

# SHIRON 試論

Essays in English Language and Literature

## CONTENTS

The Legend of the 'Martyr King' :

Political Representation in *The Man of Law's Tale*

..... Akio Kikuchi 1

Serpents Named and Naming :

Representations of Confrontation in Keats's *Lamia*

..... Chikako Saito 21

*Bleak House* and Brown's *Work*: A Gaze upon the Poor

..... Takashi Nakamura 39

ヴィクトリア朝のプロメテウス

『テス』における歴史のダイナミズム

(A Victorian Prometheus: Historical Dynamism in Hardy's *Tess*)

..... 鈴木 淳 63  
(Jun Suzuki)

SHIRON 39 試論 第39集

2000

# ***SHIRON***

## **Essays in English Language and Literature**

### **EDITORS**

HIROSHI FUJITA

EIICHI HARA

TAKASHI NAKAMURA

HIROSHI OZAWA

PETER ROBINSON

## No. 39

August 2000

Department of English Literature  
Tohoku University  
Sendai, Japan



## Synopses

### The Legend of the 'Martyr King': Political Representation in *The Man of Law's Tale*

AKIO KIKUCHI  
Page 1

One of the critical subjects concerning *The Man of Law's Tale* is the teller's relationship to the tale. In this paper, I pay attention to Chaucer's satirical attitude toward the Man of Law by examining the characterizations of the two kings. Scholars have argued about the narrator's materialism or his limited viewpoint. However, in the main, they treat only Constance, and we should take her two husbands into greater consideration. To clarify the political position of the Man of Law, I focus my argument on the narrator's handling of the Sultan's death within its religious and historical context. First, I define the Man of Law's political position as a royalist with regard to his emphasis on the successful conversion of King Alla. King Alla of Northumberland is treated by the narrator as the ideal Christian monarch manifesting both authority and religious piety, while the Sultan of Syria is presented as an ill-starred pagan. On the surface this point seems to emphasize the narrator as a royalist one, who supports a divine absolute kingship. However, the 'martyr king' in English religious and historical writings provides examples similar to that of the Sultan. Finally, the image of the 'martyr king' in relation to contemporary politics is discussed. Furthermore, its image was used as a political strategy by Richard II, whose absolutism is supported by the Man of Law. The view of the 'martyr king' thus leads us to the conclusion that Chaucer mocks the narrator's political position as a royalist by means of the latent implications intricately composed within *The Man of Law's Tale*.

### Serpents Named and Naming Representations of Confrontation in Keats's *Lamia*

CHIKAKO SAITO  
Page 21

Keats's *Lamia* has been discussed as a confrontation between the magical enchantment of Lamia and the cold philosophy of Apollonius. The conflict has been considered as various forms of allegory, but, about Lamia, there have been basically two contrary views; some critics regard her as a victim and others judge that she is an evil woman. At the end of the story, Lamia vanishes since she is accused of being a serpent. The denouement seems to be the triumph of Apollonius's cold philosophy, since he indicates that Lamia is a serpent who preys upon young Lycius.

In this paper, I attempt to analyze the process of naming Lamia a serpent, and question the accusation of Apollonius. The description of Lamia shows that her identity consists in the continuity of her femininity and her consciousness. The serpent body works as a prison for her. Even after her transformation from serpent to woman, the naming by Apollonius and Lycius fixes her as a serpent. Calling her Lamia, which is the name of a monster, the

narrator also takes part in labeling her a serpent.

On the other hand, the appearance of the sage Apollonius suggests his malice and his moral ambiguity. Moreover, his depiction by Keats gives the impression that he is also a serpent. Since Lamia's womanly love for Lycius cuts the youth off from his teacher, she imperils the inheritance of wisdom and the authority of Apollonius and the established society. Apollonius's definition of her as a serpent is interpreted as a countermove to her threat. Keats's narrator, implying that the champion of cold philosophy is also a serpent, makes the final encounter between Lamia and Apollonius a confrontation between two serpents and, consequently, creates an emblematic image of the ouroboros. Lamia's vanishing is not merely her defeat. As this act ends the conflict and protects her identity from his naming, it has the power to challenge the authority of the social order produced by Apollonius.

