters into a hallucinatory state, the product of scurvy-induced dreams which occur intermittently. In these dreams, the decadent, sado-masochistic behavior of the people who stay at Foppl's house becomes mixed with reports of the campaign of 1904, when the German army slaughtered sixty thousand Hereros, and of the soldiers' daily life in those days. In the narrative of Mondaugen's feverish dreams about the atrocities committed by German soldiers on native people, the problem of narrative authority and point of view is complicated. Here, I shall examine an episode in Mondaugen's dream which depicts one of the soldiers' most dreadful inhuman acts:

> Together the troopers [German soldiers] sjamboked the Hottentot [one of the native tribes] on the buttocks and thighs, forcing him into a queer little dance. It took a certain talent to make a prisoner dance that way without slowing down the rest of the trek because of the way they were all chained together. (279)

What is clear in this passage is that the soldiers relish visually the natives suffering the pain as "a queer little dance". Their inhuman, unsympathetic attitude is clear in this phrase. However, the dreams seem to result from the stories which Mondaugen has obtained by questioning spontaneously the German colonial soldiers. As he thinks that "he had a gift of visual serendipity: a sense of timing, a perverse certainty about not whether but when to play the voyeur" (260), he more or less takes pride in and enjoys his voyeuristic attitude, to peek into the decadent sexual behavior Foppl's guests. Not until he catches sight of the extreme union of cruel colonial violence and the perverse, sadistic sexual behavior acted out by Vera Meroving, does he decide to leave Foppl's place:

> Hanging over the rows, each wrist attached to a different stringing-wire, feet gangling over young hops already sick with downy mildew, was another Bondel, perhaps Foppl's last. Below, dancing about the body and flicking its buttocks with a sjambok, was old Godolphin. Vera Meroving stood by his side and they appeared to have exchanged clothing. Godolphin, keeping time

> with the sjambok, launched quaveringly into a reprise of Down by the Summertime Sea. (278)

Having looked at this brutal spectacle, "Mondaugen *this time* withdrew, preferring *at last* neither to watch nor to listen" (296). Here, the narrator Stencil suggests and casually denounces Mondaugen's decadence itself. Nevertheless, ironically enough, Stencil may also be responsible — as he, too, may have to some extent enjoyed or been excited by Mondaugen's story. Pynchon clearly calls into question the ethical aspect of the relation between a voyeuristic attitude and rampant violence, the moral non-involvement of the voyeur.

According to Catharine R. Stimpson, there is also an episode in chapter 7 that depicts V. as a voyeur. In Florence, when the Venezuelans begin to riot, she watches, safe inside the building.

> She saw a rioter. . . being bayoneted again and again. . . . She stood. . .still. . . ;*her face betrayed no emotion*. It was as if she saw herself embodying a feminine principle, acting as complement to all this bursting, explosive male energy. *Inviolate and calm, she watched the spasms of wounded bodies, the fair of violent death, framed and staged*, it seemed, for her alone in that tiny square. *From her hair the heads of five crucified also looked on, no more expressive than she* (emphasis mine). (220)

Victoria is totally detached: she shows no sympathy or response, "inviolate and calm" and "no more expressive" than "the heads of five crucified" which are carved on her ivory comb—although she catches sight of the rioter being brutally attacked, "being bayoneted again and again". Despite responding to this spectacle of physical violence, she attaches an abstract argument to the scene: "herself embodying a feminine principle". She is morally distanced from the riot, totally uninvolved.

These voyeurs scarcely feel any sympathy with the victims of violence, because of the distancing nature of sight. The precedence of sight make them lose effervescent, bodily, tactical sensation, allowing them to remain calm and indifferent to others' sufferings and pains.

4. Tourism, a Dancer, and Commodification of the Visual

Having seen the cold, cruel, and indifferent attitude of voyeurism associated with colonial or political violence, we now go on to consider the descriptions of tourism, another aspect of voyeurism in the novel. Chambers points out that "for Pynchon tourism is a derogatory

term to describe voyeurs, those spectators of life who travel thousands of miles to another country only to set about creating 'a most perfectly arranged tourist-state' (*V.*, 71).[5] Tourists remain insulated against the beauty and diversity of the culture they pretend to visit" (63). In the third chapter, the native Egyptian Aieul, a café waiter whom Stencil impersonates, explains the concept of tourism as a kind of mentality which seeks to appropriate the superficial, 'the visual', characteristics of the landscapes through which they pass, and miss the intrinsic values: "Let them [tourists] be deceived into thinking the city something more than what their Baedekers said it was: a Pharos long gone to earthquake and the sea; picturesque but faceless Arabs; monuments, tombs, modern hotels. A false and bastard city; inert—for 'them'—as Aieul himself" (60). Another person whom Stencil impersonates, a denizen in the Baedeker land, Maxwell Rowley-Bugge considers himself "as much of a feature of the topography as the other automata: waiters, porters, cabmen, clerks. Taken for granted" (66). Automata are nothing more than "things" or objects. To regard others as automata is to value others only in terms of their mechanical functions or appearances. Pynchon represents tourisms' superficiality and its materialistic and mechanical view of the world in regarding the native people and landscape as without any intrinsic value.

