

SHIRON 試論

Essays in English Language and Literature

CONTENTS

A New Look at Browning's 'Evelyn Hope'	
.....	Kurt Scheibner 1
Conrad's Ideas of Gastronomy: Dining in 'Falk'	
.....	Paul Vlitos 27
Golding's Pincher Martin: Rendering of the Techniques for Satire	
.....	Kazuhiko Saigusa 49

March 2008

No. 44

SHIRON 44
試論
第44集

SHIRON

Essays in English Language and Literature

EDITORS

EIICHI HARA

MIKI IWATA

MITSUKO SUZUKI

PAUL VLITOS

OSAMU YAGAWA

No. 44

March 2008

Department of English Literature

Tohoku University

Sendai, Japan

2008

SHIRON
Essays in English Language and Literature No.44
ISSN: 0387-7590

Shiron is published annually by the Department of English Literature,
Graduate School of Arts and Letters
TOHOKU UNIVERSITY
27-1 Kawauchi, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8576 Japan
Phone : 022-795-5961
<http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp>

試論 第44集 目次

(平成20年3月)

CONTENTS

A New Look at Browning's 'Evelyn Hope'	
.....Kurt Scheibner	1
Conrad's Ideas of Gastronomy: Dining in 'Falk'	
.....Paul Vlitos	27
Golding's <i>Pincher Martin</i> : Rendering of the Techniques for Satire	
.....Kazuhiko Saigusa	49
研究会会則.....	72
投稿規定.....	73
編集後記.....	74

A New Look at Browning's 'Evelyn Hope'

Kurt Scheibner

'Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead,' unfortunately, 'Evelyn Hope' the poem is almost as dead; it has shown few signs of life over the last half century. Of course, this popular poem is still frequently referred to and quoted from, but it seems to have been, for whatever reasons, wrapped up and sealed in its traditionalist shroud, i.e., the speaker in the poem is a sentimental old admirer paying his last respects to the young dead girl he has loved for so long. Since the sixties, this standard view of the poem has not been seriously challenged as far as I have been able to find. The silence seems to indicate that this poor little creature has died a natural death and should be allowed to rest in peace. But wait; we need to remember that this is a Browning poem. As such, how many of his characters die of natural causes, especially young, beautiful innocent girls?¹ The carnage left in Browning's wake includes characters who are stabbed, strangled, poisoned, beheaded, shot, hung, tortured, burned at the stake, bullied into suicide and all manner of hideous murders. The murders are often committed by completely sane individuals yet some of Browning's most memorable villains are mad – temporarily or certifiably insane. Being able to see through the character's veneer and discover the inner workings of the speaker's psychology is the challenge and enjoyment of reading a Browning dramatic monologue.

Accepting Evelyn Hope's cause of death as natural should be, if not suspect, at least out of sync with other Browning poems. That in itself, I think, should be sufficient reason to exhume the poor girl and find out what really killed her. In this paper, I attempt to offer arguments that her autopsy needs to be seriously reconsidered. At the very least, I hope to show that her cause of death needs to be changed from 'natural' to 'mysterious.' Moreover, as will be seen in this interpretation, I suggest that her death was the furthest thing from natural; it was another

Browning murder. Generally speaking, as Clyde Ryals points out in *The Life of Robert Browning*: 'Like most of Browning characters the speaker is not what he seems, either to himself or to others. The would-be manipulator is himself in fact controlled by his creator' (74).

In 'Love and the Lover in Browning's 'Evelyn Hope'' Susan Radner writes: 'It is surprising to what degree Robert Browning's poetry is still misread as idealistic philosophy rather than appreciated for its insight into abnormal psychology. 'Evelyn Hope' is a pertinent example' (115). Why this poem is not as popular as 'My Last Duchess' or 'Porphyria's Lover' is a mystery to me. The similarities between 'Evelyn Hope' and 'Porphyria's Lover' are, according to George Marshall, 'quite striking. In each poem a man, the speaker of the dramatic monologue, is alone with the body of a girl who has recently died. In each the death of the girl has (in the eyes of the man) eliminated all obstacles to their love— irrational though the man's opinion be —and . . . the man can be certain, for the first time, that the girl is his.' (33–34) Despite these remarkable parallels, most critics of 'Evelyn Hope,' as Radner writes, 'accept [this poem] at face value . . . a hope for spiritual reunion after death' (115). Perhaps, given the greater maturity and subtlety available to Browning's craft a good ten years or more after writing 'My Last Duchess' and 'Porphyria's Lover,' the story of Evelyn Hope has been generally missed. C. E. Tanzy in his article: 'Madness and Hope in Browning's 'Evelyn Hope'' writes that readers 'expect a Browning monologue' to reveal the psychology of the character, something that 'most critics have overlooked in the case of this particular speaker' (155). What Browning consistently does in his dramatic monologues is to demand a dedicated effort from his readers. Philip Drew concisely makes this point: 'Above all he [the reader] must be continually vigilant to distinguish between truth and sophistry, between deception and self-deception, between clear sight and the limitations of the speaker' (119). Unfortunately, for the last fifty years or so, this poem has apparently lost its appeal among the majority of writers. Very few new readings of this poem have been suggested since the sixties whereas other Browning poems such as 'My Last Duchess' and 'Porphyria's Lover' continue to receive a wide range of variant interpretations.

The way I interpret this poem is a drastic departure from traditional readings, at least as far as I have been able to determine. The conventional reading of this poem acknowledges the speaker's ideal love of Evelyn; William DeVane explains the whole of the poem with the following summary: 'The conception of love as invincible

and immortal, and also the idea that after death we progress through a series of worlds is particularly Browning's' (344). Ian Jack writes in *Browning's Major Poetry* that the poem 'is inspired by a middle-aged man's dream of loving and being loved by a young girl' (145). I think both views of the poem miss all of the inherent Browning fun; as usual, there is much more going on in this poem: details, subtleties and hints which Browning cleverly weaves into the fabric as he does with all of his best poems. He expects us, the readers, to be sufficiently attentive in our reading. Ironically, my view is only drastically different from traditional interpretations of the poem itself; it is in perfect alignment with a host of other Browning poems where the speaker has lost contact with reality. With this paper, I hope to dig this poem up from its premature grave and to show that the speaker is not a kind, love-struck older gentleman paying his last respects to the young girl he adores who has recently died. My argument, if successful, will open the way to group this speaker with the likes of other insane or deluded characters as are found in poems such as 'Cristina,' 'Johannes Agricola in Meditation,' 'Porphyria's Lover,' 'Mesmerism,' 'The Laboratory' and 'My Last Duchess.' In addition to the obvious 'mad' poems, other psychologically questionable characters appear in 'Pauline,' 'Paracelsus,' 'The Bishop Orders His Tomb at Saint Praxed's Church,' 'Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came,' 'Too Late,' *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*, *The Inn Album*, 'Of Pacchiarotto, and How He Worked in Distemper,' 'Numphleptos' and many others. These kinds of poems reveal Browning's fascination with less than normal characters. For some reason, 'Evelyn Hope' has been excluded from this grouping; I argue that this poem has all of the heat, passion and twisted abnormal psychology similar to many of Browning's unforgettable creations.

This poem was included in *Men and Women* (1855) along with many other love poems, but Browning redefines the meaning of 'love poem' again and again. The opening line of this poem, 'Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead,' grabs the reader's attention, as do many of Browning's opening lines. Naturally, we immediately want to know when, how and why she died. The logical first step to answer these questions, I feel, is to take a close look at the personality of the speaker who is sitting on dead Evelyn's bed next to her corpse. The speaker of the poem informs us that he is an older man (forty-eight years old) and Evelyn died at the age of sixteen. In his monologue, he also tells us two crucial pieces of information concerning his 'relationship' with the deceased; first, he says in line 10: 'Perhaps she had scarcely heard my name;'

an admission that they did not know each other very well, in fact, it would appear that Evelyn did not know this man at all. The choice word 'scarcely' connotes the triple meaning of 'hardly ever,' 'inaudibly' and 'just before.' One wonders why she could not have heard his name clearly, but more on that later. To her, he was nothing more than a stranger; the speaker even paraphrases Evelyn's own words, the two of them were nothing more than 'fellow mortals, naught besides . . .' (24).

The second important admission occurs when he says: 'I loved you, Evelyn, all the while!' (49). The majority of the story takes place between these two statements. Put together into a single sentence, it reads: She did not know him and yet, he has always loved her. This one hybrid sentence alone should serve as a strong signal that something is definitely suspicious. It gets worse; she has suddenly and recently died, she is still in her bed and this older, unknown love-possessed man is sitting there, next to her corpse, looking at her body, talking to her, touching her. The reader only needs to ask why this forty-eight-year-old stranger is in her bedroom and why, to wonder even further, is he sitting on her bed next to her dead body? Tanzy poses the same question when he asks: 'Just what is this forty-eight-year-old man doing in sixteen-year-old Evelyn's bedroom anyhow?' (155).

Before we can answer that question, we need to find out just what kind of man the Hopes have allowed into their home to spend time with their beautiful, young and recently deceased daughter. We need to remember, as with other Browning poems, the speaker gives us all we need to know about himself in order for us to make a judgment about his character and the nature of the love he feels for Evelyn. We already know about their thirty-two-year age difference, that Evelyn does not know him and that sometime prior to her death, she told him to get lost. He also tells us that their 'paths in the world diverged so wide,' (22) so by his own admission, we know they had little in common. Now that she is dead, the speaker has decided to 'claim' her, 'for [his] own love's sake!' This is where it starts to get interesting. He is determined to 'claim' her for himself; is that in keeping with a romantic kind of love? Is it even a normal statement of love from one lover to the other? He repeats this sentiment again when he explains that he has a lot to do before 'the time [comes] for taking [her].' The speaker is certain that he can take her; a thought Slinn captures when he writes: 'A relationship potentially doomed while she was alive becomes ideally and ironically possible now she is dead . . .' (81). Before she died, she rejected him out of hand, yet he insists on claiming and taking her with him, against

her will, into 'the new life' which comes after death. Is that love? It sounds more like obsession to me. Although she clearly stated that she wants nothing whatsoever to do with this man, he tells Evelyn that someday he will explain 'what you would do with me . . .' (39); he has not only chartered out his own destiny, but he forces Evelyn, against her wishes, to be his eternal partner. Is that a healthy form of love? That he feels some form of love for her is not the question; what we need to understand is that the nature of his love is twisted, possessive, licentious, demanding and self-serving. He claims her for himself whether or not she wants to go along for the ride, a journey which he knows and lets us know, Evelyn would have intensely refused.

We learn more about the demented nature of his love; rather than immediately wanting to join his soul to hers 'In the new life' as one might expect from a lover, he tells her that their reunion needs to be 'delayed' because, oddly, he has a lot of things to do first. He explains that 'in the years long still' he must gain 'the gains of various men,' ransack 'the ages' and spoil 'the climes.' Those are not the plans of a gentle, loving person anxiously awaiting to be with his lover in the after life; his plans are excessively violent, clearly impossible and quite mad. Then there is his lust. He tells us that Evelyn is 'beautiful,' he notes her 'sweet white brow' and that her 'body and soul [are] so pure and gay;' he comments twice on her 'red young mouth' and her 'hair's young gold.' Is that really the kind of man one would allow into Evelyn's bedroom? And yet, there he is. He is not there for a little farewell. No matter how well he is known by the parents, it seems to me an hour is an exceedingly long period of time for one to pay his last respects; especially for an older man who was not known to Evelyn. As a parent, how much time would seem appropriate to allow a forty-eight-year-old man to be alone with the body of the sixteen-year-old Evelyn, in her room, on her bed? Five minutes? Ten? Given his deep love of her and their age difference, permitting him an hour (or more) would seem to be rather irresponsible (especially since she did not know him).

With this understanding of the speaker's insanity, we can now go back to the beginning of the poem and see what is really going on. His first words are 'Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead!' This is a cold statement of fact and holds little room for remorse. The only recognizable emotion he displays anywhere in the poem is when he reiterates her rejection of his love. It seems more than a little curious to me that he does not express any sadness about her death. In the second line he allows himself 'an hour' to 'sit and watch by her side . . .' I

wonder how long he has already been sitting with her on her bed. The fact that an exact amount of time is given, 'an hour', subtly sets a kind of timer in motion: the reader becomes aware that there is not much time before things will begin to happen. The fourth and fifth lines continue to frame the time sequence of events: 'She plucked that piece of geranium-flower, / Beginning to die too, in the glass' (4–5). Because of the exquisite simplicity of the words and rhymes used in this poem, a reader might be lulled into reading too casually and miss some of the facts. For example, one wonders how the speaker knows such a detail, that Evelyn did, in fact, pluck the geranium which is 'Beginning to die too'. As soon as the question is asked, the answer would seem to suggest that he must have seen her pick it. (A family member might have told him about the plucking of the flower, but that does not seem likely since he was a stranger to Evelyn). One also wonders when she picked it, and the unavoidable answer would be that she plucked it in the last few days. That, in itself, is not important, but now that Evelyn is dead, little things take on more significance. Perhaps she 'plucked that piece of geranium-flower' as recently as the evening before. Tanzy picks up on this point as well: 'Evelyn' he writes, 'hadn't expected to die, any more than Porphyria had . . .' (155–56).

Working these details into an overall scheme, I find myself wondering about other unusual circumstances; foremost among them is the complete absence of any other people. Parents, siblings, more distant relatives, friends, a priest, a doctor, mourners, neighbors, an attendant —are all nonexistent. Donald Thomas notes that the typical Victorian deathbed scene 'included among other things . . . the *continuous* presence of an attendant . . .' (145). (Emphasis mine.) Keeping in mind that Evelyn is dead, in bed, and that she is only sixteen years old, is it normal, I ask, for no one to be there other than this unknown stranger? That this man might be a doctor is suggested by Tanzy: 'Perhaps he is a doctor called in to verify the death. We don't know. . . . If the speaker is a doctor he doesn't tell us what killed her. We only know that her death was sudden. No lingering illness here, Evelyn had been up and around till just before she died . . .' (155).

Just who is this man in Evelyn's room? Is he a priest from the family church who has been called in to pray for her? This would not seem likely for several reasons. First, Evelyn had hardly heard his name. Second, though not impossible, it is entirely inappropriate for a priest to lust so longingly for her 'body and soul' with her 'red young mouth' and her 'hair's young gold.' Third, to 'claim' her 'for [his] love's sake

. . .' and to promise to take her 'In the new life come in the old one's stead' against her will are not only unpriestly but indicative of his insane passion to possess her. Fourth, no God-fearing priest would look forward to ransacking 'the ages' and spoiling 'the climes': such calculated violence against humanity is either the work of the devil or the insane, not the quest of a respectable priest.

The fact that she had hardly heard his name rules out nearly every possibility of logically identifying this man from the context of the poem — he can not be the family physician, a priest, a teacher, a neighbor; he can only be what we have been told — a stranger to her. This brings us back to the earlier questions; what is this old stranger doing in her room? and why is he permitted to be alone with her corpse for so long? It is clear that she is at home; it is also clear that there are no people present other than this forty-eight-year-old man whom Evelyn never knew.

As the mystery grows, one also wonders when and how she died. To answer the first question, it is reasonable to assume that she has died very recently; after all, she is still in her bed. Surely she has died within the past day or two; otherwise her corpse would be on display somewhere else in the house (not in her bedroom), or at a church, or possibly it would already be interred in a cemetery. I hope to show that she died in the last twelve hours, probably in the last six hours because, as we learn from the sixth line: 'Little has yet been changed, I think . . .' (6). The speaker here, as in other lines of this poem, invokes the passive voice to explain conditions, conveniently removing himself from any direct responsibility. A little voice in the back of my mind asks: 'Changed by whom?' and 'What is to be changed?' This line adds to the time sequencing, from 'hour' in the second line, the plucking of the flower in the fourth and now with the word 'yet' indicating that things will begin to change (soon) but have not 'yet.'

The eighth line tightens the time sequence even further by informing the reader that the night has passed and the sun has risen: 'no light may pass / Save two long rays through the hinge's chink' (7–8). The words 'two long rays' will take on an important meaning as the full scope of this poem is realized. Here, one could argue, it could be any time of the day, from sunrise to sunset. I suggest that it is very early in the morning; this argument is based on the important fact that no one is attending the corpse. Not only is no one in attendance (other than the stranger), but the whole house is deathly quiet; one would expect some commotion from within the household which had so

recently lost a loved one; surely there would be friends, relatives and/or neighbors dropping in to pay their last respects. There would be sounds of mourning, uncontrolled sobbing, anguish and comforting. I would think most of the mourners would want to at least see her body if not take the opportunity to speak to her or pray for the safe passage of her soul. None of this occurs; there are no sounds, no parents, no people. What could possibly account for this absence? I argue that the reason why 'Little has yet been changed' is because no one in her family is aware 'yet' that she has died during the night. Once her family discovers that she has died, everything will begin to change. This, therefore, implies that she died during the night. If so, how did she die? Why is the speaker in her bedroom? Why is he sitting on her bed? Had she died before he entered her room? How did he get into the room? Where is everyone? If she died during the night, the present time of the poem would need to be early dawn, perhaps as early as 4:00 or 5:00 a.m. The family will probably begin awakening around 6:00.

Line 11 introduces the first of many assertions of the speaker concerning Evelyn's character which makes one wonder how it would be possible for him to have known so much about her. The speaker says: 'It was not her time to love . . .' (11), and he tells us later, 'the time will come . . .' (33). We can assume that she loved her family, she probably loved some friends and other relatives. So what the speaker is referring to must be romantic love. Since Evelyn does not love him, what he really thinks is, 'It was not her time to love' —me. The deluded arrogance of this thought is hard to miss. Nevertheless, the speaker needs to justify or explain to himself why Evelyn does not love him. He seems to be completely baffled and shocked; he can neither accept nor believe her rejection. She did not love him, he concludes, because it was not 'her time to love' him. The reader can easily imagine a dozen reasons why she would not love him not the least of these would be their age difference, that he is a total stranger and that his life is very different from hers (they have nothing in common). In our imagined list of reasons why she would never love him, 'It was not her time,' would not even be considered. It would not be her time to love him even if she were twenty, forty or ninety years old! That he would make such an odd rationalization while sitting beside her corpse is another sign of his loss of touch with reality. As we learn at the end of the poem—: 'I loved you, Evelyn, all the while' (49) —he has always loved her (it does not seem to bother him much that she feels nothing for him); he is intent on telling us, the readers, that he still loves

her. Confessions of this sort are a mainstay of Browning's dramatic monologues.