Let us look at the clear-cut explanation of the nature of tourism in the novel. In the penultimate chapter, "V. in love", V. is described as having "found love at last in her peregrinations through (let us be honest) a world if not created then at least described to its fullest by Karl Baedeker of Leipzig". Baedeker (1801-59) is the publisher of detailed guidebooks for tourists. The passage continues:

> This is a curious country, populated only by a breed called 'tourists'. Its landscape is one of inanimate monuments and buildings; near-inanimate barmen, taxi-drivers, bellhops, guides: there to do any bidding, to various degrees of efficiency, on receipt of the recommended banksheesh, pourboire, mancia, tip. More than this it is two-dimensional as is the Street, as are the pages and maps of those little red handbooks. As long as the Cook's, Traveller's Clubs and banks are open, the Distribution of Time section followed scrupulously, the plumbing at the hotel in order. . . the tourist may wander anywhere in this coordinate system without fear.Å@War never becomes more serious than a scuffle with a pickpocket, . . depression and prosperity are reflected only in the rate of exchange; politics are of course never discussed with the native population. Tourism thus is supranational, like the Catholic Church, and perhaps the most absolute

> communion we know on earth: . . . they [tourists] share the same landscapes, suffer the same inconveniences; live by the same pellucid time-scale.
>
> (441)

Here, tourism is defined as a substitute for humanity in the modern Western world. Tanner describes how in the passage "the religious parallels only serve to enforce the fact that the 'tourist country' lacks any religious or spiritual dimension (what Henry James called 'the forth dimension') not to mention an emotional, human third dimension" (*Thomas Pynchon*, 51). Tourism's superficiality is expressed: "Its landscape is one of inanimate monuments and buildings" and "it is two-dimensional". In addition, the mechanical view of the world is emphasized here, "near-inanimate barmen, taxi-drivers, bellhops, guides". Furthermore, it should be noted that tourism is based on commercialism or capitalism. This is apparent in phrases such as "there to do any bidding. . . on receipt of the recommended banksheesh, pourbouire, mancia, tip", and "depression and prosperity are reflected only in the rate of exchange". In such a structure the native people and landscape are debased into commodities whose superficial and sensational aspects only, especially their visual factors, are noticed. Considering this point, the sameness of the tourist experiences may be understood as a product of modern capitalistic standardization with its focuses on efficiency and rationality. It follows from what has been said that in tourism, there can be seen the debasement and violation of the natural or the original by converting them into commodities or objects in the system of modern commercialism and capitalism.

Pynchon clearly associates the superficiality of tourism with V.'s voyeuristic love affair with a ballet dancer called Melanie. In their relationship V. reduces young Melanie to a visual love object, a fetish: "certain fetishes never have to be touched or handled at all; only seen, for there to be complete fulfillment" (440). Thus this relationship is introduced as the ultimate form of the image-directed, sterile, decadent, and narcissistic objectification of others:

> But such was her [V.'s] rapture at Melanie's having sought and found her own identity in her and in the mirror's soulless gleam that she continued unaware, off-balanced by love; forgetting even that although the Distribution of Time here on pouf, bed and mirrors had been abandoned, their love was in its way only another version of tourism; for as tourists bring into the world as it has

> evolved part of another, and eventually create a parallel society of their own in every city, so the Kingdom of Death is served by fetish-constructions like V.'s, which represent a kind of infiltration. (443)

"The Kingdom of Death" expresses the tourist country, Baedeker land. Here, V's voyeuristic love affair and tourism are clearly associated with each other as they are both committed to visual appearance. The phrase "mirror's soulless gleam" implies Melanie's degeneration through attaching importance only to the corporeality, the material object, completely separate from her mind. This attitude is shared by the tourists' materialistic view of the world. Here, the tourists are described as not respecting others' otherness, but tending to take a self-centered point of view. Robert Newman describes this as the colonial mentality: "The tourist possesses the colonial mentality in being unwilling to see the land on which he is trespassing from the native's perspective. Instead, he chooses to interpret his experience from a familiar and self-contained viewpoint which differs very little from that of other tourists. . . rendering travel a solipsistic rather than a broadening experience" (49). This "colonial mentality" of the tourist suggests the self-centered and self-contained nature of the predominant visual sensation. In order to discover the rich and complex value of an object, one needs to probe through its surface, into the ideal and the spiritual. Moreover, Melanie may be considered to have become one of the commodities of the stage managers, being a dancer. Melanie the visual love object of the lady V. as well as the visually-appreciated commodity of the stage manager, in the last part of the story, happens to be killed in the theater during a performance when she is impaled on a sharp pole, having forgotten to put on the metal plate intended to protect her. It is important that the theater is a place where the audience enjoys watching performances. Pynchon makes crucial links between the precedence of the image, the mechanization and objectification of the seen, the violation of the natural, and the dreadful violence in this episode of the lady V.'s voyeuristic love affair.