The following description of Evelyn's life could come only from a close friend, a family member or a keen observer:

Her life had many a hope and aim,
Duties enough and little cares,
And now was quiet, now astir . . . (12–14)

These lines, combined with the phrase 'all the while' confirms that he has known her for a long time and that he had never approached her (since she had scarcely heard his name). A more modern word for his behavior would be called stalking. The speaker also foreshadows the extended time sequence with two words in line 14: 'now was.' Present and past are linked as the speaker believes 'In the new life come in the old one's stead' (40). Grammatically, 'then was' or 'now is' would be expected, but the speaker employs this combination twice 'now was quiet, now [was] astir'.

The next line, line 15, takes us even deeper into the mystery of Evelyn's death: 'Till God's hand beckoned unawares'. On a first reading, before any apparent suspicions, this line appears to mean that God suddenly took Evelyn's life; she dies of natural causes such as a sudden illness or perhaps a riding accident or a chicken bone lodged in her throat. The speaker is careful to avoid giving any reasons for God to have summoned her. But with a more thorough reading, especially in light of the reader's growing awareness that something is not quite right in Evelyn Hope's world, the line also suggests, ironically, a plurality of meaning in the word 'unawares' to include the possibility that God was also unaware, that is, her life was not intended to end at the age of sixteen. Stanza II concludes with the line: 'And the sweet white brow is all of her' (16), suggests that, while her body is covered, her 'sweet' face remains exposed, which reinforces the first word of the poem 'beautiful.' To the speaker, as well as to us readers, beautiful Evelyn Hope appears to be asleep and, as the speaker dictates in the last line of the poem, she 'will wake' after a delay.

This 'sleeping' and 'waking' is clearly not meant to suggest that she will suddenly come alive again physically in the near future; so in what way is the speaker using them? He has said both 'dead' and 'died,' and at the end of the poem he says 'the sweet cold hand', so it is clear that he is aware of her physical death. So, one wonders, in what way does he expect her to sleep and wake? This is answered in line 40:

she will wake 'In the new life come . . .'. The diction throughout the poem is soft, rhythmic, smooth and quite calming in contrast to what the reader is actually experiencing. As the reader becomes increasingly aware of what is really going on, this incongruity and shock produces a subtle kind of humor; the sweet old man sitting next to Evelyn has transformed into a crazed, determined, confused monster; perfect material for a Browning fiction. This leaves us with the unsettling feeling that her death was anything but natural. The way I see it, in the last few hours, 'even very recently' (Wisnicki 55), a beautiful and sweet girl of sixteen has died, her family is not yet aware of this tragedy, an unknown man of forty-eight has somehow gained entrance to Evelyn's bedroom during the night and, summing it all up, I am drawn to one single conclusion: he was there when she died. The reason she dies in his presence is because he killed her. Both Radner and Tanzy back away from actually calling the speaker a murderer. Tanzy makes his point clear: 'But of course this is speculation. Nothing in the poem convincingly shows either that Evelyn has been murdered or that the speaker did it' (156). I wholeheartedly disagree; many elements of the story suggest her murder: the man is a stranger alone in her room, he is 'thrice' her age, the absence of other people, he believed she would love him, she rejected his love, he was shocked and incensed that she would tell him so bluntly and, as argued in the opening of this paper, he has his own issues with the meaning of reality. Even with all this, he is still determined to 'claim' her 'for [his] own love's sake,' if she likes it or not. Tanzy accepts the speaker's words as truth believing that God has taken Evelyn's life. When reading Browning, I always reserve a little room to doubt the speaker's words, especially the mad ones. In this poem (as in others), the speaker not only speaks for God, he also acts for Him. In 'Porphyria's Lover,' the speaker says, after strangling Porphyria: 'God has not said a word!' (PL 60). If God had any objections to the murder, surely, in the killer's mind, He would have either prevented it or made some divine protest such as having a sudden tidal wave swallow the cottage or strike the killer with a sudden bolt of lightning. The speaker in 'Evelyn Hope' thinks along the same lines I think; that he serves as an agent of God, to perform His divine assignment; in this case he believes he is God's instrument. He speaks for God in the fourth stanza as well; here again, God shows His acceptance of murder by remaining silent.

Radner says: 'had Browning intended Evelyn's lover to be her murderer, he [Browning] would have made this explicit in the poem'

(Tanzy 157). In 'My Last Duchess' there is only the single subtle hint that the Duke caused the death of his wife when he says: 'I gave commands / Then all smiles stopped together' (MLD 45-46). Browning, himself, true to form, thrills in keeping the ambiguity alive when he comments much later in life: '. . . the commands were that she should be put to death, or he might have had her shut up in a convent' (DeVane 331). Anyone familiar with Browning knows of his subtlety and fascination with the abnormal and the insane often reflected in the criminal psychology of his many and varied characters. Beside 'Porphyria's Lover' and 'My Last Duchess,' other poems involved with murder of a spouse or loved one include 'The Laboratory,' 'In a Gondola,' *The Inn Album*, 'A Forgiveness,' *The Ring and the Book*, and 'Mr. Sludge.'² Wisnicki makes a similar observation: 'Browning, of course, is not above writing a poem where the lover poisons or even kills his beloved . . .' (55).

Within the third stanza, further evidence of the man's insanity is easily detected. The speaker suddenly shifts from the third person (where he talks to us, the reader, about Evelyn) and suddenly speaks directly to her in the second person. The first line of Stanza III, although softly spoken, is a major turning point of this poem: 'Is it too late then, Evelyn Hope?' A plethora of questions arises from this one seemingly simple question: Why does he suddenly address her? Why is the question in present tense although he is fully aware that she is dead? And the most important question is: 'too late' for what? This question remains unanswered until the end of the poem, although hints are given elsewhere.

In the remainder of the third stanza, the speaker tells Evelyn that her 'soul was pure and true' (19), that her spirit was made of 'fire and dew' (20). It was made by the stars; her birth through the 'horoscope' removes her even further from an earthly existence, as if she never had corporeal parents. She is more metaphysical, or spiritual than physical thereby making her murder as conscience-free as snapping off a geranium flower. In the next three lines, many of the mysteries of the poem begin to become clear:

And our paths in the world diverged so wide,
Each was naught to each, must I be told?
We were fellow mortals, naught beside? (22-24)

Lines 23 and 24 are perhaps the most critical lines in the poem,

and the four words 'must I be told' are, I think, the most incriminating words the speaker says. While they are expressed in the passive voice, 'must I be told' leaves us with no doubt that Evelyn had contact with this man, either written or oral where she said, in no uncertain terms 'Each was naught to each . . .'. The speaker breaks from his controlled, almost lullaby voice by bursting into an angry, hurt, accusing, pleading question ending with the words: 'must I be told?' The speaker asks Evelyn, in effect: 'Why did you have to tell me that we meant nothing to each other!? Why did you have to say that the only thing we had in common is that we are both human!?' In this admission of Evelyn's rejection, another hugely important question arises which demands an answer. When did she tell him these things? He may have made this first contact while she was 'plucking that piece of geranium . . .'. One wonders what he said, but it seems obvious how she reacted. She must have panicked and thought or said something like: 'Get away from me, you strange old man. I don't know you at all.' What he said to her must have frightened her to the core. To me, at least, a reasonable conclusion is that they first made contact in her bedroom during the night (otherwise, the family would have been on high alert for this unknown stalker). But since there does not appear to be any alarm within the family (the house is quiet throughout), the speaker must have waited until she was sound asleep. Then, after sneaking into her bedroom in the middle of the night, he may have been prepared to say the words from the last part of the poem but in second person and present tense:

I [have] loved you, Evelyn, all the while!
My heart seem[s] full as it [can] hold; (49–50)

One can easily imagine how Evelyn woke up, still drowsy and unfocused in her dark room, to find an old strange man sitting on her bed, next to her, perhaps holding her hands (or, just in case, a pillow) and crooning his endless love for her. From the depths of her soul, and the gruesome weight of panic, she may have tried to scream which our speaker was quick to interrupt. In her dying moments, suffocating through the pillow or through strangulation, he may have whispered his name which she would have scarcely heard. Now, in the early morning hour, this stalker and killer invites us, the reader, to join him on Evelyn Hope's bed. This style of writing is Browning in his stride; the beauty of this poetry is in direct contrast to the gruesome subject being described.

The reader is still left without a motive, other than the speaker's blind and obsessive infatuation. In his mind, even though Evelyn had never met him before and that there exists a thirty-two-year difference in their ages and that they are complete opposites, he hopes and expects that she will love him as much as he loves her. From his frame of mind, it is not difficult to understand his shock and disappointment at having been told that he meant nothing to her. He makes no attempt to explain or rationalize their differences, both in age and in their 'paths'; he admits these differences boldly. Remembering the speaker's own description that her spirit was made of 'fire and dew', I think it is reasonable to imagine that she reacted to this first contact with the 'fire' side of her spirit. The motive becomes clear in lines 23–25. Just as the speaker ends Stanza III in the impassioned plea— 'must I be told?' — he enters into Stanza IV with an emphatic and self-assured reply: 'No, indeed!' In other words, he says that he refuses to accept her rejection. His conclusion: 'No, indeed!', not surprisingly, answer his own questions. This double negative 'No' response means, at least in the speaker's belief, that Evelyn and he are not 'naught' to each other, that they do not have 'naught' in common; he is no more interested in her opinions than he is in her life. He negates them both. Yet, he claims to love her. For the second time in the poem, this stranger speaks for God and explains:

No, indeed! For God above
Is great to grant, as mighty to make,
And creates the love to reward the love (25–27)

The verbs—'grant,' 'make,' 'create' and 'reward'—are all within the realm of the divinity, except that these lines revolve around the words 'create the love to reward the love'. The 'love' is, of course, his ideal love for her, whether in this life or the next. This love has nothing to do with love for or of God; it is about his immense love for Evelyn. Therefore the 'great' and 'mighty' 'God above' will 'grant,' 'make,' 'create' and 'reward' his love by making Evelyn love him in the next life. Like many fanatics, of this he is certain; it is his unquestioned hope; he expects it of God. 'Once again,' writes Wisnicki, 'the speaker equates his wishes with those of God' (53). Earlier in the poem the speaker states that it 'was not her time to love', (since she rejected his advances) but with the mighty hand of God, her young cold heart will melt, and she will find herself as deeply in love with this stranger as he is in love with her. Traces of this same mad passion can be found in

other Browning poems including 'Too Late,' 'Cristina' 'In A Balcony,' 'Martin Relph' and 'Numpholeptos.' Our speaker answers his first question as well: 'Is it too late then, Evelyn Hope?' and the reply 'No, indeed!' answers all three questions.

Having regained his self-confidence through a self-convincing rationalization of Evelyn's rejection (and consequent murder), he states one of the most critical lines of the poem: 'I claim you still, for my own love's sake!' (28). Browning, of course, was aware of the triple meaning of the word 'still;' one meaning 'yet,' another meaning 'unmoving' (as in corpse!) and a third meaning 'quiet.' More important than the implied irony of this word is the phrase preceding it, 'I claim you' and the connotations of the verb 'claim.' This word is used for objects and possessions which, in the speaker's subconscious mind, is exactly what Evelyn means to him. Evelyn, according to Wisnicki, 'exists only within the speaker's mind, she becomes a passive, often manipulated object' (53). The aggressive verbs 'plucked,' 'claim' and 'taking' are, writes Radner, 'more suggestive of physical than spiritual reunion' (115-16). Evelyn is literally his to have and to hold. The truly disturbing twist of this man's thinking is the fact that her dead body makes no difference to him because he expects to 'claim' her soul, her spirit for his 'own love's sake!' whether she wants it or not. By all definitions, his love of Evelyn is possessive, arrogant, deluded, in fact, not love but selfish greed. Wisnicki points out that the speaker does not love 'the real Evelyn Hope, but the vision he has created with his own imagination . . . the relationship between the speaker and Evelyn . . . exists not in some tangible reality, but almost wholly within his mind.' (52). He wants to own and possess all of her, regardless of how she feels.

Beginning with line 29, the poem takes another unexpected turn. After claiming her he comments:

Delayed it may be for more lives yet,
Through worlds I shall traverse, not a few:
Much is to learn, much to forget
Ere the time be come for taking you. (29-32)

The speaker is once again in control, the words are softer, no more exclamation points. He announces to Evelyn's spirit that he can not 'take' her yet, 'take' being the companion verb to 'claim.' The 'time for . . . taking' her needs to be delayed. The reader immediately asks two questions: 'Take where?' and 'Take what?' To answer the

second question first, he obviously is not going to take her corpse. Instead, he aims to take her soul, her spirit, to be with him eternally. This understanding makes the answer to the first question easier to comprehend; he is going to take her spirit with him into everlasting life as he says in line 40: 'In the new life come in the old one's stead.' In an odd twist, the ambient irony of his love shows a second side which is remarkably innocent and not a little romantic. (Much kinder than the Duke of Ferrara's who kills his wife and begins planning his next marriage.) This madman, in his own possessively sick way, really does love his imagined ideal of Evelyn Hope. 'He is,' according to E. Warwick Slinn, 'in love with a paradigm rather than an individual and the reality and power of that image lead him to an identification with the constructions of his own belief' (81). It is his obsessed love of the ideal Evelyn which makes him so lethal.

Still, the reader wonders why this man needs to delay. The answer to that is, I think, not difficult: in order for him to take her soul into the afterlife, he will need to die too. He is apparently not ready for that quite yet because he has a lot of things to do first. One would think that with his over-abiding love for her, he would want to join her at once. In his mind at least, Evelyn's spirit can wait because time does not exist for her spirit which will 'wake' when he eventually dies and joins her. Tanzy makes an interesting point when he writes: 'It may be abnormal for a live older man to love a very young girl, but it will be quite normal for a dead lover to love a dead girl whatever their respective age. Death is an effective equalizer. . .' (155). Marshall puts this same point succinctly: 'Her death has obliterated the discrepancy in their ages as an impediment to their love' (33). In the next life, these two spirits, like 'two long rays' will be intertwined forever piercing the darkness together. Once again, the reader is faced with another batch of questions. The speaker explains that he must first 'traverse' many worlds and that he has 'much to learn, much to forget'. This is the second hint of the speaker's life aside from Evelyn. The first hint told us earlier that his 'path diverged so wide' of hers. Her life, we are told, 'had many a hope and aim, / Duties enough and little cares' (13-14). Her pathway through life was normal; his path, on the other hand, is anything but normal. He must continue to travel throughout the world, visit many countries, 'learn' and 'forget' many things. Again, one wonders why he needs to travel so much and what he must learn and forget. A possible answer to this comes later.

Nevertheless, the speaker opens the fifth stanza with a promise to

Evelyn: 'But the time will come—at last it will' (33) for him to take her into eternity. Even as the line separating reality and fantasy is blurred in this man's mind, so too is time. The speaker commingles time, past, present and future; the speaker projects the next 14 lines onto his future self while looking back on the present: 'I shall say . . .' From this eerie perspective he asks the question: 'What meant . . . that body and soul so pure and gay?' (34–36). Because he is reflecting on the present from the future, 'in the years long still' (again the triple meaning of 'still'), he says to Evelyn, to put it simply: 'I shall tell you the meaning of your body and soul.' Are those the words of a compassionate lover? of a sane person? He describes her as being 'in the lower earth,' (death of body) referring to her physical self, therefore temporal and corporeal as opposed to the 'higher earth,' of the spiritual (life — or afterlife of soul).

Not only is time intermingled and blurred, but the speaker also shifts from second person to third person and then back again to second when he speaks of her body. Nowhere else in this poem does the speaker use the second person when referring to Evelyn's physicality; in Stanza V he says 'that body' not 'your body.' Yet, in the next two lines he refers to 'your hair' and 'your mouth.' In Stanza VII he says 'the . . . smile,' 'the hair,' 'the . . . hand.' The reason behind these shifts in grammar is, I think, that in the speaker's mind, the color of the younger golden-haired girl is blurred with the older Evelyn with amber-colored hair. Although he seems to be confused about the color of her hair, the passion he feels for her 'red mouth' remains constant in his imagination.

To make matters worse for poor Evelyn's soul, this man has already concluded what Evelyn will do with him in their future life together: 'And what you would do with me, in fine / In the new life come in the old one's stead' (39–40). The wording of the phrase 'And what you would do with me' is not a question (nor a conditional); it is part of the answer to his statement that he will explain 'In the new life' the meaning of her 'body and soul', as well as tell her what she is supposed to do with him. The preposition 'with' has a double meaning here; one sense means 'together,' and the other is used as in the question: 'What are you going to do with your old car?' Either way the word 'with' is to be interpreted, he has already prepared the explanation and will demand that behavior from her. Evelyn has no say whatsoever in her destiny. Tanzy explains: 'after they are both dead he will tell her how he has 'Given up myself so many times . . .'' (156).

The speaker continues describing the present from the perspective of the distant future in the sixth stanza: 'I have lived (I shall say) so much since then' (41). The description of the many extraordinary things he will have accomplished in the long years ahead are quite remarkable. Here is what he says: by the time he is ready to 'claim' Evelyn, he will have done the following:

Given up myself so many times,
Gained me the gains of various men,
Ransacked the ages, spoiled the climes (42–44)

Line 44 just quoted may be the least understood line in the entire poem. Radner interprets the verbs from this line: "'ransacked' denotes pillaging, and 'spoiled' suggests dirtying.' Together, these two verbs 'imply defilement, . . .' (116). The undercurrent of sexuality and violence (as in 'Porphyria's Lover') has been commented on by a number of critics. Citing Radner once more, she writes that 'Evelyn Hope' 'is a non-sexual cover-up for the aggressive sexuality of the narrator . . .' (115). Marshall comments on 'the passion the speaker feels for the girl' and says that 'her death . . . has augmented his passion for her' (33). Tanzy agrees fully with Radner; they both 'see the lover's deeply sexual interest in Evelyn . . .' (155). All of the gaining, ransacking and spoiling is inherently violent and not a little sensual. Radner comments on the explicit sexuality of these verbs and others (including plucking, claiming and taking). Not only the verbs, but the speaker also refers to the passionate color of red: 'your mouth of your own geranium's red', and 'the red young mouth'.

Although passion is clearly at the heart of this poem, a sexual violation of Evelyn seems most unlikely, both from the context of this poem and the whole of Robert Browning's works. To suggest a non-consensual sexual relationship between Evelyn and the speaker requires a rather large stretch of the imagination. Though the ambiguity of the sexual overtones remains for the individual reader to determine, the speaker's need to control and possess another character is not uncommon with Browning. 'The fantasy of a man in complete possession of a woman only when she is dead recurs frequently in Browning's work' (Tracy 60).

That still leaves the meaning of the line— 'Ransacked the ages, spoiled the climes' —without an adequate interpretation. Marshall writes: "'Ransacked' and 'spoiled' are not words that are ordinarily

used to describe experience . . .' (34). He points out the oddity of those two words, but to my knowledge, neither he nor anyone else has written specifically about the meaning of these two words in relation to what the speaker plans to do. In the absence of any alternatives, I will step out on a limb here and suggest two possible explanations. First, perhaps he sees himself, projected into the future, as a powerful political leader, perhaps a king, with equally powerful military might. How else could one man 'ransack the ages' and 'spoil the climes'? It would seem that the only possible means of wrecking such destruction would be through a revolution or war (or some kind of social catastrophe of Biblical proportions). It is reasonable to interpret the phrase 'Given up myself' in a way which does not signify the meaning of 'surrender' as much as 'compromise' and 'deception' in order to 'gain the gains of various men' including the acquisition of power, position and wealth as he 'traverse[s]' 'Through worlds . . . not a few' (30). The reader, of course, finds these delusions of grandeur beyond mere fantasy and can only interpret them as a kind of metaphysical superhuman dream, additional evidence of his madness.

A second hypothesis makes more sense to me. The speaker could be or see himself as a professional actor who must continue to perform his plays on the world-wide stage. (Browning wrote five plays for the theater and was intimately familiar with the life of drama and its actors. In his poem 'A Light Woman,' Browning even makes fun of himself by writing: 'Robert Browning, you writer of plays.') The speaker in 'Evelyn Hope' says: 'Much is to learn, much to forget' (31); this may refer to the stage lines he continually rehearses (while forgetting former ones). Two lines previously he says: 'Delayed it may be for more lives yet' (29), with the word 'lives' serving as either a verb or a noun. An actor performs the 'lives' of many different characters. And, of course, an actor needs an audience and employs us to serve as his audience through the double commands 'sit' and 'watch.' Playing different roles ('Given up myself') while performing the stage dramas, he will have 'gained [himself] the gains of various men,' the other men being fellow actors as well as gains from the playwright and the audience. Along the way he also hopes to 'gain' recognition and awards for his performances. While acting in tragedies he will ransack 'the ages' and spoil 'the climes'. To the speaker, the consequence of Evelyn's death is negligible; there is always Act II when all the players rise from the stage, prepare for new roles and begin again. The line between reality and drama is blurred in this speaker's mind; on the

stage, age differences, love, hate, life and death, fantasy and reality are nothing more than the lines in the play. If he is an actor, he is quite mad, but not as delusional as the first hypothesis would suggest.

After gaining 'the gains of various men,' ransacking 'the ages' and spoiling 'the climes', the speaker admits that even with all he has done, (that is, will do), he has not been able to acquire 'one thing,' that 'thing' being his possession of Evelyn. Once again, he returns to the present tense and says: 'And I want and find you, Evelyn Hope! / What is the issue? Let us see!' (47-48). The comically odd question: 'What is the issue?' helps us see a little further into the speaker's frame of mind. The girl he has always loved is now dead. One would expect a heart-rending agony, tears welling up from the depths of his soul, perhaps a temptation to commit suicide to be able to be with his love. All this man can do is objectively ask: 'What is the issue?' as if her death is of no more consequence to him than a leaf falling from a tree. He answers this question in Stanza VII where he speaks to both Evelyns, her spirit and her body:

I loved you Evelyn, all the while!
My heart seemed full as it could hold?
There was place and to spare for the frank young smile,
And the red young mouth, and the hair's young gold. (49-52)

In the very next line, the speaker says: 'So hush,—I will give you this leaf to keep' (53). The admonition to 'hush' is also a (stage) command for silence, his ever present demand for control and domination in this drama. The 'hush' is also required so as not to alert the family. Additionally, one wonders where this leaf came from; could he have plucked it from the same geranium plant from which Evelyn plucked the flower? The fact that he has carried the leaf with him into her bedroom suggests a determined preparedness and premeditation, knowing 'all the while' that he would be giving it to her (turning over a new leaf in the next life, so to speak) as a reminder.

The next line is equally revealing: 'See, I shut it inside the sweet cold hand!' (54). We, (the readers and his attentive audience), are forced to witness his mad, one-sided love given through this symbol. Having come this far, the reader can not help but wonder why the speaker places a leaf in her hand. Why a leaf? A lowly, common leaf?³ Not a love note, a diamond, not even a flower which, as with everything else between these two, Evelyn has no choice but to accept. The answer seems obvious to me; he does not want to raise suspicion once her

death has been discovered. He could have given her a pebble, a twig or a piece of bark, but the likelihood of a young girl dying while clutching any of those would be remote. A leaf is not suspicious and it fits nicely (and symbolically) with the 'piece of geranium-flower'. While avoiding words such as mad, insane or even deranged, Slinn interprets the leaf-giving gesture as 'a final representation of the speaker's devotion to maiden innocence, to a virginal purity which becomes the idealised mythic goal of all desire . . . (81).

To the speaker, 'the sweet cold hand' is nothing more than part of a dead and empty shell, along with 'the smile,' 'the mouth,' and 'the hair.' In the next-to-last line, he says: 'There, that's our secret: go to sleep!' He orders her to sleep, an image of suspended animation, a period of waiting so that he can continue with his ambitious future. The speaker hopes that after 'the years long still,' after his own death, his spirit will find and join with Evelyn's. At that moment, she 'will wake, and remember, and understand' 'In the new life come'. As Tanzy puts it: 'there certainly is something for Evelyn to remember when she awakens after death, and something for her to understand: how love can destroy its unattainable object in order to attain that object eventually' (156).

This final irony can not help but send chills up the reader's spine; should Evelyn actually wake 'In the new life' and find herself in the presence of her crazed murderer, what she is bound to remember will not be his love, but his madness and violence: how he stalked her for years, how he demands and takes not only her body but also her soul. She will remember his psychotic possessiveness, perseverance and selfishness. The speaker hopes, on the other hand, that she will remember how much he loves her, and that will be a sufficient catalyst for her to love him in return, a clear reminder of his insanity. He will never give up hope that Evelyn will 'understand' his love and his determination to have her. Conversely, the speaker might be just as pleased if she remembers and understands his evil; if she remembers and understands the murder, violence and possession, perhaps when she wakes, 'In the new life', she will not be so quick to reject him a second time; either way, he wins in his imagination. (Ironically, in reality, either way he loses.) In his twisted logic, if she remembers and understands his madness, in order for her soul to exist in peace, she will have to accept his demands, and pretend to love him throughout eternity.

Pride, murder and madness are not infrequent in Browning's

imagination and works, but what sets this poem apart from most of the others is the everlasting effect of evil which carries over from this life to the next. Evelyn was killed at sixteen but her horror does not end there; in fact, it will never end if he has his way. In the next life, she will be forced to spend eternity with this madman. What choices does she have? She will either wake into 'the new life come' to face the madman who killed her and wants to possess her throughout eternity or she will never wake. The speaker's flights of fantasy into the world beyond with the unwilling soul of Evelyn Hope should, of itself, be sufficient evidence of the man's insanity. That he does not follow quickly on the heels of her death as proof of his love underscores the questionable nature of his love for her. That he adamantly rejects and overrules her protests in the name of love then 'claims' her 'for [his] own love's sake . . .' to take her against her will 'In the new life come' should leave little room to place any trust in his sanity. That he intends to ransack 'the ages' and spoil 'the climes' 'in the years long still,' is perhaps the strongest evidence of his deranged mental state. Slinn writes that the 'excessive nature of' the speaker's desire 'is an emotional extravagance which verges on self-parody' (81). Evelyn's lover even commands her to 'hush' before placing the leaf in her hand; here as well, she is ordered to remain quiet and then is told to 'go to sleep!' He controls every single aspect of Evelyn's life and death with fanatic confidence born of obsessive passion. Knowing the speaker's twisted mental condition, would anyone, including Mr. and Mrs. Hope, allow this unknown stranger to spend an hour or more alone with their sixteen-year-old daughter, allowing him to sit next to her on her bed while admiring her hair and 'red young mouth' and touching her hand? I sincerely think not. So, what is he doing in her bedroom in the first place? For me, the only logical answer is that he entered her room unnoticed and uninvited to do what he had to do so that he and she will be together throughout the whole of eternity, regardless of what Evelyn or God has to say about it.

As well crafted and hauntingly beautiful as this poem is, one wonders whether Browning might have had a little more in mind than a story of unrequited love. Perhaps the inspiration behind this poem came from a more detailed look at Evelyn Hope's name. 'Evelyn,' writes Radner, 'means, literally, 'little Eve.' Read as such, together with hope, we can see that Browning is summarizing the man's attitude toward the girl and the double levels of the poem: Eve, the temptress; little because she is so young and innocent: a child-like seductress;

hope for the spiritual fulfillment of this love and also to be able to claim the girl again, somehow' (157). That may be; still, if one were to change the soft vowel sound of Evelyn to the long vowel sound as in Eve, a whole new reading of this poem is possible. Perhaps Browning heard or conceived the phrase 'Evil in Hope,' and latched onto that concept as the source of a delightfully hideous poem.

Of course, there is nothing in Browning's memoirs to suggest that he had this phrase in mind while creating 'Evelyn Hope,' but the concept fits so firmly to the story that, either consciously intended or not, a plausible new reading of the poem presents itself. 'Beautiful Evil in Hope is dead.' And what is the beautiful Evil to be found in Hope? It could be argued that the speaker's hope is the ultimate Hope in this poem. He hopes that she will love him, he hopes to be with her, and even after killing her he hopes that she will 'wake, remember and understand'—and return—his love. His hopes are, of course, evil, but for his 'love's sake', stalking, murdering and claiming her soul are merely a means to a beautiful end. In the speaker's mind, his first hope was that Evelyn would have accepted him in this life. His second and greater hope (and ever more so evil) will be to join Evelyn's soul 'In the new life' where she 'will wake, and remember and understand.'

As to the deceased poem 'Evelyn Hope,' perhaps future readers will 'remember and understand' that this is a Browning creation which means, ipso facto, things are rarely the way they seem.

Notes

¹ Certainly, the girl in 'Golden Hair' was young, sweet, innocent and also died, probably, of natural causes. We learn, however, that midway through the poem, she was not so innocent after all. Additionally, the poem was based on a true story, see Pettigrew, Vol. 1, 1150.

² In the poem, Hiram H. Horsefall murdered his mother.

³ Could Browning be using this leaf as a pun? Leaf is also used as part of a book, a script or folded sheet of paper. There is also the more archaic use of the word 'lief' as in Browning's own words in the preceding poem 'A Lovers' Quarrel' where he writes: 'I'd as lief that the blue were grey.' The similarity to the words 'life,' 'leaf' and 'lief' could suggest that he is giving her a new life. The word 'belief' is also a derivative of 'lief,' and more than anything else, the speaker wants Evelyn to believe in his love.

Works Cited

- DeVane, William Clyde. *The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning*. Binghamton, New York: The Vail-Ballou Press, F. S. Crofts & Co., 1934.
- Drew, Philip. *The Poetry of Browning: A Critical Introduction*. London, Methuen & Co. LTD, 1970.
- Jack, Ian. *Browning's Major Poetry*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Marshall, George O. 'Evelyn Hope's Lover.' *Victorian Poetry* 4 (1966): 32–34.
- Radner, Susan. 'Love and the Lover in Browning's 'Evelyn Hope.'" *Literature and Psychology* 16:2 (Spring 1966): 115–16.
- Ryals, Clyde De L. *The Life of Robert Browning*. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993.
- Slinn, E. Warwick. *Browning and the Fictions of Identity*. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1982.
- Tanzy, C. E. and Susan Radner, 'Madness and Hope in Browning's 'Evelyn Hope.'" *Literature and Psychology* 17 (1967): 155–58.
- Thomas, Donald. *A Life Within a Life*. New York: Viking Press, 1982.
- Tracy, Clarence. ed. *Browning's Mind and Art*. Edinburgh: London; Oliver and Boyd, 1968.
- Wisnicki, Adrian. 'Some Kind of Melancholia: Mourning in Four Poems by Robert Browning.' *Browning Society Notes* 27 Dec. 2000: 46–67.

Evelyn Hope

Robert Browning (*Men and Women* – 1855)

I

Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead!
 Sit and watch by her side an hour.
 That is her book-shelf, this her bed;
 She plucked that piece of geranium-flower,
 Beginning to die too, in the glass;
 Little has yet been changed, I think:
 The shutters are shut, no light may pass
 Save two long rays through the hinge's chink.

5

II

Sixteen years old when she died!
 Perhaps she had scarcely heard my name; 10
 It was not her time to love; beside,
 Her life had many a hope and aim,
 Duties enough and little cares,
 And now was quiet, now astir,
 Till God's hand beckoned unawares,— 15
 And the sweet white brow is all of her.

III

Is it too late then, Evelyn Hope?
 What, your soul was pure and true,
 The good stars met in your horoscope, 20
 Made you of spirit, fire and dew—
 And, just because I was thrice as old
 And our paths in the world diverged so wide,
 Each was naught to each, must I be told?
 We were fellow mortals, naught beside?

IV

No, indeed! for God above 25
 Is great to grant, as mighty to make,
 And creates the love to reward the love:
 I claim you still, for my own love's sake!
 Delayed it may be for more lives yet,
 Through worlds I shall traverse, not a few: 30
 Much is to learn, much to forget
 Ere the time be come for taking you.

V

But the time will come,—at last it will,
 When, Evelyn Hope, what meant (I shall say)
 In the lower earth, in the years long still, 35
 That body and soul so pure and gay?
 Why your hair was amber, I shall divine,
 And your mouth of your own geranium's red—
 And what you would do with me, in fine,
 In the new life come in the old one's stead. 40

VI

I have lived (I shall say) so much since then,
 Given up myself so many times,
 Gained me the gains of various men,
 Ransacked the ages, spoiled the climes;
 Yet one thing, one, in my soul's full scope, 45
 Either I missed or itself missed me:
 And I want and find you, Evelyn Hope!
 What is the issue? Let us see!

VII

I loved you, Evelyn, all the while!
 My heart seemed full as it could hold? 50
 There was place and to spare for the frank young smile,
 And the red young mouth, and the hair's young gold.
 So, hush,—I will give you this leaf to keep:
 See, I shut it inside the sweet cold hand!
 There, that is our secret: go to sleep! 55
 You will wake, and remember, and understand.

From Robert Browning: *The Poems* Vol. 1, John Pettigrew, Ed.

Conrad's Ideas of Gastronomy: Dining in 'Falk'

Paul Vlitos

Introduction

In the century and more since Joseph Conrad's 'Falk: A Reminiscence' was first published, the tale has been examined from a variety of critical perspectives.¹ I would like to begin by considering some of these responses, in order to locate this paper's perhaps surprising claim that 'Falk' is a story about dining.

Conrad himself described 'Falk' as a 'contrast of commonplace sentimentality with the uncorrupted point-of-view of an almost primitive man (Falk himself) who regards the preservation of life as the supreme and moral law' (Karl and Davies, ii.402).² Both Redmond O'Hanlon and Walter E. Anderson have focussed on the narrative's depiction of an 'almost primitive man' to claim 'Falk' as a case-study in reverse evolution. Approaching the tale's claims about primitivism 'from a postcolonial perspective', Harry Sewlall has attempted to unravel 'the narrator's own preconceptions and prejudices', and to read 'Falk' in contrapuntal relation to 'Cannibalism as a Trope in Colonial Discourse' (Sewlall 1).

Nevertheless the fullest account of 'Falk' as a whole remains Tony Tanner's "'Gnawed Bones" and "Artless Tales" — Eating and Narrative in Conrad'. Drawing on Claude Lévi-Strauss as well as Conrad's own preface to his wife Jessie's *Handbook of Cookery for a Small House* (1923), Tanner emphasizes the parallels in the tale between the acts of cooking and eating and the act of narration. Both, Tanner argues, are ways of making sense of the world: 'We must eat to live, but we must also narrate to live' (35). In 'Falk', 'the one piece of fiction by Conrad in which literal cannibalism is at the centre of the action' (Tanner 19), these activities stand in an unusually vexed

relation to each other. Tanner approvingly discusses Lévi-Strauss's suggestion that 'the cooking of any society is a kind of language which in various ways says something about how that society feels about its relations to nature and culture' (26).³ For Tanner, 'Falk' is a tale about 'the breakdown of categories', in which Falk himself is forced by circumstances to reconsider 'hitherto unquestioned taxonomies' (28). Among the categories broken down is that of the edible, the limits of which the tale and Falk himself explore.

This paper will focus on a related but previously underexamined categorical distinction in the tale: that between eating and dining. If cooking and eating are 'a kind of language', dining can be seen as the attempt to say something more specific in that language.⁴ As Isabella Beeton puts it:

Dining is the privilege of civilization. The rank which a people occupy in the grand scale may be measured by their way of taking their meals, as well as by their way of treating their women. (363)

Perverse as it may seem to read Conrad's 1901 narrative of high-seas cannibalism and social breakdown through Beeton's 1861 *Book of Household Management*, this paper nevertheless suggests that they share an important set of anxieties about dining, or rather what it means to dine. As Beeton makes clear, 'It is not a dinner at which sits the aboriginal Australian, who gnaws his bone half bare and then flings it behind to his squaw' (363). 'Falk', I will argue, presents a series of meals which unsettle the distinction between eating and dining. In doing so, it raises difficulties for the attempt to use meals as a way of measuring a people's rank in the grand scale, or indeed even to distinguish the civilized from the 'aboriginal' or primitive. Tanner, O' Hanlon, Anderson, Sewlall, and Conrad himself have all asserted that the relationship between the civilized and the primitive is central to 'Falk'. However, this paper argues that there has not previously been sufficient acknowledgement of the ways in which 'Falk's deliberate engagement with theories of the relationship between eating and dining informs and complicates the question of how the civilized and primitive might be distinguished. Dining is, in 'Falk' as in Beeton, one of the standards by which civilization can be judged.

The paper will begin by focussing on what it takes as a key moment in the tale: a discussion of the usefulness of gastronomy in making judgements about character. It will be argued that this discussion highlights the tale's interest in the question of what it means to dine.

The second part of the paper examines the attempts of previous critics to explain the enormous number and variety of references to food and consumption (both literal and metaphorical) in 'Falk'. The third part of the paper explores Conrad's own opinions about dining and its significance. The fourth part of the paper investigates the tale's allusions to previous literary dinners. The fifth and final part of the paper reads 'Falk' against the chapter in Beeton's text devoted to 'Dinners and Dining', in order to suggest what each text helps illuminate in the other.