From these observations on the motif of tourism, it is clear that Pynchon depicts it as a kind of voyeuristic pseudo-communion in the modern Western world. The tourists with their commitment to the surface reduce the native people to mere automata lacking any spiritual or emotional dimension. Here, mechanization or the homogenization of the natural by modern commercialism and capitalism is also explicit.

5. Modern Image-directed Bodies

Pynchon takes the specific example of cosmetic surgery to demonstrate the image-directed condition of modernity and its relation to the motif of mechanization. This is another example of the prioritization of the superficial and visual appearances usurping intrinsic values and forcibly transforming people into objects. Mellor and Shilling summarize this dominance of image in modern society:

> Anthropologists of the senses have associated modernity with a growing importance of the eye, and a partial diminution of the body's close contact senses (Classen, 1993; Corbin, 1986). People's visual sensitivity, and their existing ability to change their bodies, is already creating greater space in their identities for the influence of collective factors. . . . On the negative side, image-directed, technologically informed body options can easily implicate people in the signifying practices of others (Pfohl, 1993). Images of the 'perfect female flesh', for example, continue to exert a massive influence over women (Wolf, 1990). (51-52)

In chapter 4, one of the contemporary American episodes, Esther Harvitz, a member of the Whole Sick Crew, believes her nose is too far from the WASP stereotype promoted by the media. She therefore decides to undergo a cosmetic surgery, a rhinoplasty performed by the surgeon Shale Schoenmaker. Pynchon stresses the grotesque violence of the surgery and the bizarre sado-masochistic relation between Schoenmaker and Esther:

> It was a routine operation; Schoenmaker worked quickly, . . . Caressing spongestrokes made it nearly bloodless. . . .
>
> "Now," gently, like a lover, "I'm going to saw off your hump." Esther watched his eyes as best as she could, looking for something human there. Never had she felt so helpless. Later she would say, "It was almost a mystic experience . . . where the highest condition we can attain is that of an object—a rock. It was like that; I felt myself drifting down, this delicious loss of Estherhood, becoming more and more a blob, with no worries, traumas, nothing: only Being" . . . .
>
> "Take that back," he smiled. "It [a nostril] doesn't want to come just yet." With scissors he snipped the hump loose from the lateral cartilage which had been holding it; then, with the bone-forceps, removed a dark-colored lump of gristle, which he waved triumphantly before Esther. (106-107)

As both Levine and Newman point out, Esther's selfhood is lost and

she is transformed into a "blob", an object, during the operation — and she relishes this, as is clear in the phrase "this delicious loss of Estherhood".[6] Schoenmaker uses the extremely insolent word "hump" for her nose, which reveals his view of her as an object for sculpting, with no respect for her humanity at all. In addition, his inhuman and emotionally distanced attitude is clear from the expressions, "[Esther] looking for something human there", "he [Schoenmaker] smiled", and "triumphantly". It is also remarkable that the narrator uses the word "hump" too. The narrator's detailed, detached, and indifferent explanation of the surgery has something in common with the doctor. Here, the connection between image-directed people and psychological mechanization is explicit. In this episode, Pynchon caricatures modern people's obsession with the superficial and their estrangement from the natural. Mechanization is both physical and psychological.

Here, one notices another commodification of visual pleasure. Rachel, a friend or pseudo-mother of Esther's, visits Schoenmaker to pay him $800, the fee for the surgery on behalf of the penniless Esther: "she takes home 50 a week, 25 comes out for analysis, 12 for rent leaving 13. What for, for high heels she breaks on subway gratings, for lipstick, earrings, clothes. Food, occasionally" (45), according to a friend of hers. Thus Esther 'buys beauty'; in other words, she implants an artificial 'uniform', and "retroussé nose the sign of the WASP or White Anglo-Saxon Protestant in the movies and advertisements" (40) for $800. Further, Rachel is lost in thought: "it takes four months for a nose job to heal. Four months from now would be June; this meant many pretty Jewish girls who felt they would be perfectly marriageable were it not for an ugly nose could now go husband-hunting at the various resorts all with uniform septa" (40). Considering the issues, that is, buying artificial noses for marriage, and the financial effect of the institution of marriage on women's lives, it may be said that the girls who undergoe the surgery are making arrangements, adjusting themselves to the standardized beauty, for the 'trade' of marriage, where they themselves will be treated as commodities. It may be said that Esther is not only objectifying herself, but also making capital in the system of modern capitalism, which reminds one of tourism or Melanie.

6. Blazoning V.

I would like to illustrate another example of the connections between the motif of mechanization, its accompanying violence, and sight, one expressed by Pynchon's use of a traditional rhetoric based on the politics of the *gaze*. Both Esther and V. succumb to the lure of the "ideal body" whose standard is established by patriarchal society:

> Her [Veronica Manganese's] face. . . was at peace, the live eye dead as the other, with the clock-iris. He (Old Stencil)'d not been surprised at the eye; no more than at the star sappire sewn into her navel. There is surgery; and surgery. . . . Even in Florence. . . he had noted an obsession with bodily incorporating little bits of inert matter.
>
> "*See* my lovely shoes", . . "I would so like to have *an entire foot of amber and gold*, with the veins, perhaps, in intaglio instead of bas-relief. How tiresome to have the same feet: . . . But if a girl could have, oh, a lovely rainbow or wardrobe of different-hued, different-sized and –shaped feet. . . ." (528, emphasis mine)

Here, it is to be noted that V. is increasingly composed of "the inanimate", dead matter. There are several references to V.'s body—how it looks young for her age by "incorporating the inert matter". By these surgeries she maintains "the ideal body", which at the same time is a symbol of her moving from a natural, human state to a decadent, inanimate one. V.'s incorporation of objects, particularly precious metals and jewelry, and the anatomizing of her living body reminds one of a traditional poetic device, the blazon.[7] Blazon is usually understood as "a richly ornate and mannered evocation of idealized female beauty rendered into its constituent parts" (Jonathan Sawday, 191), which are to be the 'objects of male gaze'. By this poetic form, women became arrayed for the consumption of men, flaunted and divided before an audience as something to be looked upon. It may be said that blazon has its basis in the visual more than any other sense. Therefore, it is possible to regard the fact that V. is dividing her own body up into inanimate parts as a literal, not metaphorical, blazon actually taking place in the novel. There is a crucial resemblance between V.'s inanimate-incorporated body and one of the sonnets of Edmund Spencer, which Sawday describes as follows: "So begins Sonnet XV of 'Amoretti' a blazon which divides the female body into a pile of treasure: sapphire eyes, ruby lips, pearl teeth, ivory forehead, gold hair, and silver hands. . . the familiar conceit of a poem which flourishes the divided female before other men is apparent. . . . The sonnet marks a

moment of conspicuous consumption, a chance for the narrator to 'display' his wealth" (200-1). He outlines the languages of blazon especially in England, "which were peculiarly consonant with an emerging 'science' or knowledge of the body . . . . The English blazon, . . divided the female body to celebrate its partitioned exploration as a geographical entity. This organism could be 'discovered' (literally 'disclosed'—rendered open to sight) and then subjected to an economy of trade, commerce and mercantile distribution" (197-8). Consequently, her apparent submission to the ideal of female beauty prescribed by patriarchal society and to the dividing and destructive male gaze is, at the same time, her making a display of her opulence and power of mastery there. Considering how V.'s physical mechanization as literal blazon taking place, its essentially visual character may be confirmed.

In another example of blazon in the novel, the destructive power of the male gaze upon women is apparent. Stencil has a vision of V., who has became entirely an inanimate object of erotic desire after the love-game with the fetish-girl, Melanie, at age seventy-six:

> . . . skin radiant with the bloom of new plastic; both eyes but now containing photoelectric cells, connected by silver electrodes to optic nerves of purest copper wire and leading to a brain exquisitely wrought as a diode matrix could ever be. Solenoid relays would be her ganglia, servo-actuators move her flawless nylon limbs, hydraulic fluid be sent by a platinum heart pump through butyrate veins and arteries. (444)

In Stencil's use of excessively scientific technical terms can be found a modern parody of blazon. Sawday explains the rhetoric's relation to science, as follows:

> . . . the vogue in the sixteenth century for the blazon, the detailed enumeration of the parts of the woman's body, can be seen as reflecting *the new scientific mentality with its mastering gaze*, its passion for mapping the world in order to gain power over it . (emphasis mine, 192)

Both male erotic desire and the scientific mentality sought to gaze upon the body while dismantling it, piece by piece. In the passage quoted above, V. is disassembled metaphorically in Stencil's imagination, anatomized by a modern scientific mentality, the male gaze, and erotic desire.