Falk's Ideas of Gastronomy

Early on in his story, the unnamed narrator of 'Falk' makes it clear that he has no interest in gastronomy, or in theorizing about the meaning of dinner:

I was engaged just then in eating despondently a piece of stale Dutch cheese, being too much crushed to care what I swallowed myself, let alone bothering my head about Falk's ideas of gastronomy. I could expect from their study no clue as to his conduct in matters of business, which seemed to me unrestrained by morality or even by the commonest sort of decency. (100)

What, then, justifies the claim that 'Falk' is centrally concerned with such ideas?

The narrator, a 'man of over fifty' who 'had commanded ships for a quarter of a century', is reminiscing to a small party, 'all more or less connected with the sea', in a 'small river-hostelry not more than thirty miles from London' (77).⁵ He tells the assembled company of 'an absurd episode [...], now many years ago, when I first got command of an iron barque, loading then in a certain Eastern seaport.'⁶ This 'absurdity', he begins by explaining, 'concerns only me, my enemy Falk, and my friend Hermann' (78).

The narrator has first encountered Falk in a professional capacity, and he is introduced to the reader with a description of his 'conduct in matters of business':

He was a Scandinavian of some sort, and a bloated monopolist to boot. [...] His tariff of charges for towing ships in and out was the most brutally inconsiderate document of the sort I had ever seen. He was the commander and owner of the only tug-boat on the river [...]. He extracted his pound and a half of flesh from each of

us merchant-skippers with an inflexible sort of indifference which made him detested and even feared. ('Falk', 89)

Falk's vessel is steam-powered and as the narrator reflects, 'this is an age of steam. The exclusive possession of a marine boiler had given Falk the whip hand of us all' (103). When Falk suspects that he and the narrator are in competition for the affections of the niece of the narrator's 'friend' Hermann, Falk simply drags Hermann's ship out of the harbour.

To the narrator, who is at the time unaware of Falk's unfounded suspicion, the act is a mystery. Having complained at the agent's office and received no explanation, the narrator drops in for tiffin at one of the town's two hotels. Over his 'stale Dutch cheese' he is told of Falk's peculiar 'ideas of gastronomy' by the keeper of the hotel, the notorious gossip Schomberg.⁷ Having offered his opinion that 'Falk isn't a man to make mistakes except on purpose', and that his motive was to 'curry favour on the cheap with Hermann' (97), Schomberg embarks on a bitter account of Falk's refusal to eat at the hotel:

'Last year I started this table d'hôte,⁸ and sent cards out — you know. You think he has had one meal in the house? Give the thing a trial? Not once. He has got hold now of a Madras cook — a blamed fraud that I hunted out of my cookhouse with a rattan. He was not fit to cook for white men. No, not for the white men's dogs either; but, see, any damned native that can boil a pot of rice is good enough for Mr. Falk. Rice and a little fish he buys for a few cents from the fishing-boats outside is what he lives on. You would hardly credit it — eh? A white man, too...' (97)

Two immediate explanations are suggested: 'He's a vegetarian, perhaps,' offers the narrator; 'He's a miser' insists Schomberg (both 98). Although the narrator tactfully avoids pointing it out to Schomberg, Falk need be neither miserly nor vegetarian to avoid dining at Schomberg's hotel. The meat is both bad and expensive, as well as being of dubious origin. The narrator speculates about 'infamous buffalo meat' (98). Nor has the rest of the European community (for whom the table d'hôte is exclusively intended) rushed to take up Schomberg's hospitality. The narrator dines surrounded by empty chairs, feeling 'as if I had intruded upon a tiffin of ghostly Presences' (98).

Schomberg's 'irrelevant babble' (99) about Falk's eating habits has not come to an end, however. His dismay extends beyond what Falk

eats, to how he does so. Indeed, this is what Schomberg claims as 'the most degrading thing':

They take the dish up to the wheelhouse with a cover on it, and he shuts both the doors before he begins to eat. Fact! Must be ashamed of himself. (98)

Schomberg has heard from Ferdinand da Costa, Falk's engineer, that the Captain will not allow his crew to cook meat either:

the rows on board every time a little smell of cooking gets about the deck! [...] The other day da Costa got the cook to fry a steak for him — a turtle steak it was too, not beef at all — and the fat caught or something. Young da Costa himself was telling me of it here in this room. 'Mr. Schomberg [...] if I had let a cylinder cover blow off through the skylight by my negligence Captain Falk couldn't have been more savage. He frightened the cook so that he won't put anything on the fire for me now.' (99)

'Is he expected to eat his meat raw?' Schomberg asks in outrage.

This apparent digression into the proprieties of dining is likely to seem as irrelevant to the reader as it does to the tale's baffled protagonist. If there is a connection in the passage between 'conduct in matters of business', 'ideas of gastronomy' and 'decency'⁹, it is Schomberg's own grasping, hypocritical 'psychology' that seems to be illuminated. Of course, as the narrator has subsequently discovered, and readers of 'Falk' soon will, there is an explanation for Falk's behaviour that hinges neither on vegetarianism nor miserliness. For the origin of Falk's unusual domestic arrangements lies in the fact that he has been compelled, in extremis, to kill and eat another human. Most likely raw, if that would compound Schomberg's horror.

Unlike Schomberg, the narrator of 'Falk' is openly sceptical about gastronomy — in the sense of a science or philosophy of food and eating.¹⁰ Certainly the narrator does not seem familiar with Brillat-Savarin's aphorisms, which include the claim: 'Tell me the kind of food you eat, and I will tell you the kind of man you are'.¹¹ Nor does it appear he has read Beeton, in whose text the phrase is translated and approvingly quoted (367). To Schomberg's dismay, Falk refuses to eat like what he is: 'A white man should eat like a white man, dash it all,' he cries, 'Ought to eat meat, must eat meat' (98). Like Beeton, Schomberg asserts that 'Dining is the privilege of civilization' — or at least race. Not to eat like or even with the other Europeans is according

to Schomberg an outrage to racial and gastronomic propriety. It is, of course, the financial effect that this has on Schomberg that he seems to feel most deeply. Schomberg's attitude represents a reductive parody of Brillat-Savarin's aphorism: his judgements about Falk are rooted not in what Falk eats, but in who gets the financial benefit. 'I won't talk about the fellow,' Schomberg claims, inaccurately, 'I don't think he has six drinks from year's end to year's end in my place' (89). While Schomberg appears to be acknowledging his unfamiliarity with Falk, he instead offers this information as a bitter criticism of him.

However, it is not only Schomberg who is obsessed with the meaning of dining. The narrator's dismissive, facetious, reference to Falk's 'ideas of gastronomy' paradoxically directs our attention to the ways in which the tale as a whole is based on an attempt to investigate the relationship between dining, civilization and psychology. Despite the narrator's rejection of Brillat-Savarin's aphorism, it is nevertheless Falk's cannibalism that seems to offer the key to explaining his behaviour. 'Falk' itself can be seen to dramatize Brillat-Savarin's aphorism, hinging as it does on the attempt to explain the relationship between what 'kind of food' Falk has eaten, and 'what kind of man' Falk is. As the next section of this paper will explore further, 'Falk' is a tale in which food and eating play a remarkably prominent part.

Before this paper goes on to explore what previous critics have made of this proliferation of references to eating, however, I would like to emphasize what I have attempted to highlight by detaching the narrator's conversation with Schomberg from its context in 'Falk' as a whole. Rather than 'irrelevant babbling' (as the narrator calls it), it is tempting to interpret the significance of the scene as revealed only by what Ian Watt has dubbed 'delayed decoding' (Watt, 276). That is to say, that what seems like a pointless conversation is later illuminated by the discovery that Falk is a cannibal. I want to suggest that this is not in fact the case — or at least not entirely. Falk rejects not only meat, but commensality. I want to suggest that while they are obviously deeply entangled, we can nevertheless distinguish the tale's interest in eating from its interest in dining. While Falk is the only cannibal in 'Falk', he is far from being its only solitary eater. Rather than a series of meals that all prefigure the revelation of Falk's act of cannibalism, 'Falk' can instead be read as a series of dinners that fail, each in different ways, and which in doing so comment both on each other, and on what it means to dine.

'Tell me the kind of food you eat, and I will tell you the kind of

man you are,' Brillat-Savarin claims. But in another aphorism he shifts this emphasis from the question of what is eaten, to suggest that 'the destiny of great nations depends on the manner in which they are fed' (also quoted in Beeton, 367). It is how, and with whom, we eat that distinguishes a dinner from a meal — the questions that trouble 'Falk' are how it does so, whether this distinction is tenable and what such a distinction might mean.

Critical Responses to 'Falk'

In his 1919 'Author's Note' on 'Falk' Conrad observes that the tale 'offended the delicacy of one critic at least by certain peculiarities of its subject' (219). Punning on 'delicacy', this is an acknowledgement of bad literary taste that wilfully compounds the offence. For subsequent critics, of stronger stomach perhaps, it is this 'peculiarity' that has drawn them to the tale, and provided the basis of their ruminations.

Falk is the only survivor of the Borgmester Dahl, a cargo steamer that broke down on its maiden voyage, 'somewhere halfway between Good Hope and New Zealand' (136), ten years before Falk's encounter with the narrator. Stranded at sea, order on the ship collapses, the men giving themselves up to despair and pointless quarrelling. 'The organised life of the ship had come to an end. The solidarity of the men had gone,' Falk recalls (139). Rather than 'delayed decoding', the horror of Falk's account derives from our advance knowledge of what is about to occur. The rest of the crew have given up hope of survival, becoming 'living skeletons' (139) or destroying themselves. Only Falk and the ship's carpenter are resolved to preserve themselves by any means. It is, at least according to Falk's account, the carpenter who first speaks of cannibalism, commenting (not quite accurately) that 'There was nothing eatable left on board' (140). The crew, 'listless feeble spectres, slunk off to hide in fear of each other', leaving only Falk and the Carpenter on deck (140).

Rather than allying themselves to choose a weaker victim, Falk and the carpenter turn on each other. After the carpenter attempts to bludgeon Falk to death with a cross-bar while he is drinking at the water-pump, both arm themselves with revolvers and take up positions, waiting for a victim to approach the ship's only supply of fresh water. After a day and a night, having snuck to a porthole of the cabin into which Falk has barricaded himself, the carpenter reaches

through it and tries to shoot Falk. Missing, he is himself shot dead. By Falk's logic, 'The best man had survived' (141). Falk then proceeds to eat the carpenter, having first thrown his former shipmate's revolver into the sea — 'He was a born monopolist' the narrator comments (141).

Falk finally reveals his secret because he wishes to marry Hermann's niece, but refuses to do so without having told her and her family of 'his terrible misfortune' (129). Indeed, the desire to do so is 'gnawing' away at him (134). Rather optimistically, Falk suggests that his revelation 'would affect the domestic arrangements of their home, but, once told, it need not be alluded to again for the rest of their lives' (128).

Hermann, who refuses to listen to the details of or circumstances behind Falk's confession, puts his main objection to the marriage succinctly: 'The thoughts that would come into their heads every time they sat down to a meal. Horrible! Horrible!' (Falk, 132). Hermann's horror is not so much at the act itself, but at Falk's decision to tell them about it. Notably, however, Hermann's outraged denunciations of Falk repeatedly fail to get to grips with what is distinctively horrific about cannibalism. Falk is a 'creature', 'a beast, an animal' ('Falk' 132), epithets which in denying Falk's status as a human, ignore or avoid the central fact that Falk is a man who has eaten other men. The narrator hears him talking about Falk in German and catches:

the word 'Mensch', man, and also 'Fressen', which last I looked up in my dictionary. It means 'devour' (131)

In contrast to 'essen', the kind of eating people do, 'fressen' is used to indicate the gnawing, gorging and gobbling of feeding animals.

Falk's insistence that this was the survival of the fittest, that in the collapse of order on the ship 'it was everyone for himself at last', has encouraged several critics to explore 'Falk' as a tale of reverse evolution.¹² Redmond O'Hanlon and Walter E. Anderson, for example, demonstrate the ways in which Falk justifies his behaviour with echoes of and coded appeals to Darwin and Herbert Spencer, and locate the tale in contemporary anxieties about the social implications of theories of natural selection. Certainly Falk himself would have us believe that as order on the ship breaks down, the naturally strong begin to feed on the naturally weak. The tale's reservations about the naturalness or inevitability of events may be registered in the fact that Falk's survival depends less upon his own physical strength or even cunning, but on

his retention of the ship's sole remaining revolver, which he uses to hunt down his remaining shipmates. Only three others remain alive to be rescued by a whaling ship, and they too have subsequently died by the time Falk reveals his secret to the narrator. Falk's monopoly of power on the ship depends on technology, just as his steam-powered tug-boat gives him the 'whip-hand' in port.

The parallel (pointedly drawn by the narrator) between these two types of monopoly has led critics to argue that the tale demonstrates not the exceptionality of Falk's experience, or the ways in which it suspends the rules governing civilized European behaviour, but its continuity with the economic and sexual behaviour in the rest of the tale. As Tony Tanner has noted the tale emphasizes the 'inter-relationship' between 'three planes of human activity: the biological — eating, hunger, the sexual drive; the economic [...]; and the linguistic' (22). Thus Falk is a 'bloated monopolist' both literally and metaphorically, extracting from the harbour shipping his 'pound and a half of flesh' (89). Falk himself comments of his desire for Hermann's niece that 'he was hungry for the girl, terribly hungry, as he had been terribly hungry for food' (133). She is 'a fine lump of a girl', Schomberg agrees, smacking his lips as he does so (112).

'Falk' is a text invitingly open to both Freudian and Marxist readings. Freud suggests that sexuality originates in 'the oral, or as it might be called, cannibalistic pregenital sexual organization', where 'sexual activity has not yet been separated from the ingestion of food' (vii.198). Discussing Freud, and Melanie Klein's claim that 'The first gratification which the child derives from the external world is the satisfaction experienced in being fed' (Klein 290), Maud Ellmann has argued that 'since sexuality originates in eating, it is always haunted by the imagery of ingestion' (Ellmann, 38). Falk's sexual appetite is more haunted than most. Likewise, when Falk's secret is considered not as the opposite of his role as modern European capitalist monopolist, but rather as of a piece with it, we might consider Karl Marx's famous comparison of capital to a vampire, which 'lives only by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks' (Marx 342). 'Falk' renders such metaphors literal.

Rather than the opposition Conrad presents between the 'commonplace sentimentality' of European civilization and Falk as an 'almost primitive man', critical consensus has emphasized the entanglement of the two. Harry Sewall argues that Falk's cannibalism collapses the role cannibalism has played in 'the grammar of colonial

discourse', as 'a signifier of alterity', to unmask the symbolic cannibalism of European civilisation itself (1). Sewlall approvingly quotes Tanner's observation that 'all the main characters are involved in different kinds of hunger, different kinds of devouring and assimilating' (Tanner 22, Sewlall 3). Likewise, Cedric Watts argues that 'Conrad had little to learn from Freud, who in 1912 declared: "Even today, love [...] is in essence as animal as it ever was"' (Watts xvii). 'Culture may refine and elaborate it', Watts suggests, 'but basically love is appetitive and egoistic.'

All three critics share two basic assumptions, which this paper argues demand reinvestigation.¹³ The first assumption is that Falk's acts of cannibalism are the central meals in the narrative. They provide the model of consumption to which all other eating in the text alludes. The second is that eating is an essentially selfish act — the implication behind Watts' association of 'egoistic' and 'appetitive'. Mrs Beeton would be outraged. It is precisely such a charge — that selfishness, self-gratification, is the defining characteristic of all eating — that the discourse of dining attempts to dispel. By implication all the eating in the tale is like Beeton's 'aboriginal Australian' meal — a naked lunch which exposes the self-centredness of each atomized consumer, satisfying their own appetites. There is no such thing as 'essen', only 'fressen' with varying degrees of sophistication. The idea of commensality, or the benefits of dining as opposed to eating, are just examples of what Conrad calls 'commonplace sentimentality'. The next section of this paper will attempt to challenge these assumptions about the role of eating in 'Falk' by examining Conrad's own comments on dining.

Conrad's Ideas of Gastronomy

Perhaps the key reason that critics have dismissed Schomberg and Hermann's claims for a distinction between eating and dining is that both frame the distinction in racial, indeed racist, terms. As we have seen from Beeton, they are far from unique in nineteenth century gastronomic theory in doing so. For Schomberg a 'white man should eat like a white man, dash it all, [...] Ought to eat meat, must eat meat' (98). For Hermann, Falk has revealed himself as both a 'beast' and a 'common cannibal' — there being little if any distinction in his mind between the two. Beeton similarly comments that 'Creatures of the inferior races eat and drink; man only dines' (363). Somewhat

unsettlingly, when Conrad himself discusses dining he sounds a lot like all three of them.

In the 1923 preface to his wife Jessie's *Handbook of Cookery for a Small House*, Conrad claims that 'Good cooking is a moral agent', adding that 'the intimate influence of conscientious cookery promotes' the 'serenity of mind', 'graciousness of thought', and 'indulgent view of our neighbour's failings' which combine to produce 'the only genuine form of optimism.' These are cooking's 'titles for our reverence', he concludes ('Preface', v-vi). Conrad illustrates this claim by comparing the serene, gracious, indulgent 'Small House' of his wife's title to the 'wigwam' of the Native American. 'A great authority upon North American Indians' Conrad explains 'accounted for the sombre and excessive ferocity of these savages by the theory that as a race they suffered from perpetual indigestion. [...] The Noble Red Man was a mighty hunter, but his wives had not mastered the art of conscientious cookery — and the consequences were deplorable' (vi). He is, in addition to the tendency towards 'unreasonable violence' that is produced by this indigestion, 'in abject submission to the wiles of a multitude of fraudulent medicine men' (vii). Developing Schomberg's argument, Conrad's preface seems to claim that a white man 'ought to', 'must', eat like a white man, or they will end up like a 'Red Man'.

Tony Tanner makes the necessary distinction between 'Conrad writing as Jessie's husband, the sane and contented Western citizen' (Tanner 18) and the (much younger) Conrad the novelist. For Tanner the preface sets up an opposition, between the 'morose irritability', the 'unreasonable violence' and 'gloomy imaginings' produced by life in the wigwam, and the 'decency', 'serenity' and 'graciousness' of life in Jessie's 'Small House'. In contrast, claims Tanner, Conrad's fiction 'works to dissolve the dangerous habit of dualistic (i.e. oppositional) thinking' (Tanner 18). For Tanner, Conrad's Native American should be associated with Falk himself — both are prey to 'gloomy imaginings' and 'morose irritability' brought on by inappropriate eating.

For Tanner, 'Falk' subverts this opposition by collapsing the distinction between eating and dining. In making this claim Tanner oversimplifies Conrad's preface — and underestimates what it has in common with 'Falk'. No reader of Conrad's preface can ignore the fact that 'gloomy imaginings', 'morose irritability' and even outbursts of 'unreasonable violence', are not unknown even among civilized European diners. But Tanner somewhat overgeneralizes about the

perceived audience of the *Handbook* by describing it as the 'Western kitchen' and the 'stable edifice of the settled bourgeois' (18). Jessie Conrad herself is quite clear that the cookbook is aimed at a specific class: the dweller in a small house for whom many of the household tasks, including cooking, must be undertaken by themselves. As Joseph Conrad's preface is well aware, this is precisely the class identified most strongly with indigestion. L. Leney's *Indigestion and How to Cure It* (1904) identifies such digestive complaints as most common not amongst 'Red Men', but amongst 'Clerks, typewriters, dress-makers, milliners, shop-assistants' and 'workers in factories' (Leney 66) — the urban and suburban audience to whom Jessie Conrad's cookbook addresses itself. At the same time Conrad was writing his preface, F.A. Hornibrook's *The Culture of the Abdomen* was addressing the digestive problems of those with sedentary occupations by counselling a return to the dining patterns, posture, and evacuative position (crouching over a specially designed toilet) of 'primitive' peoples. An examination of the variety of texts suggesting solutions for the problem of poor digestion suggests both the prevalence of the problem and that it was not only Native Americans who were subject to the advice of a variety of 'medicine men' of varying degrees of usefulness.

If we are looking for a literary equivalent to the preface's uncomfortable Native American we can find it not in Falk, but in H.G.Wells' Mr Polly, who 'suffered indigestion now nearly every afternoon of his life, but as he lacked introspection [...] projected the associated discomfort upon the world' (7). Mr Polly's indigestion is also imagined to lead to violence (although metaphorically):

Mr Polly's system, like a confused and ill-governed democracy, had been brought to a state of perpetual clamour and disorder, demanding now evil and intolerable and unsuitable internal satisfactions such as pickles and vinegar and crackling on pork, and now vindictive external expressions, such as war and bloodshed throughout the world. (138)

Here the association is not between primitive eating and savage violence, but between industrialized eating and colonial violence. By locating the preface in contemporary discourses about eating and identity, what Conrad is doing becomes more clearly evident. This paper makes a similar claim about 'Falk'.

As Tanner wittily notes, Conrad did not presumably intend that

'readers should start to question the prevailing vocabulary of the Western kitchen' (Tanner 19). Rather, Conrad is putting forwards a semi-serious claim about the effects of bad diet — presumably to be remedied by his wife's advice in her cookbook. While Conrad reverses the racialization of the division between dining and eating, the distinction itself remains valid.

'Much Depends on Dinner': Literary Allusion in 'Falk'

As Falk begins to tell the story of the Borgmester Dahl, the narrator admits that he has a 'head full of preconceived notions as to how a case of "cannibalism and suffering at sea" should be managed' (135). Cedric Watts directs the reader's attention to two contemporary (and widely reported) cases: that of Thomas Dudley and Edwin Stevens in 1884, and that of Andersen and Thomassen in 1899 (Watts 226-7). Falk's insistence that he deserves pity, not condemnation, echoes the best-selling memoir published by Jean-Baptiste Henri Savigny and Alexandre Corréard, two of the survivors of the 1816 wreck of La Méduse: 'Reader we beseech you, do not feel indignation towards men who are already too unfortunate; but have compassion on them, and shed some tears of pity on their unhappy fate.' (Savigny and Corréard, 52-3, quoted in Crain 25). In the event the narrator's preconceptions prove misleading. Unlike either case, Falk's cannibalism takes place on board ship, rather than in an open raft, and Falk emphasizes that the Borgmester Dahl has suffered a 'breakdown' rather than being shipwrecked (135). Whether we feel pity or horror in relation to Falk's actions is, of course, left open in Conrad's tale.

This section will focus, however, on a pair of literary allusions in 'Falk'. The first, to Byron's *Don Juan*, is to a text which also features cannibalism at sea. The second, perhaps more surprisingly, is to Milton's *Paradise Lost*. What these allusions have in common is that they are both to texts in which food and eating play a prominent part. Furthermore, they are both texts from which Beeton quotes at length, using them to illustrate the distinction between dining and eating.

In Canto II of Byron's poem *Don Juan* is trapped in an open boat after the ship on which he has been travelling, the 'Trinidad' has sunk in a storm. Juan has to watch as his tutor is eaten, after the survivors have drawn lots to determine their fate (*Don Juan* II.73-5). It is certainly possible that the narrator has this in mind when he comments to Falk: 'You were then so lucky in the drawing of lots?' (135). Falk

laughs the suggestion to scorn: 'Do you think I would have allowed my life to go for the drawing of lots?' (135). Watts, however, detects an earlier reference to Byron in the tale, when the narrator refers to 'tides in the affairs of men which taken at the flood... and so on' (94). The primary reference is to *Julius Caesar* (IV.iii.216-7) — 'There is a tide in the affairs of men,/Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune'. Watts detects a further echo — of *Don Juan's* lines "'There is a tide in the affairs of men,/ Which taken at the flood,'" — you know the rest' (VI.i, noted Watts 226). In a tale set in a tidal port, which hinges on the resulting reliance of craft like Hermann's and the narrator's on Falk's steam-powered tug, the reference is particularly apt.

This paper suggests a further echo of *Don Juan* in 'Falk', and one far removed from the eating of *Don Juan's* tutor: the dinner at Norman Abbey in Canto XIII. Like Schomberg, like the preface to the *Handbook of Cookery for a Small House*, the narrator of *Don Juan* expresses the connection between dining and human progress:

Lord Henry and his Lady were the hosts;
The party we have touch'd on were the guests:
Their table was a board to tempt even ghosts
To pass the Styx for more substantial feasts.
I will not dwell on ragouts or roasts,
Albeit all human history attests,
That happiness for Man — the hungry sinner! -
Since Eve ate apples, much depends on dinner.
(*Don Juan* XIII.99.785-792)

Watts (225) also suggests an echo of *Paradise Lost* in Falk: 'from early morn to dewy eve. In the last rays of the setting sun' (89) echoing *Paradise Lost's* 'from noon to dewy eve, / A summer's day; and with the setting sun...' (I, 742-4). Both 'Falk' and *Don Juan* allude to the idea of human history beginning with the act of eating what has been forbidden.

In his next stanza, however, Byron expresses greater scepticism about dining as a symbol of human progress:

Witness the land which 'flowed with milk and honey,'
Held out unto the hungry Israelites:
To this we have added since, the love of money,
The only sort of pleasure which requites.
Youth fades, and leaves our days no longer sunny;
We tire of Mistresses and Parasites;

But oh, Ambrosial Cash! Ah who would lose thee?
(*Don Juan*, XIII.100.793-9)

Like 'Falk', this stanza disturbingly associates sexual, economic and gastronomic appetites. Indeed in *Don Juan* the appetite for 'Ambrosial' cash displaces all other appetites. Where does this leave Beeton's attempts to 'rank' a 'people' in the 'grand scale' according to 'their way of taking their meal, as well as by their way of treating their women?' (363).

Beeton's chapter on 'Dinners and Dining', which is the focus of this paper's interest in the *Book of Household Management*, begins with a lengthy compilation of literary quotations in praise of dining. Locating the beginning of civilized dining in Classical Greece, Beeton's chapter provides quotations in chronological order from *Paradise Lost*, Keats and Tennyson. Surprisingly, she also includes two lengthy quotations from *Don Juan*. The chapter then proceeds to offer course-settings and bills of fare for a wide variety of dinners. Other than Byron, Beeton's examples of literary meals — Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, the meal served by Porphyro in 'The Eve of St Agnes', the picnic from Tennyson's 'Audley Court' — are all meals which emphasize intimacy between a couple. All contrast with the savage eating of the Australian aborigine and his 'squaw'. It is furthermore somewhat unclear, in Beeton's example, whether it is the Australian or the bone that if 'half bare' — an ambiguity that offers a disturbing hint of cannibalism.

Beeton quotes Byron's lines on Lord Henry's feast, but then skips ahead to Stanza 69 of Canto XV:

Who would suppose, from Adam's simple ration,
That cookery could have call'd forth such resources,
As form a science and a nomenclature
From out the commonest demands of nature?
(*Don Juan*, XV.549-552, quoted Beeton 364)

In doing so, Beeton avoids the entanglement of economics and eating, to instead have Byron unironically commenting upon 'the curious complexity of the results produced by human cleverness and application catering for the modifications which occur in civilized life, one of the simplest of the primal instincts' (Beeton, 363-4). Where the juxtaposition of ideas in Byron comments acidly on the commercialisation of pleasure in dining, Beeton's juxtaposition firmly enlists *Don Juan* to attest the continual (and mutually inalienable)

upward progress of civilization and dining.

Like Beeton, Conrad rewrites Byron, but to a different end. Like the narrator of *Don Juan* in Stanza 99, the narrator of 'Falk' imagines himself dining surrounded by ghosts. In 'Falk', these are the 'ghostly Presences' of those who have (wisely) avoided Schomberg's table d'hôte, ironically summoned into existence to fill the empty chairs ignored by Schomberg's self-evidently false assertion that 'There's first-rate company always at my table' (98). While Beeton avoids the relationship between eating and economics that Byron asserts — the idea that economic appetite displaces the physical, deadening all pleasure in food — Schomberg's attempt to do so fails. It is all too clear, both to the reader and to the narrator, that it is economic considerations that lie behind his hospitality, and which frequently surface in his anger at Falk. The table d'hôte parodies the ideas of dining that Schomberg spouts — it pretends to ideas of hospitality, commensality, fellowship just as its buffalo meat aspires to pass itself off as beef. For both Conrad and Byron it is commercial modernity, not primitive savagery, that is the enemy of dining.

Conclusion

'Falk' is a tale told by a hungry man. The 'small river-hostelry' where the tale is being told, provides an excellent view of the Thames but an 'execrable dinner': 'all the feast was for the eyes' (77). The narrator of this frame-story speculatively compares the setting to an ancient 'lacustrine dwelling', noting the 'antediluvian and worm-eaten sideboard', and the 'chipped plates' that 'might have been disinterred from 'some kitchen midden near an inhabited lake' (77). The 'chops' they are served:

recalled times more ancient still. They brought forcibly to one's mind the night of ages when the primeval man, evolving the first rudiments of cookery from his dim consciousness, scorched lumps of flesh at a fire of sticks in the company of other good fellows; then, gorged and happy, sat back among the gnawed bones to tell his artless tales of experience — the tales of hunger and hunt — and of women, perhaps! (77)

Tony Tanner, in his elegant reflections on the relationship between the frame-narrative and the story of Falk, observes that this is a fitting 'prelude to a tale which will question the accepted differences and

distances between the primeval or primitive and the civilized' (25). As Watts adds, 'What ensues' in the subsequent narrative is 'a take of extreme hunger, of a man-hunt to the death, and of a woman who is the object of a form of hunting' (xv). This paper argues the opposite.

'The use of a group having a rotten meal in an old restaurant as a frame situation for a story about cannibalism is a suitable ironic device', Tanner suggests (25). For Tanner this meal, like all meals in 'Falk', gestures towards the moment when it is revealed that Falk is a cannibal. The bad meal at the restaurant and the imagined primeval feast are supposedly similar, conflating the primitive and the present, just as Falk's actual and symbolic cannibalism confuses the distinction between the savage other and the civilized European. However, it could also be argued that what emerges from the juxtaposition of the framing-meal and the imagined primitive feast is not their similarity, but their dissimilarity. The primitive feast can be seen as the only real dinner in the tale: the only time when fellowship, satisfying food, and a sense of shared experience come together.¹⁴

Rather than a series of parodies of Falk's cannibalism, the other meals in the tale can be seen as a series of gestures towards this ideal of dining which in different ways all fall short. Falk' presents a series of meals that go wrong: including the companionable but sadly foodless 'dinner' at the river-hostelry, the narrator's dinner at Schomberg's, Falk's solitary meals alone in the wheel-house, da Costa's burnt turtle-steak, and Falk's attempts at one point to tear a cushion with his teeth (134). Even the breakdown of the Borgmester Dahl results not only in cannibalism, but first in a series of parodies of dining. Preceded by the discovery that the ship's meat has spoiled and must be jettisoned (136), the breakdown is followed by the attempts of members of the crew to make soup of their boots, to drink the oil in the lamps before all eating the candles, even to start eating the wood of the ship itself (all 139). All this takes place, as Falk emphasizes, in a setting which has all the trappings necessary for dining at its most civilized: 'a ship with beds, bedding, knives, forks, comfortable cabins, glass and china, and a complete cook's galley' (139).

Searching for a pilot who can guide his ship out of the port without Falk's help, the narrator encounters a 'immensely corpulent' Italian, imprisoned in a small cell for murder (110). This Antonio, who does nothing but eat, is a 'bloated carcass, apparently more than half filling the sort of cell wherein it sat, recalled [...] a fat pig in a sty' (110). 'It' is like a pig: elsewhere Falk makes men into food, here the Italian

does it to himself. An oddity of Falk's dining alone is that when he fed on human flesh, we are explicitly told he does not do so alone. Having shot the carpenter, 'there crept into view one by one [...] a band of hungry and livid skeletons' (141). Likewise, after Falk dispatches his subsequent victims, the other survivors emerge from 'their hiding-places at the seductive sound of a shot' (141). Eating alone in his wheel-house, the Falk of the tale's present echoes the self-indulgent Italian more closely than the primitives that are imagined in the frame-narrative. Strangely nonchalant about Falk's cannibalism (as both Tanner and Watts comment), the narrator is outraged by Antonio. If Falk's cannibalism is a case-study in reverse evolution, a reversion to a state of society before dining, his subsequent mode of eating (alone, pleasurelessly, at his place of work) seems to gesture forward — to a society which has left dining behind. The narrator comes across Schomberg eating alone at his table d'hôte, 'feeding himself furiously' and seeming to 'overflow with bitterness' (96). It is in such an atmosphere that the narrator himself eats, joylessly, while dealing with business in town. As in *Don Juan* commercial appetite takes the place of the genuine pleasure in eating — despite Schomberg's hopeless attempt to reconcile the two.

We cannot be certain that Conrad had read Mrs Beeton, or had her work specifically in mind when writing 'Falk'. In his preface to Jessie Conrad's cookbook he confesses that 'I find it impossible to read through a cookery book' (v). Nevertheless, where Mrs Beeton assembles a collection of literary quotations in praise of dining, 'Falk' offers a series of dinners-gone-wrong. Where Beeton's aboriginal meal is the opposite of dining, in 'Falk' it is a primitive feast that represents a lost ideal of dining.

Nicola Humble makes a key observation for the purpose of comparing Conrad's text and Beeton's when she notes the dramatic shift in domestic arrangements being undergone by Beeton's original readership. 'Husbands', Humble notes 'increasingly travelled into the centre of London and other large cities to work, and took their midday and often their evening meal in town' (xxiii). Beeton alludes to this development in her preface (3), and Humble cites an early twentieth-century commentator noting in retrospect that the influence of 'Beetonism has preserved the family as a social unit' (Nown 60, quoted in Humble xii). Like that of Falk and Hermann's niece, the success of such marriages depended on the improvisation of a new set of domestic arrangements. Despite a distance of forty years between

the original publications of the two texts, and despite the very different texts that they are, both perform a similar sleight-of-hand. While both texts frame their discussions of dining with the apparent opposition between savagery and civilization, the primitive and the contemporary, both Beeton and Conrad are as concerned with the imminent possibility of the end of dining as with its beginning. In contrast to Beeton's series of poetic extracts in praise of dining and its continuing progress, we might rather consider 'Falk' marking a transition point in the literary prose of dining: midway between the diners of Dickens and the unhappy Mr Polly or the solitary eaters of Joyce's *Dubliners*.¹⁵

Notes

¹ Writtem om 1901 but not serialized, 'Falk: A Reminiscence' was first published in *Typhoon and Other Stories* (London: Heinemann, 1903).

² The citation is for Karl and Davies' translation of the letter, originally in French (ii.399). Cedric Watts also cites this translation (Watts xvi).

³ Lévi-Strauss suggests in *Structural Anthropology* that food can be interpreted using the methods that structural linguistics applies to language, by dividing 'the cuisine of a society' into 'gustemes', constituent units of meaning (85-7). Claude Fischler has suggested that food was for Lévi-Strauss what dreams were to Freud: 'a royal road' to the understanding of the deep structures underlying human thought (quoted in translation in Mennell, Murcott and van Otterloo, 20). In Lévi-Strauss's famous culinary triangle the poles of raw (cru), cooked (cuit) and rotten (pourri) form the structure on which human thought about culture and nature are based ('The Culinary Triangle' 590). Lévi-Strauss later complicated this triangle in his *Mythologiques*, which attends to the significance of the methods of cooking used in transforming the raw into the cooked.

⁴ Mary Douglas, among others, has criticized Lévi-Strauss's search for a 'pre-coded, panhuman message in the language of food' (250).

⁵ Cedric Watts notes in his introduction to *Typhoon and other Tales* that the narrator of 'Falk', 'whose ship resembles Conrad's Otago, appears also to be the narrator of 'The Secret Sharer', *The Shadow-Line*, and 'A Smile of Fortune'; furthermore he has clear resemblances to the young seafaring Conrad depicted in *The Mirror of the Sea*' (xxxi).

⁶ Identified by Watts as Bangkok ('Notes' 224).

⁷ Schomberg first appeared in *Lord Jim* (1900), and plays a significant role in *Victory* (1915). Axel Heyst in *Victory* is another man whom Schomberg describes as 'turning up his nose at my table d'hôte'.

⁸ A table d'hôte, Watts notes, is 'a meal served at a set time and set rate in a hotel or restaurant' (241).

⁹ Schomberg uses variants of the word twice: 'decent' and 'decently' ('Falk' 98). The word is often related to eating in Conrad — it is also used in this context

in *Victory* (37) and Conrad's preface to the *Handbook of Cookery for a Small House*: 'The decency of our life is for the most part a matter of good taste' ('Preface' v, quoted in Tanner 17).