As pornographic as Stencil's 76-years-old V. is the less intellectual-

ized blazon of Profane's all-electronic woman: "Someday, please God, there would be an all-electronic woman. Maybe her name would be Violet. Any problems with her, you could look it up in the maintenance manual. Module concept: finger's weight, heart's temperature, mouth's size out of tolerance? Remove and replace, was all" (414). Although his blazon is less scientific and cold than Stencil's, the destructive nature of the male gaze and its mechanization and objectification of the female body are clearly seen in these examples. Whether literal or metaphorical, Pynchon's use of the poetics of blazon reveals the inseparable relation between violence brought about by the predominance of visual sensation and the motif of mechanization.

7. Disassembly, Blazon, and Modern Protestant Bodies

There is another synchronous representation of the predominance of visual sensation and the mechanical objectification, and the literal blazon depicted in the novel. Chapter 10, the fourth historical section, is quite different from others in that it consists of a man's manuscript of his confessions. The author of the manuscript is Fausto Majistral, who is the father of Profane's Maltese girlfriend, Paola. Paola gives it to Stencil. Her father's confessions, which concentrate on the Axis' siege of Malta, consist partly of passage from his diary and partly of comments on them. The diary was written from 1937 to 1943, and is given the commentary and editing in 1955. He divides his life into four segments, tracing them through his four identity-phases, numbered Fausto I-IV, whose discontinuity is produced by the tumultuous and violent state of war in those days in Malta.[8] He is estranged from the ancient Maltese matriarchal culture, because the Maltese have been invaded, colonized by Italy, England and others. Moreover, he conceives of himself as "a new sort of being, a dual man" (330), being educated in English, not Maltese, a consequence of the colonial rule by England. Thus, speaking and thinking in both languages, English and Maltese, Fausto is torn between two cognitive modes. Through his English education he seems to achieve the cognitive mode of the Protestants, prioritizing the distant contact senses, and making linguistic symbols and narratives a central source of people's self-identity. As Fausto describes the transition of his personality, in respect of his changing attitudes to, and use of, language, it is likely that the foundation of his identities is that of modern Protestants. Here, it is necessary to review Mellor and Shilling's account of the modern Protestant body:

> The emphasis placed on the word can be seen as part of a Protestant attempt to control the body through cognitive narratives of the self. By making the body individual, Protestantism helped remove it from the sensual experience of effervescent sociality and turn it instead into a vehicle for thought and belief. . . . Instead of being driven by sensual desire, Protestants sought to ensure that their bodies would fit their narratives of self.
>
> (43-44)

The closest of all his identity-phases to a state of non-humanity is Fausto III, who gradually emerges when the condition of the war becomes more violent, identifying himself with the rockhood of his home island, Malta. Fausto III is also characterized not only by inanimation but also by "sensitivity to decadence". During this period, his wife Elena is killed in an air-raid and he witnesses the disassembly of the Bad Priest by some of the Maltese children in his neighborhood[9], the last avatar of V., who is pinned under the wreckage after a German bombing raid:

> . . . Up came one of the slippers and a foot—an artificial foot—the two sliding out as a unit, lug-and-slot.
>
> "She [Bad Priest] comes apart". . . .
>
> At her navel was a star sapphire. The boy with the knife picked at the stone. . . . He dug in with the point of bayonet. Blood had begun to well in its place. . . . I wondered if the disassembly of the Bad Priest might not go on, and on into evening. *Surely her arms and breasts could be detached; the skin of her legs be peeled away to reveal some intricate understructure of silver openwork. Perhaps the trunk itself contained other wonders: intestines of parti-coloured silk, gay-baloon lungs, a rococo heart.* But the sirens started up then. The children dispersed baring away their new-found treasures, and the abdominal wound made by the bayonet was doing its work. I lay prone under a hostile sky looking down for moments more at what the children had left; suffering Christ foreshortened on the bare skull, one eye and one socket, staring up at me: a dark hole for the mouth, stumps at the bottoms of the legs. And the blood which had formed a black sash across the waisting down both sides from the navel.
>
> (369, emphasis mine)