¹⁰ This is the sense in which it is used in Brillat-Savarin's *La Physiologie du goût* — *The Philosopher in the Kitchen* as the 1970 Penguin translation has it.

¹¹ Nicola Humble notes that 'Brillat-Savarin (1755-1825) was a French judge, famed for his excellent table as well as his treatise on gastronomy' (587).

¹² See Redmond O'Hanlon, 'Knife, Falk and Sexual Selection', *Essays in Criticism* XXXI.2 (April 1981), 127-41, and Walter E. Anderson, "'Falk": Conrad's Tale of Evolution', *Studies in Short Fiction* 25.2 (Spring 1988), 101-8. Both are cited in Daphna Erdinast-Vulcan's *The Strange Short Fiction of Joseph Conrad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 96.

¹³ Both Sewllall and Watts are, of course, consciously drawing upon Tanner. I am trying to use them to suggest the different ways in which Tanner's insights have been developed, and to suggest why a re-examination of Tanner's basic assumptions may be necessary.

¹⁴ Nevertheless, this primitive meal apparently excludes women, as indeed does the dinner at the riverside hostel.

¹⁵ I am thinking here of Lenehan's plate of peas in 'Two Gallants' (51), and Mr Duffy's 'small tray of arrowroot biscuits' (104) in 'A Painful Case'. In 'The Dead' the Christmas dinner is explicitly identified by Gabriel Conroy as a relic of the past, part of a dying tradition of Irish hospitality (204).

Bibliography

Primary Texts

- Beeton, Isabella. *Mrs Beeton's Book of Household Management*. Ed. Nicola Humble. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. First published London: S.O. Beeton, 1861
- Brillat-Savarin, Jean-Anthelme. *The Philosopher in the Kitchen*. Trans. Anne Drayton. London: Penguin, 1970. First published Paris: Sautet, 1826
- Byron, George Gordon. *The Complete Poetical Works. Volume V: Don Juan*. Ed. Jerome K. McGann. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986
- Conrad, Joseph. 'Author's Note'. *Typhoon and Other Tales*. Ed. Cedric Watts. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2002. 218-220. First published in *Typhoon and Other Tales*. London: Heinemann, 1919. vii-xi
- Conrad, Joseph. 'Falk: A Reminiscence'. *Typhoon and Other Tales*. Ed. Cedric Watts. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2002. 75-145. First published in *Typhoon and Other Stories* (London: Heinemann, 1903)
- Conrad, Joseph. *Victory: An Island Tale*. London: Penguin, 1963. First published London: Dent, 1915
- Hornibrook, F.A. *The Culture of the Abdomen*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957
- Joyce, James. *Dubliners*. Ed. Terence Brown. London: Penguin, 1992. First published London: Grant Richards, 1914

Savigny, J.-B. Henry, and Alexander Corréard. *Narrative of a Voyage to Senegal in 1816 Undertaken by Order of the French Government*. Marlboro, Vermont: Marlboro Press, 1986

Wells, H.G. *The History of Mr Polly*. London: Penguin, 1946. First published London: Thomas Nelson, 1910

Secondary Texts

- Anderson, Walter E. "'Falk": Conrad's Tale of Evolution'. *Studies in Short Fiction* 25.2 (Spring 1988): 101-8
- Crain, Caleb. 'Lovers of Human Flesh: Homosexuality and Cannibalism in Melville's Novels'. *American Literature*. 66.1 (March 1994). 25-53
- Douglas, Mary. 'Decoding a Meal'. *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*. London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975. 249-79. First published in *Daedalus* 101 (1972). 61-71.
- Ellmann, Maud. *The Hunger Artists: Starving, Writing and Imprisonment*. London: Virago, 1993.
- Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. *The Strange Short Fiction of Joseph Conrad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999
- Fischler, Claude. *L'Homnivore: le goût, la cuisine et le corps*, nouvelle édition corrigée. Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob, 1993
- Freud, Sigmund. 'Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality'. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Volume VII (1901-5). Trans. James Strachey and Anna Freud, 24 vols. London: Hogarth Press/Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1953.
- Humble, Nicola. 'Reading Victorian Cookbooks'. Paper delivered at 'Cooking Culture: Food and Consumption in the Nineteenth Century', Institute of English Studies, London, 29-30 July 2004
- Karl, Frederick R., and Laurence Davies, eds. *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983 –
- Klein, Melanie. *Love, Guilt, Reparation and Other Works 1921-45*. Int. R.E. Money-Kyrle. New York: Delta, 1977.
- Leney, L. *Indigestion and How to Cure It*. London: C. Arthur Pearson Ltd, 1904
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. Trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. London: Peregrine, 1977. (First published as *Anthropologie Structurale*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1972)
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 'The Culinary Triangle'. *Partisan Review* 33 (1966). 586-95
- Marx, Karl. *Capital*. Volume One. Trans. B. Fowkes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976
- Mennell, Stephen, Anne Murcott and Anneke H. van Otterloo. *The Sociology of Food: Eating, Diet and Culture*. London: SAGE, 1992
- Nown, Graham. *Mrs Beeton: 150 Years of Cookery and Household Management*. London: Ward Lock, 1986
- O'Hanlon, Redmond. 'Knife, Falk and Sexual Selection'. *Essays in Criticism* XXXI.2 (April 1981): 127-41
- Sewllall, Harry. 'Cannibalism as a Trope in Colonial Discourse'. Paper delivered at the AUETSA-SAVAL-SAACLALS Conference, University of KwaZulu Natal, 5-7 July 2004. Reproduced online at <http://www.uwc.ac.za/arts/auetsa/>

HSewlall.htm (accessed 20/10/2005)

Tanner, Tony. "'Gnawed Bones' and 'Artless Tales' — Eating and Narrative in Conrad". *Joseph Conrad: A Commemoration*. Ed. Norman Sherry. London: Macmillan, 1976. 17-36

Watt, Ian. *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1980

Watts, Cedric. 'Introduction'. *Typhoon and other Tales*. Rev. edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. xi-xxxiii

Golding's *Pincher Martin*: Rendering of the Techniques for Satire

Kazuhiko Saigusa

William Golding's *Pincher Martin* (1956) is a novel which poses a serious question about its status. At first glance, it is a realist fiction in the tradition of *Robinson Crusoe*. The attempt at surviving of Christopher Hadley Martin, an officer of a battleship in the World War II, is depicted vividly in a realistic way, so that the novel apparently reads a modern tragedy of a castaway. However, the novel does not allow itself to be treated as such. At the very end of the novel a surprising fact is revealed that Martin dies as soon as the novel begins. Then, he has struggled to survive not in the real world but somewhere beyond it.¹ Before both the realistic description of events and the negation of their reality at once, our rational mind is bothered. Indeed, not a few reviewers and critics have showed puzzlement and disapproval, sometimes even offense, against the delayed revelation of the true condition of Martin.² The novel seems as if it mocks and plays with our inflexible rationality.

Taking into consideration such receptions of the novel, the delayed revelation of Martin's bodily death is, in effect, an attack on rationality. It is attacked by being perplexed with this rationally-inexplicable situation. This is a remarkably bold and dynamic maneuver, but is merely one of a number of attacks on rationality which are delivered in the novel. As Johnston Arnold rightly points out that in the novel "Golding's concern with the dangers of rationalism appears at full force (38)," *Pincher Martin*, indeed, contains many expressions which can be interpreted as hostile to rationality or rationalism.³ Therefore, we can read the novel as a satire or satirical fiction against rationalism.

Although satire is one of the important aspects of *Pincher Martin*, the mainstream of criticism about it has not discussed it as a satire.

Describing the general tendencies of criticism about Golding, Crawford observes in his recent innovative work on the author that "Few critics have examined satire in Golding's novels, or indeed referred to Golding himself as a satirist" (10). Some critics have, in fact, pointed out sporadically that Golding's novels are satires,⁴ but few critics have analyzed their satirical aspects properly. However, in *Pincher Martin* the techniques of satire are used repeatedly and prominently to attack rationalism, so that they should be paid more attention. Highet suggests that one of standards for regarding a novel as satire is "the choice of a theme and method used by earlier satirist" (16). Rationalism is a theme which has been long attacked by satirists, and the techniques used in the novel are traditional ones. *Pincher Martin* does not limit the targets of its satire only to rationalism. The novel, as well as others by Golding, brings forth relentlessly before our eyes a more fundamental issue inherent in human nature which we tend to avoid facing at. Here again, the satirical techniques are used effectively, and such aspects of human nature are the familiar issues as well. This paper analyzes the satirical techniques used in the novel and would like to emphasize that the novel is one which links itself to the tradition of satire in literature. In the analysis four techniques for satire—exaggeration and caricature, grotesque, irony and scatology—are focused on in turn, but at first, we examine Golding's negative outlook on rationalism, and treat one of his essays in particular.

1) Golding's Negative Outlook on Rationalism: An Attack on "Reductionism"

The theme of rationalism has so much significance for Golding that it appears frequently in his novels, as well as its opposite, the irrational or inexplicable. His disapproval of a reliance on rationalism is an important motive which drives him to write. From his first novel it has been interwoven in his novels, and we can recognize that it is treated in a satirical manner. In *Lord of the Flies*, Piggy, one of main characters, for example, can be interpreted as a caricature of scientific rationalists, as the author himself indeed talks about the boy in these terms,⁵ because several characteristics of scientific rationalists are exaggeratedly embodied in his figure. The scene of his death with his head crashed on the rock also shows metaphorically the defeat of rationalism. Thus, rationalism is harshly attacked.

Apart from his novels, Golding actively displays his anti-rational attitude in his essays, interviews and speeches. In his well-known

biographical essay "The Ladder and the Tree," we can meet his instinctive negative attitude toward rationalism. Though he had, the essay implies, his natural negativity to rationalism, he was brought up to understand and respect the way of rational scientific study, under the strong influence of his father, a science teacher. Then, in the early period of his life, Golding used to have a positive outlook on human beings and a trust in the progress of the human society based on scientific rationalism. His optimism, however, was obliged to alter fundamentally by his experience in World War II, and he came to have no doubt about the deficiency and viciousness of human nature. He also realized that a social system founded on such concept would not work as well as expected. He, thus, came to have a severely critical attitude toward rationalism.⁶

As a typical example which shows his attitude, I would like to introduce here his essay "Belief and Creativity." In the essay, Golding enumerates three thinkers who were enormously influential over the modern society, and attacks them bitterly. In the human society, he says, there appear "the phantasmata that condition our world," which are generally derived from very influential persons, and Golding:

saw the Western world conditioned by the images of Marx, Darwin and Freud; and Marx, Darwin and Freud are the three most crashing bores of the Western world. The simplistic popularization of their ideas has thrust our world into a mental straitjacket from which we can only escape by the most anarchic violence. These men were reductionist, and I believe . . . that at bottom the violence of the last thirty years and it may be the hyperviolence of the century has been less a revolt against the exploitation of man by man, less a sexual frustration, or an adventure in the footsteps of Oedipus, certainly less a process of natural selection operating in human society, than a revolt against reductionism . . . (186-87)

Golding denounces Marx, Darwin and Freud, calling them "crashing bores" and "reductionist[s]," for causing the cruel and disastrous world wars. He observes that the incidents more violent than anything else in the twentieth century resulted from the desperate attempt by people to free themselves from the mental constraint which is called "reductionism," rather than from the problems in themselves which are the subjects of the theories by the three persons. He feels so great indignation at reductionism that he ascribes the catastrophe to .

In the following of the passage quoted above, Golding satirically describes in a metaphor how the "phantasmata" or the images of

the three persons are concerned with people. He evokes “*Macey’s Parade*” (sic), which he says is “a procession truly emblematic of the twentieth century” (187). Over the procession, balloon-figures, which are grotesquely huge and showy, float and proceed along the main street. They are supported and pulled with ropes by the people in the procession. The enormosity and gaudiness of those figures dominates the scene, so that in contrast to themselves they make the people walking below look tiny, as if they were ants, and the buildings along the street look smaller as well. Golding compares the relation between the balloon-figures and the people in this sight to that between the images of the reductionists and people. He describes the large images of the reductionists proceeding in the broad street of lives of people. On the bodies of the images, a phrase is inscribed which summarizes their ideas in a rather too simple and one-sided point of view. Whatever situation people are placed in, their eyes are arrested by those images. Then, Golding goes on to represent the scene: “we all know to one degree or another—are *forced* to know to one degree or another [original italicized]—that these simplistic representations of real people are what goes on and what counts. They, inept, misleading, farcical, are what condition our communal awareness” (188). What people see are only simplified images of the three thinkers and their theories, and they do not have as much validity as the originals, but they are nevertheless recognized as so significant that they affect profoundly people’s minds.

Their theories, while they have been problematic or sometimes misapplied and now are partly doubted, have been enormously influential over society and have made a contribution to the development of various fields of study and the system of human society, but Golding does not conceal his indignation toward Marx, Darwin and Freud. For Golding the phenomenon concerning with human existence is too complex to be explained rationally by theories, and such a principle as reductionism seems to be inappropriate and unfavorable. He is also resentful at the situation that their theories, even though simplified versions, have been so prevalent that people’s mental activities have been restrained by reductionism. Golding’s antipathy against reductionism and reductionists must be strong, since he attacks them severely again and again. His antipathy as above is reflected so noticeably also in *Pincher Martin* that we cannot miss it.

2) The Satirical Rendering of Martin’s Survival Story

a) Exaggeration and Caricature

Both exaggeration and caricature are common devices in satire and they are closely related. Feinberg asserts that “All satire is exaggeration” (105). The employment of it is so plain to readers that it is a useful weapon for satirists, so that satire usually exaggerates its victim more or less. On the other hand, caricature, he explains, “operates by choosing an objectionable quality, attributing it to an individual or a group, then describing the victim only in terms of that disagreeable characteristic,” and in this process “oversimplification is the basic requirement” (117). Caricature necessarily includes exaggeration, and therefore these two devices are entwined closely and attack the victim.

Pincher Martin, as a satire against rationalism, also uses exaggeration and caricature. The elements of rational man in Martin are so exaggerated that he would appear a caricature of it. It should be remarked that in this caricature what Golding calls reductionism is recognizable.

Martin claims to himself that he has “education and intelligence” (77). His status, speech and behavior prove his claim. They are required for his career as an actor in civil life and an officer in the navy. We come to be acquainted with his knowledge of natural science, literature and classics. In the survival life on the rock he makes rational inferences and decisions on the basis of his knowledge of nautical astronomy and geography, and makes sound rules to be obeyed in order that he may be rescued. Therefore, it seems to be fair and reasonable to regard him as a rational man of intelligence and education. However, our estimation of Martin is forced to be modified as the novel progresses. His characteristics as a rational man are more than once described so exaggeratedly that he comes to seem ludicrous and silly. For example, he thinks that mental activity is fundamental characteristic of human beings and important in order for him to survive. He repetitiously insists on his intelligence and education, and importance of thinking. In addition, he shows his knowledge of literature and science, but they do not seem to be necessary or of much help in ensuring his survival. On the contrary, his excessive reliance on mental activity and display of his knowledge seem to be mere showing off, so that they present him as a shallow person.

Identity is a great worry for him. He is very eager to make sure of his identity and awfully afraid of losing it. A scene in which he notices

his ID disc hanging from his neck shows the importance of identity. When he finds his name and status on the disc, he cries out astonishedly, as if he had not known who he was so far, “Christopher Hadley Martin. Martin. Chris. I am what I always was!” and the narrator tells us, “All at once it seemed to him that he came out of his curious isolation inside the globe of his head and was extended normally through his limbs” (both 76). Now that he can be sure who he is, he feels as if his consciousness extended fully to the corners of his body, so that he perceives with reality his body and the environment as a substance. Thus, recognition of his identity is described as giving him assurance of his existence. As this scene shows, identity has a great importance for a person, and then, it is understandable that Martin is very concerned with his identity, because isolated on the rock he does not have as many means to make sure of it as before. His anxiety, nevertheless, goes to the extent of being extraordinary. His mention of identity is repeated more than once, as well as that of intelligent and education. When he comes into a hole in the rock, he finds that his voice is reflected on the wall. Then, he speaks out again and again because he thinks that he can be assured of his identity from the echo of his voice. At another place, he complains that he can neither look himself in a mirror or photographs nor see what kind of person other people regard him as, so that he cannot recognize his identity definitely. Moreover, because his blurred portrait in the booklet is useless, Martin tries in vain to reflect himself on the surface of some pools on the rock. His anxiety and behavior about identity as above seems to be excessive and obsessive. So much so that, he can be regarded as a caricature of people in the modern world who are too much influenced by the concept of identity.

Martin's attitude toward religious matters represents another typical attitude of modern rational man. Martin does not at all believe in the existence of the God nor the afterlife and dislikes even talking about them. He seeks for pleasures which he can feel bodily in real life, but anything beyond actual matters never attracts his interest. His indifference to religious matters is shown clearly in his conversation with his friend Nathaniel, who can be seen as another exaggerated character at the opposite extreme, a caricature of a religious man. He eagerly advises Martin to convert his attitude to be more religious, but Martin scorns him and refuses indifferently his advice. Martin is a caricature of people who disregard God or religious matter. As we have examined so far, the characteristics of a rational man are satirized

by the use of exaggeration and caricature. In addition, an attack on reductionism would be recognized.

Since Martin relies greatly on rational and scientific knowledge, he often resorts to them as mentioned before. When he happens to see a nightmare-like vision, he does so again. He attempts, as if trying to overcome the fear of it, to explain it in a psycho analytical manner. He says that: “Tunnels and wells and drops of water all this is old stuff. You can't tell me. I know my stuff just sexual images from the unconscious, the libido, or is it the id? All explained and known. Just sexual stuff what can you expect? Sensation, all tunnels and wells and drops of water. All old stuff, you can't tell me. I know” (146). Such terms used here as sexual, unconscious, libido and id remind us of Freudian theory. It can be said that there is an effect of the theory or, at least, a similarity to it in his knowledge. At another place, he starts abruptly to lecture the definition of human being. What he chatters about is the process of human evolution, which is no doubt a simplistically popularized form of Darwin's theory. However, because his knowledge which derives from the theory of reductionists does not seem to be useful for him in the scene but meaningless and ostentatious, he seems to be a satiric representation of reductionists or those people restrained by reductionism, which Golding describes in his essay quoted before.

b) Grotesque

As William Nelson, in his criticism about two Golding's novels *Darkness Visible* and *Rites of Passage*, observes that “Golding's use of the grotesque in his earlier fiction, starting with *Lord of the Flies*, has been well established (181),” the grotesque is an important element of his novels. Though it is considerably difficult to define it as a concept, in the criticism of the modern literature, it seems to be acknowledged as a phenomenon of “disharmony” which is produced when two opposite modes or atmosphere are placed together, which is suggested by Thomson to be “The most consistently distinguished characteristic of the grotesque” (20). However, in the following discussion in this paper, it is treated as more original sense of it as Bernard Mc Elroy introduces: [the use of] language to evoke for the reader a vivid visual image which is perceived as grotesque” (ix). In *Pincher Martin* aspects of a rational man are so much exaggerated that Martin looks more or less grotesque. Now, it will be examined that another aspect is described in visual grotesque manner, and consequently it is attacked

effectively.⁷

Martin is described as a horribly selfish and greedy person from the moralistic point of view. His fragmented recollections, which enable readers to judge his character, show the histories of his immoral deeds: he commits adultery with the wife of his friend and shows him the scene to mock him; he urges a girl to have a sexual relation with him, threatening to kill her if she rejects him; riding on a bike side-by-side with a friend, he attempts to kill him in the guise of an accident; he seduces the wife of the producer of the theater company in order to get a role. For him other people are nothing but objects of which he makes use at will, as he says to himself of her "You're not a person, my sweet, you're an instrument of pleasure" (95). Besides, in spite of the fact that he is placed in a dangerous situation on the rock, in his head the images of a woman's white body and a boy's body are circling. Furthermore, when he is cast as the role of Greed, the description of him by Peter illustrates his nature plainly: "[he] takes the best part, the best seat, the most money, the best notice, the best woman. He was born with his mouth and his flies open and both hands out to grab. He's a cosmic case of the bugger who gets his penny and someone else's bun" (120). As these recollections prove, he exploits others relentlessly, suffering no pangs of conscientious, in order to satisfy his own desires, sensual ones in particular. He is, by most ethical or moral standards, a grotesque person.

The grotesquely selfish and greedy nature of Martin is integrated, as a metaphor, in the figure of a crawling creature which devours endlessly. It is introduced impressively through Peter's tale of a strange Chinese dish. He tells about it that in a tin box buried under the ground maggots emerge from the fish and eat it up, and then, they devour themselves each other until there survives the last one, "one huge, successful maggot" (136). It is easily compared to Martin, a greediest person. Thus, the figure of maggots which crawl and swallow one another ferociously is a metaphor for the selfish and greedy nature of Martin. Generally speaking, people would revolt at the sight of maggots. Moreover, their cannibal fight in the small tin box produces an impression of horrible and disgusting, even of the grotesque. Compared to the maggot, then, the figure of Martin emphasizes our perception of him as grotesque.

When we focus on the figure of Martin on the rock, its relation with the crawling creature becomes more obvious and direct. Just after he has drifted onto the rock, he is indeed reduced to the bare

minimum of existence. He shows himself before our eyes as a figure which crawls and moves instinctively about on the rock, seeking for a shelter, water and foods. Because he was exhausted in the sea, he cannot stir, even if slightly, let alone stand up and walk about, so that he is forced to crawl little by little. His actions are laborious and exhausting, but they are compared to the motion of crawling creatures on the ground. For example, when he is looking for a shelter, he is described as follows: "[his mind] shifted the arch of skull from side to side like the slow shift of the head of a caterpillar trying to reach a new leaf" (45). There is no image of human beings who stand up on their feet and walk about freely. In another part of the novel, Martin is described as a snake and lobster: "He lay flat on his stomach and began to wriggle weakly like a snake that cannot cast its skin. . . . The oilskin was hard and he backed with innumerable separate movements like a lobster backing into a deep crevice under water" (46). The comparison to such crawling creatures vividly evokes Martin's figure which is crawling on the ground. Then, while it describes his physical condition, it also emphasizes his image of the grotesque creature.

Though the grotesque image which is superimposed on Martin works effectively for representing his nature as above, Golding's method is sometimes criticized. Some readers blame him for only showing characters in the novel by expository prose without describing them convincingly. It seems that to them Peter's description of Martin, the horrible image of maggots and his fragmented recollections, almost all of which show only his one-sided dimension of his life, are over-expository or too explicit. Indeed, for example, Ted E. Boyle bitterly criticizes the novel because "Golding never quite projects the viciousness of Martin's ego except by the desperate device of asking us to transmute our loathing for maggots into our loathing for the character" (26). Boyle's opinion sounds too severe, but it would be reasonable to observe that Golding did not describe the people in the novel fully.

This insufficiency in characterization is often pointed out as a defect of the novels of Golding. It is claimed that his novels, especially his earlier ones, do not represent characters of various aspects but rather simple and obvious ones. The settings of the novels have also been criticized for being narrowly limited or secluded both in time and place. Such criticism is acceptable to some extent, and therefore, it cannot be denied that Golding is not the type of novelist who elaborately depicts characters of various aspects in the complex social

setting. The criticism is also true of *Pincher Martin*, but it should be valid only when the novel is compared with traditional English ones. It is not appropriate to judge it by their standard because it does not seem to aim at describing characters in the same way as they do; it should instead be evaluated on the basis of satire. Satire usually chooses to describe simple characters, not complex ones, in an explicit and succinct manner. This approach is more suitable for the purpose of satire, since the form often expects readers to make a quick judgment about nature of the characters. By the standard of satire, it is reasonable to say that the method used in representing the characters in *Pincher Martin* is both effective and satisfying.

The grotesque which attacks Martin's nature reaches its climax of power in the last scene of his survival story. His monstrously greediness is as well represented by another metaphorical figure as by maggots, and the narrator at this time goes further. Martin is presented as if he were his metaphor in itself, a large red lobster which clings with its two claws to a piece of the crumbling rock: "There was nothing but the centre and the claws. They were huge and strong and inflamed to red" (201). He, bared to be his basic component of "pincher," no longer appears to be a human being but the very grotesque monster, and his claws, which the narrator describes clutch tightly, represent his tenacity. In this way, the use of visual grotesque shows Martin's nature strikingly before our eyes.

c) Irony

It is common for us to use the word "irony" or "ironical" casually in our daily life, so that the general concept of irony apparently seems to be pervasively and widely established. Indeed, "a frequent and common definition" of irony is "saying what is contrary to what is meant (Colebrook 1)," but the concept of irony cannot be defined with such a simple phrase. However, to define it is not included in the purpose of this paper, and it is treated solely as one technique of satire.

Irony as a weapon of satire, though, is not easy to deal with, either. It seems to be considerably difficult to explain the relationship of irony to satire. Irony must be a powerful device of satire, but the boundary between them is highly ambiguous. Sometimes irony is an element of satire, and sometimes almost the same as the other. George A. Test observes on this topic that "Satire and irony work together, but discussions about the nature of the irony and of the relationship have produced little agreement" (147). It is not certain that there is

a decisive explanation of the relation between them but irony surely affects satire. Then, putting aside the distinction between them, I would like to introduce the idea of "self-defeating" action, which Kernan suggests is conspicuously ironical. The actions are considered to be so, he explains, "not because we judge them by some outside standard . . . but rather because they always achieve the exact opposite of what is intended" (81). In *Pincher Martin*, the action of "self-defeating" is remarkably recognizable. Martin's actions more than once are self-defeating, and consequently, a great doubt is cast to his self-assumption of existence.

From the beginning of the novel, Martin is grasped in the hands of the whimsical fortune. It is ironical for him that his ship is torpedoed and he is thrown out into the sea, because at the same moment when the accident happens, he is attempting to fling out his friend Nathaniel from the ship. He schemes to fling out Nathaniel, who is in prayer at the corner on the deck, by turning the ship suddenly in the guise of making an emergency maneuver to avoid the danger. To be ironical, however, at the same moment he makes the order, the ship really is torpedoed. This coincidence is doubly ironical because if his order had been made in time, it might, contrary to his intention to kill a person, have saved the crew. After all, though, his action ends up producing the result which he expected the least. Thus, he is played with by ironical fate.

After he is thrown out into the water, he cannot escape from irony. He is faced at an ironical picture of his childhood experience. At the moment he dies, he recalls a memory of a jam jar, a toy with which he used to play when he was a child. This memory has a profound significance from the satirical point of view because the picture of playing the toy shows us two figures of Martin at the same time. They make a dramatic contrast each other, and an irony is produced. Let us examine the memory of jam jar:

it was interesting because one could see into a little world there which was quite separate but which one could control. The jar was nearly full of clear water and a tiny glass figure floated upright in it. The top of the jar was covered with a thin membrane—white rubber. . . . The pleasure of the jar lay in the fact that the little glass figure was so deliberately balanced between opposing forces. Lay a finger on the membrane and you would compress the air below it which in turn would press more strongly on the water. Then the water would force itself farther up the little tube in the figure, and

it would begin to sink. By varying the pressure on the membrane you could do anything you liked with the glass figure which was wholly in your power. You could mutter,—sink now! And down it would go, down, down; you could steady it and relent. You could let it struggle towards the surface, give it almost a bit of air then send it steadily, slowly, remorselessly down and down.

The delicate balance of the glass figure related itself to his body. In a moment of wordless realization he saw himself touching the surface of the sea with just such a dangerous stability, poised between floating and going down. (8-9)

It is quite understandable to the readers that the glass figure can be related to Martin, who is also buffeted up and down by heaving water. The small world in his memory shows an ironical miniature version of his current situation. This irony is perceived by Martin himself, too. He observes the delicately balanced movement of the figure in his memory, and then, the narrator tells, he suddenly recognizes the resemblance between his condition and that of the figure. It is cruelly ironic of his memory that it, by reminding him of his long forgotten memory, suggests him the fatal situation under which he is now being placed.

The irony of this memory does not lie only in the comparison of the glass figure to Martin. An awareness of the fact that the toy provides two positions allows us to recognize another irony: the position of the glass figure or played with, and that of player. It is Martin who used to be in the position of player. He enjoyed arbitrarily controlling the glass figure by putting his finger on the membrane of the toy. His arbitrariness in playing the toy seems to suggest his behavior toward people in his life since for him they are only objects which he attempts to control at will. Therefore, the memory of the jam jar shows that he is the arbitrary player. However, through the comparison of Martin to the glass figure, it is plain that he, who is now struggling in the water, is no more than the played with. In this way, at the beginning of the novel, it is ironically revealed that he is not the arbitral player as he assumes, so that Martin's arbitral and selfish nature is attacked. The ironical revelation similar to this structure is repeated through his self-defeating action later in the novel.

It is ironical for Martin as a rational man that he attempts to survive on the imaginative rock whose existence cannot be explained rationally. He has to make himself believe in the reality of the unreal rock because if it is doubted, his existence is also. However, on the

rock he encounters some impossible things: the guano is dissolved into water though it must be insoluble; a red lobster is moving around in the water though it cannot be reddened before it is cooked; he thinks that the rock on which he struggles is a tooth. These things are imperfections which suggest the unreality of the rock. He must not acknowledge them; otherwise he cannot believe in its reality. When he notices them and his rationality insists on their strangeness, though he seems to almost understand why they exist there, he averts his glance from them and pretends that he does not know the reason. In this way, he prevents his rational mind from working as it does, but after all, his rationality does not let him ignore the unreal things against his will. However hard he tries to avert his notion from them, his sane and rational mind cannot help recognizing them, and his knowledge of science also insists that they cannot exist in the real world. Thus, his most reliable weapon of intelligence, education, and rationality prevents him from surviving.

To some readers, Martin may seem to be an admirable person of rationality and indomitable will, a type of Robinson Crusoe,⁸ but the frequent satiric representation is likely to diminish the admiration gradually. Moreover, his evasive logic, which we are going to examine, would degrade still more the estimation of him. When he cannot ignore the existence of the impossible things any longer, he attempts to deceive himself so as not to admit the logical incongruities in his world. This self-deception has two phases: at first, he compares the state of sanity and that of madness and decides which is better. Naturally, he as a rational man chooses the former and explains to himself that he did not really see the unrealistic things but only made a strange mistake that he saw them. However, when he finds the notion of their presence intolerable, he enters into the second phase. He, contrary to his previous approach, attempts to deny the sanity and rationality of his mind; that is, he pretends that he is mad. He explains that a mad man will see things which do not exist really, and concludes that any unreal things he has noticed on the rock are not real but only illusion. Madness is another role for him to play like "Poor Tom (178)," and it is, he says, "a refuge like a crevice in the rock," and "A man who has no more refuge can always creep into madness . . ." (156). His evasive attempt is particularly ironical for him because when he establishes the rules to observe, he decides that he must be careful not to lose sanity, not to let madness sneak into his mind. Against his resolution, he makes an excuse logically and steps into

an irrational state of mind, that is, madness. Thus, his rationality and logical thinking corner him to contradict his own assumption that he is an intelligent and educated rational man.

The contradiction to his self-assumption is also observed in the dialogue with the god-like figure. It persuades Martin to give up surviving and points out that he has been dead and created his heaven as a form of the rock. When he is confronted with the fatal fact of his condition, he bursts out frantically: "I prefer it [his heaven]. You gave me the power to choose and all my life you led me carefully to this suffering because my choice was my own. Oh yes! I understand the pattern. All my life, whatever I had done I should have found myself in the end on that same bridge, at that same time, giving that same order . . ." (197). What he calls "the pattern" can be interpreted to be a pattern of behavior. It is, for Martin, the pattern of being selfish and greedy, which drives him to animalistic life and makes him cling to his life even after he dies. He means that he has always followed this pattern and, as a result, he is now inevitably placed in the tormenting situation. He admits that he is seized tightly by an animal pattern of behavior.

His admission here involves him in a self-contradiction once again. He thinks that animals "are caught in their patterns of behaviour, both mental and physical [sic]" (174). Then, when he hits upon an idea to make a pattern with seaweed on the rock in order to attract rescuers, he thinks to himself that "Men make patterns and superimpose them on nature (108)," and "to impose an unnatural pattern on nature [sic], a pattern that would cry out to any rational beholder—Look! Here is thought. Here is man!" (109). Thus, Martin assumes that human beings make and impose the pattern, which proves the existence of them. However, he exposes the fact that he is not such an existence as he assumed. Ironically enough, therefore, he proves by his own behavior that he is an irrational and patterned creature like an animal.

At this point, Martin's vision of playing with the jam jar should be recalled. As we examined before, this image presents a figure which plays with others arbitrarily and is played with at the same time. In his memory, Martin is the player of the jam jar but he, who is caught in the wave movements, is also related to the glass figure which is played with in the pattern of up-and-down movements. On the rock, he at first assumes and pretends that he is a maker and imposer of a pattern but ends up exposing by his own behavior the fact that he is only the captive of a pattern.

Thus, the two aspects of his condition are presented with irony at the beginning of the novel, and then the presentation is repeated through the development of the novel. In this way, his conceited assumption that he is the maker and imposer of a pattern is attacked.

d) Scatology

Generally speaking, excrement is not favorable matter. Though it is inevitable for people as a living thing to be concerned with it, in a civilized society the act of excreting should usually be kept behind the door of the bathroom and such a topic is kept from the conversation. Therefore, referring to a matter of excretion or excrement will sensationally catch the attention of people and excite their discomfort, so that people cast their negative glances at the victim when it is associated with scatological references. Scatology also reminds people of a fact that they are not able to escape from being an animal. Because many people assume that they are superior to other animals and their mentality or mental activity is evidence of their superiority, they would avert their eyes from their animal nature. However, such an assumption is a suitable target for satirists to attack, so that while "proud, self-delusional man ever aspires to elevate himself and his dignity . . . the satirist destroys such upward mobility by reducing man to defecating animal before our eyes" (Clark 116). The use of scatology compels people to face their animal nature concealed behind the mask of civilization. If scatology, then, is applied appropriately, it can be an effective weapon to attack objects. Therefore, for satirists "Scatology is the logical choice (Lee 18)," so that it has been utilized as one of various weapons.

Scatology in literature has a long tradition and "literature's concern with the scatological increases significantly in this [twentieth] century" (Clark 2). Golding is also part of this trend as a novelist of the twentieth century and tends to use the scatology, which sometimes critics have pointed out. Arnold Johnston, for example, suggests that Golding can be associated with Swift in the sense of their concern with both moral and scatological matter (48). Employment of scatology by Swift produces bitter satirical effect, and does also in the case of Golding. Indeed, he has employed the scatology in this way since his first novel. In *Lord of the Flies*, the scatology produces the implication of moral degeneration of the boys, according to Clark's interpretation of the novel (121). In *Pincher Martin* the scatology is employed in a notable and aggressive manner, so that it attacks bitterly the proud

assumption that human beings are heroic and superior.

The rock island, illuminated by the morning sunlight, shows itself vested with various colors before Martin, who is nearly drowned. While waves gradually heave his body, his eyes catch various colors in the sea: green, red, white, yellow and brown. The colorfulness makes a remarkable contrast with the colorless of the darkness among which he has been struggling. The abundance of colors apparently shows the rock to be a hopeful place of beauty and even sanctity, which is offered by the grace of God. However, the rock is never such a place. Contrary to the beautiful impression of its emergence, what is particularly noticeable is its filthiness. The rock which welcomes a nearly drowned man is not a place of safety and comfort but one of dirtiness, dampness, and an offensive smell. A cleft of the rock is described like this: "the cleft was dripping, dank and smelly as a dockside latrine (30)"; "The dark, lavatorial cleft, with its dripping weed, with its sessile, mindless life of shell and jelly" (32-33). Then, Martin finds a sight: "the mouldering bones of fish and a dead gull [sic], its upturned breast-bone like the keel of a derelict boat. . . . There were the empty shells of crabs, pieces of dead weed, and the claws of a lobster" (59). Moreover, guano, which is the white accumulation of dried and stiffened dung of gulls, covers the surface of the rock. Though white usually has an image of the clean and pure, the whiteness on the rock does not have such an image at all. Thus, the rock is filled with such filthy matter as the derelict dead body of a creature, excrement and urine.

This dirty landscape of lavatory and cemetery can be interpreted to imply his nature and true condition. The rock is imaginatively created out of the memory of his own decayed tooth, so that the rock is, as it were, the remaining of his body or the inside of his mouth. The origin of the rock and its dirtiness suggest symbolically his voracity because mouth has much significance for him. Then, the lobster's claws implies his hand as "pincher" and the bone of dead gull like the frame of a boat does that of his dead body, as he perceives that "my chest is like the ribs of a derelict boat . . ." (188). Thus, the description of the rock is apparently realistic, and at the same time, it is a satirical metaphor.