The first thing one notices is that Fausto remains an idle onlooker observing minutely the atrocious "disassembly" conducted by the children, though he has the ability to chide the children into letting the Bad Priest go. The detachedness and non-involvement associated with the predominance of the sight is explicit. Curiously distanced from the situation, he wonders about and imagines the process of dismantling. We

notice the recurrence of the use of blazon in his fancy. This attitude may be understood as a manifestation of his modern Protestant mentality, which gives priority to the 'distant contact senses' and enables individuals to "visually and aurally monitor, *judge and anticipate* natural and social phenomena before making close contact with them" (Mellor and Shilling, 44, emphasis mine). Here, Fausto "visually monitors" the process of "disassembly", and remains an onlooker by keeping his distance, lost in contemplation. It may be said that the modern (Protestant), distant, and unsympathetic mentality that prioritizes sight is associated with inhuman violence. The disassembly by which the children raven away, piece by piece, the parts of the Bad Priest's body consisting of precious metals and jewelry can be regarded as the most destructive literal blazon actualized in the novel. Given the visual nature of blazon, the connection between the predominance of visual sensation and inhuman violence is again made explicit.

So far a range of Pynchon's representations of the precedence of visual sensation has been examined in the relation between, and communication among, the characters that embody the motif of physical and psychological mechanization. First, the voyeuristic characters who witness some fierce political violence are studied, and it is made clear that their prioritization of sight seems to result in their loss of bodily sensation, and ends in unsympathetic and indifferent attitudes to others' sufferings, and a moral non-involvement in the face of rampant violence. Secondly, the nature of the motif of tourism was focused on, one which is depicted as also having a voyeuristic attitude. Another example of the crucial connection between the predominance of the image, namely, the mechanization and objectification of the seen, and inhuman violence is revealed. Further, in this motif, the modern commodification and standardization of the living are described as a violation and debasement of the natural. Thirdly, the Jewish girl Esther's cosmetic surgery, another example of the characters' commitment to the visual, is analyzed. Her masochistic enjoyment in becoming an object made clear the connection between image-directedness and her psychological mechanization. Besides, she and other girls like her who undergo such surgery may be understood in a sense to be capitalized and commodified. Finally, Pynchon's repetitive use of the blazon is examined, which has its basis exclusively in visual rather than any other bodily sensations. By using and parodying the poetic device, the author shows the violent nature

of the mastering male gaze and its mechanization and objectification of the female body.

All these observations make it clear that an excess of sight results in human beings' loss of and alienation from their own bodies: the seers lose their bodily sensations and regard others as mere objects, in other words, corporealities lacking any inner life. Here, the Cartesian dualism of mind and the corporeal is apparent. Human bodies are mechanized in that they are only considered as material corporealities that are separated from their minds. It is also noted that the precedence of vision itself is a result of modern dualism. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that the relation between dualism and reification caused by the excess of seeing is circular: they are in a vicious circle where the dualism creates the reification and the reification reinforces the dualism. The deprivation of the close-contact senses impels us to commit inhuman violence to others in an unsympathetic and detached attitude, insensible to their physical pain. The critical relation between the precedence of sight and modern political violence are presented in the novel.

Pynchon depicts the devastating nature of modern human bodies through the descriptions of modern ferocities and cruelties. It should be noticed that those motifs of physical and psychological mechanization are often linked not only with violence but also with death, such as Melanie and V.. Another point to note is that one of the protagonists, Benny Profane is threatened by the nightmare in which he turns into an automaton and suffers his own dismantlement. Finally, it may be inferred that he meets his end with an American girl who seems to embody modern materialism. Thus many of the characters in this novel are encroached on and violated by the destructive and murderous sway of mechanization. However, it is to be emphasized that the mechanized V. is ultimately dismantled, which would not have happened, had it not been for her own transformation into the mechanical. Thus, it follows from what has been said that Pynchon denies and criticizes such modern mechanization through the description of ruin and death brought on by its self-destructive nature.

Notes

[1] "David Richter has identified the significance of 1859 as the year in which both Marx's *Critique of Political Economy* and Darwin's *Origin of Species* were published" (Madsen 51).

[2] See for example, Hanjo Berressem, *Pynchon's Poetics: Interfacing Theory band Text;* Allen McHoul and David Wills, *Writing Pynchon: Strategies in Fictional Analysis*; Alice Jardine, *Gynesis: Configurations of Women and Modernity*.

[3] For another example, Kevin Robins persuasively explains the idea of "the sight as distancing senses". He gives examples of modern, highly developed visual technologies that are exploited for military operations, such as military simulations and the use of photographic guidance in smart bombs. McGuigan comments on Robins' argument as follows: "fantasies of order and control are built into the design of information and image technologies, resulting in a separation of the human subject from palpable reality and the difficult problems of lived experience" (78).

[4] "Mondaugen" means "moon eye" in German (which is ironic because the moon is the symbol of a goddess, and V. is personified as a degenerated goddess) (Chambers, *Thomas Pynchon* 78-79).

[5] For arguments about Pynchon's use of the terms "tourism" and "tourists", see Deborah Madsen, *The Postmodern Allegories of Thomas Pynchon*, 34; Tony Tanner, *Thomas Pynchon*, 52.

[6] For useful discussions of Esther's rockhood, see George Levine, "Risking the Moment", *Thomas Pynchon: Modern Critical Reviews*, 64; Robert Newman, *Understanding Thomas Pynchon*, 43.

[7] The definition of the poetic blazon is given in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*:" a poetic genre devoted to the praise or blame of something". The author suggests the approximation of the term to— catalogue—one of which, he explains can be "often used for itemizing topics such as the beauty of woman".

[8] On this point, see Deborah Madsen, *The Postmodernist Allegories of Thomas Pynchon*, 35-36. She points out, "Fausto I is characterized by a love of high-flown rhetoric, Shakespeare and Eliot; whilst Fausto II, a product of the siege of Malta, is 'more Maltese and less British'; he is a 'young man in retreat,' a retreat into religious abstraction and poetry. 'Moving towards that island-wide sense of communion. And at the same time towards the lowest form of consciousness' [PC336]. It is a communion in 'Purgatory,' and a retreat into non-humanity. As Fausto III begins to emerge, abstraction gives way to a 'sensitivity to decadence' or inanimation".

[9] In his essay "V. and V-2" (in Mendelson, ed., *Pynchon: A Collection of Critical Essays*), Tony Tanner argues that "The word 'disassembly' implies 'the human turned into the machine'" (48).

Works Cited

Berressem, Hanjo. *Pynchon's Poetics: Interfacing Theory and Text.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *Thomas Pynchon: Modern Critical Views.* New York: Chelsea House, 1986.
Chambers, Judith. *Thomas Pynchon.* New York: Twayne, 1992.
——. "Parabolas and Parables: The Radical Ethics of Pynchon's *V.* and *Gravity's Rainbow*." *Powerless Fictions? Ethics, Cultural Critique, and American Fiction in the Age of Postmodernism.* Ed. Alfonso Ricardo Miguel. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996. 1-23.
Cowart, David. "Pynchon and the Sixties". *Critique*, 41 (Fall, 1999). 3-12
Eddins, Dwight. *Gnostic Pynchon.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.
Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. London: Free Association Books, 1991.
Jardine, Alice. *Gynesis: Configurations of Women and Modernity.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.
Karl, Frederick. *American Fictions 1940/1980: A Comprehensive History and Critical Evaluation.* New York: Harper & Row, 1983.
Kemeny, Annemarie. "The Female Machine in the Postmodern Circuit". *Liminal Postmodernisms: The Postmodern, the (Post-)Colonial, and the (Post-)Feminist.* Eds. Theo D'haen and Hans Bertens. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994. 255-73.
Leitch, B Vincent. *American Literary Criticism from the Thirties to the Eighties*. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.
Lehmann, Hartmut and Guenther Roth, eds. *Weber's Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts.* Washington, D. C.: German Historical Institute, 1993.
Levine, George and David Leverentz, eds. *Mindful Pleasures: Essays on Thomas Pynchon*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1976.
——. "Risking the Moment". Levine 113-136.
MacGuigan, Jim. *Modernity and Postmodern Culture.* Buckingham: Open UP, 1999.
Madsen, Deborah L. *The Postmodern Allegories of Thomas Pynchon.* New York: St. Martin's, 1991.
McHoul, Alec, and David Wills. *Writing Pynchon: Strategies in Fictional Analysis*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1986.
Mellor, Phillip and Chris Shilling. *Reforming the Body: Religion, Community and Modernity.* London: Sage Publications, 1997.
Mendelson, Edward. *Pynchon: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Engelwood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
Newman, Robert D. *Understanding Thomas Pynchon.* Columbia, South California: U of South California P, 1986.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
Preminger, Alex and T. V. F. Brogan. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics.* New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1993.
Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture.* London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
Stimpson, R. Catharine. "Pre-Apocalyptic Atavism: Thomas Pynchon's Early Fiction". Bloom 79-91.

Swidler, Anne. "The Concept of Rationality in the Work of Max Weber". *Sociological Inquiry* 43 (1973). 35-42.
Tanner, Tony. "V. and V-2". Mendelson 16-55.
——. *Thomas Pynchon*. New York: Methuen, 1982.

研　究　会　会　則

第１章　総　　則

第１条　本会は「試論」英文学研究会と称する．

第２条　本会は，事務局を東北大学文学部英文学研究室内に置く．

第２章　目的及び事業

第３条　本会は，英語英文学研究の発展と向上を目ざし，同時に会員相互の親睦交流をはかる．

第４条　本会は，第３条の目的を達成するために次の事業を行なう．

１．研究誌「試論」の発行（年一回).