Understandably, the meaning of this metaphor might not be obvious because the truth about the origin of the rock is not easy to grasp. The concept of its origin is not real but fantastic, and the narrator never declares the truth definitely. Besides, Martin will not recognize

the truth because for him to recognize it means to admit that he is dead. However, his true nature is shown in his memory and his death is frequently implied, if not apparent, so that the metaphor of the dirtiness of the rock gradually becomes graspable. While this use of scatology has rather bitter and serious mood, there is another type of scatology. It produces a playful and funny mood and may provoke laughter to contrast to the former.

The scene which depicts Martin's administering an enema to himself is the scene in which scatology is used most remarkably in the novel. Martin suffers from constipation and food poisoning, so that he decides to give himself an enema, which he produces from his lifebelt. The sequence of actions concerning the enema is rendered with a rich of imagination in mock-heroic manner. Let us examine that scene. Martin sets a stage for himself. He compares the discomforting stuff stagnant in his bowels with the evil serpent. He assumes himself to be Atlas and Prometheus, the Titans who suffer from agonizing pains and never give up with indomitable will, so that he gains self-confidence and strength. His body is represented crawling forward in dignified tones. The sounds which accompany his movements are compared to the background music of the orchestra, and they accentuate his bravery. However, in fact, he is not such a mythical hero as the Titans, nor what he is doing is an admirable deed; he is only going to give himself an enema. This incongruity between the heroic rendering and the reality of what he is doing produces a comic atmosphere and makes Martin look foolish. The moment of his operation is described with a touch of Pope as follows:

He hunched himself back against a rock with his legs sprawled apart. The music rose, the sea played and the sun. The universe held its breath. Grunting and groaning he began to work the rubber tube into his backside. He folded the two halves of the long bladder together and sat on it. He began to work at the bladder with both hands, squeezing and massaging. He felt the cold trickle of the sea water in his bowels. He pumped and squeezed until the bladder was squashily flat. He extracted the tube and crept carefully to the edge of the rock while the orchestra thundered to a pause. (165)

The surroundings are described as if they set a stage for him and drew the attention of audience to it. The surge and pause of the music expresses his strained nerves and concentration on his performance. The analogy of music, however, produces a playfully comic effect

rather than improves his heroic image. Besides, the particularity of the description also contributes to produce the mood. The series of his actions is described in a detailed and precise manner, just as he is described when he struggles to crawl soon after he is cast onto the rock. However, the vulgar image of operating enema is unworthy of this strict preciseness and it represents the scene more laughable. The sequel to this scene is described as below:

And the cadenza was coming—did come. It performed with explosive and triumphant completeness of technique into the sea. It was like the bursting of a dam, the smashing of all hindrance. Spasm after spasm with massive chords and sparkling arpeggios, the cadenza took of his strength till he lay straining and empty on the rock and the orchestra had gone. (165)

In this manner, the moment of his evacuation is rendered splendidly with an abundance of music words. The last action of his self-enema is compared to the cadenza, a technical impromptu by the soloist before the finale, that is, a highlight of the performance. The choice and arrangement of words are remarkably imaginative, but they are totally unsuitable to describe the motion of evacuation and its sound. The incongruity between the description and the reality culminates at the moment of his evacuation, and so does the playful and funny mood. After he accomplishes his deed, he speaks out, as if he declares his conquest, to the excrement which he has assumed as the antagonist in this heroic though filthy stage, but his declaration only makes him appear to be more ridiculous.

The scatology produces ridiculousness again later in the novel. In the scene just before his imagined rock and its surrounding collapses radically, Martin is still more degraded. Caught in a furious storm, he, who is acting madman, in order to shelter himself jumps into a hole and crawls into the pool inside of it. The guano is dissolved into the water and it is clouded up dirty white. He plunges himself into the filthy white water, “among the slime and circling scum” (199). The sight of a disguised madman who is struggling in the dung dissolved pool produces perfect ridiculousness.

After Martin's survival story is over, the satire is not yet. The last chapter is also a satirical representation of the modern rational world. The conversation between Davidson an officer and Campbell is a reenactment of that between Martin and Nathaniel, that is, a

rational man and a spiritual one. Campbell, who finds and keeps Martin's dead body, feels something spiritual or mysterious about his death and asks the officer whether or not he believes that Martin experienced “surviving” of nonphysical sense (208). However, Davidson, who deals with dead bodies without sympathy day after day and is indifferent to anything other than collecting their ID discs, cannot understand what the questioner means. Campbell reluctantly gives up receiving an answer to his question. Their conversation, thus, shows again that the rational and the spiritual cannot communicate with each other. This is the reality of the society with which Golding, a moralistic and religious writer strongly against modern rationality, is dissatisfied.

Though, as Gindin observes that “The polarity between the rational and the imaginative or mysterious is always visible in all Golding's work (12),” Golding repeatedly describes the incapability of communication, he does not dare to go further. He, as suitable to a writer of satire, restrains himself from presenting such an ideal vision as he favors and grimly confronts us with his observation about the real condition of human beings. This is also true of the characterization of Martin. While he is described as a man “fallen more than most (Meaning 10)” and his unfavorable nature is attacked thoroughly with the techniques for satire, any possibilities of his reformation in either moral or religious sense are not suggested in the least. Possibly, he might be regretful about his behavior, as he says “Because what I did, I am outsider and alone (181),” and then, his frequent reference to his boots may be interpreted to mean that really he is sorrow for starting his surviving after death, by kicking them off. He also knows that his persistence for life gives him nothing but pain. However, he rejects to reform his behavior or to give up his life; he is not described as a person who regrets his deed and changes his behavior. It is his unalterable disgusting nature that we can see in Martin,⁹ and in this point of view, *Pincher Martin* can be regarded as a satirical parody of its possible predecessors, *Robinson Crusoe*¹⁰ and Taffrail's *Pincher Martin. O. D.*¹¹ In his third novel Golding attempted an inversion which thoroughly deflates the optimistic view toward human nature as well as in his earlier two novels.

Davidson's mention of Martin's boots is truly surprising to most readers because though there are, in fact, many clues which imply that Martin is dead and surviving nonphysically on the imaginary rock, they are too subtle to grasp unless readers are very sensitive.¹²

However, the effect of shock is neither permanent nor fundamental. As it wears off, readers' observation of Martin's story would be modified. Now that his early death is plain, it would be clearly perceived the fact that every objects appearing in his suffering are illusory in spite of their material reality, which Martin, a materialistic rational man, desperately makes himself believe in. This ironical fact can be interpreted to suggest the illusiveness and insignificance of physical things, and then attack the modern materialism. The fact that Martin's suffering is nonphysical also suggests that it has no end. He has continued to exist by the power of his desire for life, so that he would not disappear unless he wants to submit himself to complete death, but he is the last person to do so. It is true that the climax of his survival story produces an expectation of its end, or his disappearance, but yet its fulfillment is not assured. The narrator avoids telling Martin's death here again, and because his suffering is beyond the physical from the beginning, it cannot be certain whether or not it has end. He might be still suffering at the moment when Davidson is inspecting his dead body. Thus, Davidson's mention of Martin's boots is not simply an ostentatious surprise, "a trick," but deepens the significance of Martin's nonphysical suffering, and emphasizes horribleness of his nature at the same time.

Conclusion

We have been examining *Pincher Martin* from the point of view of its use of the technique for satire. We have recognized that in rendering Martin's survival story, subjects which are profoundly concerned with people in modern society are satirized by the use of the four traditional techniques, exaggeration and caricature, the grotesque, irony and scatology. Those subjects seem to lack reference to particular or topical objects in the real society outside of the text, which someone regard as essential quality for satire. It is true that the subjects attacked in the novel are rather universal or perennial. However, satire does not always demand such quality as the former, and if it is necessary, the rationalism noticed in the novel has relation to what Golding calls reductionist and reductionism. Though Martin is completely isolated, he surely has his background of the society in the twentieth century. The techniques familiar to satire are effectively employed, and among them irony especially seems to have much weight. Therefore, *Pincher Martin* can be counted a fiction of satire.

Notes

¹ *Pincher Martin* is a rather complicated and puzzling text, so that the author himself gives his explanation of the novel in a BBC radio program as below, which is quoted in an essay written by Kermode:

Christopher Hadley Martin had no belief in anything but the importance of his own life, no God. Because he was created in the image of God he had a freedom of choice which he used to centre the world on himself. He did not believe in purgatory and therefore when he died it was not presented to him in overtly theological terms. The greed for life which had been the mainspring of his nature forced him to refuse the selfless act of dying. He continued to exist separately in a world composed of his own murderous nature. His drowned body lies rolling in the Atlantic but the ravenous ego invents a rock for him to endure on. It is the memory of an aching tooth. Ostensibly and rationally he is a survivor from a torpedoed destroyer: but deep down he knows the truth. He is not fighting for bodily survival but for his continuing identity in face of what will smash it and sweep it away—the black lightning, the compassion of God. For Christopher, the Christ-bearer, has become Pincher Martin who is little but greed. Just to be Pincher is purgatory; to be Pincher for eternity is hell.

Needless to say nowadays, we should be cautious about accepting the authors' interpretations of their own works and we do not have to agree with them entirely. However, it is true that this explanation is very helpful in understanding the novel, and we does not seem to me to be able to ignore it. Frank Kermode "William Golding," *Puzzles and Epiphanies: Essays and Reviews 1958-1961*, Intro. William Phillips (New York: Chilmark, 1962) 207-08.

² Norman Page, "Golding and the Reviewers: A Survey of Responses and Reactions," *William Golding Novels, 1954-67*, Casebook. Ed. Norman Page (London: Macmillan, 1985) 24-26.

³ In this paper, the word rationalism is used in a rather broad definition which includes from rationality founded on intelligence and reason to what is represented by the theories of Freud, Marx and Darwin.

⁴ For example, McCarron regards Lord of the Flies and The Inheritors as satire, though he does Pincher Martin and Free Fall as parody. Kevin McCarron, "In Contemplation of my Deliverance": *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pincher Martin*," *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*, ed. Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson (London: Macmillan, 1996) 286.

⁵ Jack I. Biles, "Piggy," *Talk: Conversations with William Golding* (New York: Harcourt, 1970) 11-14.

⁶ Of the biographical or theological background to Golding's works, the following are helpful. Golding, "The Ladder and the Tree." Leighton Hodson, "Biographical Introduction," *William Golding, Writers and Critics*. 1971. (New York: Capricorn, 1971) 1-18. James Gindin, "Background Themes: The Propellants," *William Golding, Macmillan Modern Novelists*. (London:

Macmillan, 1988) 8-19.

⁷ Stinson also analyzes the use of the grotesque in Golding's earlier five novels mainly from the visual point of view in his essay, but the most of his discussion is spent for *Free Fall* and *The Spire*. John J. Stinson, "Trying to Exorcise the Beast: The Grotesque in the Fiction of William Golding," *Cithara* 11 (1971): 3-30.

⁸ In fact, many reviewers or critics have acknowledged some kind of inspiring heroism in Martin's survival in itself. Neville Braybrooke, "The Return of *Pincher Martin*," *Commonweal* 25 Oct. 1968: 118. Margaret Walters, "Two Fabulists: Golding and Camus," *Melbourne Critical Review* IV (1961): 18-29. Rep. in Nelson 102-03. Hodson, *Golding*, 56.

⁹ Gregor and Kinkead-Weekes observes that Martin's unchangeability shows Golding's essential concern with not "Becoming" but "Being." Ian Gregor and Mark Minkead Weekes, *William Golding: A Critical Study of the Novels*, 3rd ed. (London: Faber, 2002) 132-34

¹⁰ Biles and Kropf, in their interpretation of *Pincher Martin* in comparison to *Robinson Crusoe*, suggest that they "certainly are connected as examples of the fictitious prose narrative dealing with spiritual experience (21)," and observe that while Crusoe converts himself to God, Martin rejects to. These critics also point out a rise of criticisms on *Robinson Crusoe* which regards the novel as "a story of spiritual experience" in the footnote (23). Jack I. Biles and Carl R. Kropf, "The Cleft Rock of Conversion: *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pincher Martin*," *A William Golding Miscellany*. Spec. issue of *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 2.2 (1969): 17-43.

¹¹ J. S. Ryan in his essay shows that "the unselfishness displayed by officers" in Taffrail's *Pincher Martin O. D.* makes a contrast to selfishness of Martin in Golding's *Pincher Martin* (147). "The Two Pincher Martins: From Survival Adventure to Golding's Myth of Dying," *English Studies* 55.3 (1974): 140-51.

¹² For example, Angus Wilson's comment on *Pincher Martin* shows that he has clearly recognized that Martin is dead before Davidson mentions Martin's boots. Biles, "Pincher Martin," *Talk* 69.

Works Cited

- Biles, Jack I. *Talk: Conversations with William Golding*. New York: Harcourt, 1970.
- Biles, Jack I, and Carl R. Kropf. "The Cleft Rock of Conversion: *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pincher Martin*." *A William Golding Miscellany*. Ed. Jack I. Biles. Spec. issue of *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 2.2 (1969): 17-44.
- Boyle, Ted E. "Golding's Existential Vision." *William Golding: Some Critical Considerations*. Ed. Jack I. Biles and Robert O. Evans. Kentucky: UP of Kentucky, 1978. 21-38.
- Braybrooke, Neville. "The Return of *Pincher Martin*." *Commonweal* 25 Oct. 1968: 115+.
- Clark, John R. *The Modern Satiric Grotesque: And Its Traditions*. Kentucky: UP of Kentucky, 1991.
- Colebrook, Claire. *Irony*. The New Critical Idiom. New York: Routledge, 2004.

- Crawford, Paul. *Politics and History in William Golding: the World Turned Upside Down*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002.
- Feinberg, Leonard. *Introduction to Satire*. Iowa: Iowa State UP, 1967.
- Gindin, James. *William Golding*. Macmillan Modern Novelists. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Golding, William. "Belief and Creativity." *A Moving Target*. American ed. New York: Farrar, 1982. 185-202.
- . Interview with Frank Kermode. "The Meaning of It All." *Books and Bookmen* Oct. 1959: 9-10.
- . *Pincher Martin*. 1956. London: Faber, 1962.
- . "The Ladder and the Tree." *The Hot Gates: and Other Occasional Pieces*. American ed. New York: Harcourt, 1966. 166-75.
- Gregor, Ian and Mark Minkead Weekes. *William Golding: A Critical Study of the Novels*. 3rd ed. London: Faber, 2002.
- Hight, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. 1962. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.
- Hodson, Leighton. *William Golding*. Writers and Critics. 1971. New York: Capricorn, 1971.
- Johnston, Arnold. *Of Earth and Darkness: The Novels of William Golding*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1980.
- Kermode, Frank. "William Golding." *Puzzles and Epiphanies: Essays and Reviews 1958-1961*. Intro. William Phillips. New York: Chilmark, 1962. 198-213.
- Kernan, Alvin B. *The Plot of Satire*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1965.
- Lae, Jae Num. *Swift and Scatological Satire*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1971.
- McCarron, Kevin. "'In Contemplation of my Deliverance': *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pincher Martin*." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. Ed. Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 285-93.
- McElroy, Bernard. *Fiction of the Modern Grotesque*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Nelson, William. "The Grotesque in Darkness Visible and Rites of Passage." Ed. James R. Baker. Spec. issue of *Twentieth Century Literature* 28 (1982): 181-194.
- Page, Norman. "Golding and the Reviewers: A Survey of Responses and Reactions." *William Golding Novels, 1954-67*. Casebook. Ed. Page. London: Macmillan, 1985. 21-30.
- Ryan, J. S. "The Two Pincher Martins: From Survival Adventure to Golding's Myth of Dying," *English Studies* 55.3 (1974): 140-51.
- Stinson, John J. "Trying to Exorcise the Beast: The Grotesque in the Fiction of William Golding." *Cithara* 11 (1971): 3-30.
- Test, George A. *Satire: Spirit and Art*. Tampa: U of South Florida P, 1991.
- Thomson, Philip. *The Grotesque*. The Critical Idiom 24. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Walters, Margaret. "Two Fabulists: Golding and Camus." *Melbourne Critical Review* IV (1961): 18-29. Rep. in *William Golding's Lord of the Flies: A Source Book*. Ed. William Nelson. New York: Odyssey, 1963. 95-107.

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旨とし、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20(2009)年10月末日とします。
 △ 原稿は、原則として、電子メールの添付ファイルで提出してください。投稿先アドレスは次の通りです。
 englit@sal.tohoku.ac.jp
 ファイル形式は、MS Word、一太郎、PDF、リッチテキストファイル(RTF)のいずれかとしてください。
 △ 紙媒体で提出する場合は、清書原稿4部(コピー)を「試論編集委員会」宛(宛先は奥付参照)に郵送してください。
 △ 清書原稿に、印字できない特殊文字等を手書きで書き込む場合は、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。OCR(Optical Character Reader)で電子化するためです。
 △ 論文は和文、英文いずれでも可です。
 △ 原稿の長さは原則として自由ですが、和文の場合は20,000字程度(注を含めて)。英文の場合は12,000語程度を一応の上限とします。
 △ 英文論文のネイティブ・スピーカーによる校閲は、編集委員会が行います。
 △ 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追加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

いつものことながら、今回も刊行が大幅に遅れましたことをお詫び申し上げます。投稿論文が少ないため、編集を進められずにおりましたが、昨年秋になってようやく3篇の論文が審査を通り、刊行可能となりました。その後編集作業を進め、今年の初めには刊行の予定でしたが、諸般の事情で延び延びになってしまいました。とくに執筆者の方々には長期間お待たせすることになり、誠に申し訳なく思います。

刊行遅れの原因の一つには、事務局のある東北大学英文学研究室の入っている建物が耐震改修工事のために使用できなくなり、昨年末から約4ヶ月間避難を余儀なくされたことがありました。現在は元の場所に戻っております。

編集委員で英文校訂の作業を行っていただいていた東北大学のポール・ヴリトス氏は2007年度末をもって退職し、イギリスに帰国しました。2008年4月からはイーアン・トウィッディ Iain Twiddy 氏がヴリトス氏の後任に就く予定です。同氏は現代イギリス詩を専門としています。次号からは編集委員に加わっていただく予定です。

少子高齢化が進み、英語・英文学を取り巻く環境はますます厳しくなっています。人文学研究の灯を絶やすことなく時代につないでいくために、『試論』の存在意義は強まっています。次号ではとくにベテランの研究者の方々の投稿を期待しております。

E. H

試 論 第 44 集

平成 20 (2008) 年 3 月 31 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 27 番 1 号

東北大学大学院文学研究科 英文学研究室

電 話 022(795)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