２．その他必要な事業.

第３章　組　　織

第５条　本会は，会員により組織する．入会には会員二名以上の推薦と，会長の承認を必要とする．

第６条　本会は次の役員を置く．

会長１名

編集委員若干名（うち事務局幹事１名）

第７条　役員は次の会務にあたる．

１．会長は本会を代表する．

２．編集委員は，会長と共に編集委員会を構成し，「試論」への投稿論文の審査，「試論」の編集，及びその他の会務にあたる．

３．事務局幹事は，庶務会計の任にあたる．

第８条　会長は，会員の互選により選出する．会長の任期は２年とし，重任を妨げない．

編集委員は，編集委員会の推薦により選出する．編集委員の任期は２年とし，重任を妨げない．事務局幹事は編集委員の互選とする．

第９条　本会には名誉会員を置くことができる．

第４章　会　　計

第 10 条　本会の会費は別に定める金額とする．

第５章　会則改正

第 11 条　会則の改正には会員の過半数の賛成を必要とする．

（平成 13 年 10 月１日発効）

投　稿　規　定

△　次号の原稿締切は平成 15(2003)年 10 月末日とします.

△　原稿はタイプ，ワープロなどによる清書原稿５部を提出してください．パソコンのワープロ・ソフトにより作成した場合は，そのワープロソフト形式のファイルと「標準テキストファイル」の両方を入れたフロッピーを添付してください。ワープロ専用機等のファイルは組版ソフトに読み込めないため提出不要です。

△　手書き原稿でもかまいません。清書原稿 4 部（コピー）を提出してください。

△　ワープロの清書原稿に手書きの書き込みをする場合は，書き込みのない清書原稿をさらに１部追加してください。ファイルが読めなかった場合等に OCR で読みとりをするためです。

△　論文は和文，欧文いずれでも可.

△　和文の場合は原則として 400 字詰原稿用紙 35 枚程度（注を含めて）．欧文の場合は原則として 6,000 語程度．採用の場合，ネィティヴ･スピーカーによる校閲は編集委員会が行います.

　和文・欧文とも長さは一応の目安です。必要な場合には大幅に超過してもかまいません。

△　論文には英文のシノプシス（300 ～ 400 語程度）を添付してください.

△　特殊活字，カラー図表などの使用や原稿量が多いことにより標準的な印刷費用を大きく超過する場合は，超過分のみを執筆者負担とする場合があります.（モノクロの図版には特別な費用はかかりません。）

△　注は末尾にまとめ，通し番号をつけてください.

△　論文の書式の細部については，原則として *MLA Handbook*（邦訳『ＭＬＡ英語論文の手引』第４版　北星堂発行）または *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th Edition に準拠してください.

編集後記

今集は力作揃いでこのように分厚いものとなりました。『試論』が 100 ページを超えたのは実に久しぶりのことです。かつては 170 ページ超ということもあった『試論』ですが、第 20 集（1981 年、127 ページ）を最後に 80 ページ前後のスリムなものが続いておりました。今回はすべて英文の論文となり、質量共に国際水準の学術誌として誇るべきものとなったのは大変喜ばしいことです。

ご承知の通り、昨今は研究成果の「国際的発信」が強く求められるようになっております。考えてみれば、日本史や国文学など日本語によっても「国際性」を謳うことができる学問分野とは異なり、英米文学研究が英語を媒体とすることは当然のことです。日本学術振興会の科学研究費補助金の学術定期刊行物の交付基準では国際性が最重要視される要件の一つであると明示されており、昨年ついに日本英文学会の『英文学研究』が補助金をうち切られてしまったのはこのことが大きな理由の一つであると考えられました。一方、日本英語学会の全文英文による機関誌の方は高額な補助金を交付されています。もちろん日本語による論文にもそれなりの意義があることは否定できません。しかし、外部評価、特に第三者評価の大幅な導入が予想されるこれからの時代には私たちは国際水準の研究、つまり国際的に評価可能な研究発表を行うことを強く意識しなければならないことは確実です。

『試論』はすでに十年以上前から論文の八割以上が英文のものとなっており、時代を先取りしてきました。これからも我が国における英米文学研究で最先端を行く媒体であり続けたいものです。

E. H.

試　論　　第 41 集

平成 15 (2003) 年 7 月 1 日印刷発行

発　行　「試論」英文学研究会
会　長　原　　英　一
〒 980–8576　仙台市青葉区川内
東北大学大学院文学研究科　英文学研究室
電　話　022(217)5961
http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp
振替口座番号　02200–1–4966
印　刷　（株）東北プリント