### *Bleak House* and Brown's Work: A Gaze upon the Poor

TAKASHI NAKAMURA  
Page 39

The fact that the poor or the laboring population was equated with the dangerous classes so ubiquitously in mid-Victorian England not only in literary texts but non-literary works such as paintings and journalistic writings inevitably reminds us of the so-called Chadwickian Sanitary Idea, which was a priority of the age. The discourse of public health was operating so as to foreground the dangerous poor and have them gazed on by a watchful disciplinary power; in this Panopticon society, the wretched poor were under strict surveillance all the more because they were regarded as a potentially evil presence as Chadwick's *Sanitary Report* took pains to reveal.

In this essay, by focusing especially on the coincidence of the genesis of Dickens's novel (*Bleak House*, 1852—53) and Brown's *Work* (1852—65), the egotism of bourgeoisie and aristocracy is examined in detail. Put differently, the novel's and the painting's involvement in, and obsession with, the Sanitary Idea are discussed, bearing in mind that both the novelist and the painter highlighted poor orphans, thereby foregrounding the evil existence in such foul, insanitary slums as the imaginary Tom-all-Alone's and the real St Giles which Dickens is said to have used as a model. The marks on Esther's face, however, metaphorically disclose her mother's sinful sexual relations with Nemo, which finally lead to Lady Dedlock's downfall. The novel thus embodies its fearful message: Tom has his own revenge via the infection and contagion upon the proudest of the proud through every level of society.

Meanwhile, the objective correlative of the Sanitary Idea in the picture may be seen in the juxtaposition of the poor orphans in the foreground, and the construction of waterworks in the background which the painter witnessed in July 1852. What is more, in the far background of the picture, it is possible to glimpse the horrible condition of a

slum like St Giles from which the orphans probably came, and interestingly, St Giles was the arena of Hogarth's celebrated pair of prints, Beer Street and Gin Lane, both of which had an unquestionable influence upon *Work*.

A Victorian Prometheus:  
Historical Dynamism in  
Hardy's *Tess*

JUN SUZUKI  
Page 63

The most characteristic feature of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* (1891) is its pattern of repetition. The various episodes in the novel seem to show only one thing: an inescapable pattern of crime and punishment for the protagonist. The retributive justice of Providence, as the Aeschylean phrase "President of immortals" suggests, works in the same way in *Tess* as in Agamemnon or Prometheus Vincetus, both of which Hardy had read in his youth.

In this essay, I attempt to trace the primal cause of Tess's tragedy back to this repetitive pattern. This pattern is emphasized by the use of genealogical family history in the text. In *Tess*, the dominance of a Metaphysical Power is also presented through the determinism pervading the life in Marlott. It is not only indifferent, but even malignant towards human beings' happiness, a happiness which they nevertheless struggle dialectically to attain, in spite of the tragedies, which the malignant divinity inflicts. Such an attitude in Hardy is best described by Gillian Beer's phrase "Romantic materialism."

Hardy admits, in his preface of 1912, that, in his novel "objectless consistency has never been attempted." For him, novels are "mere impressions of the moment." In *Tess*, this philosophy has been put into practice. In other words, his kind of humanism is "simply" represented through the juxtaposition of tragedy with human happiness.

As many critics have suggested, Tess is like a modern Prometheus. Since ancient times, Prometheus was considered bound, but in the early nineteenth century he was unbound in Shelley's poem. Again, in 1891, the history of Prometheus is represented through the body of Tess. Tess embodies both tragedy (being bound) and the possibility of happiness (being unbound) in herself.

However, we must not forget the fact that Tess is only one "mark" in the long history of Prometheuses, past, present, and future. The history of Prometheus repeats itself endlessly. In *Tess*, Hardy's view of this historical dynamism is powerfully presented.

## The Legend of the 'Martyr King': Political Representation in *The Man of Law's Tale*

Akio Kikuchi

### I

Recent critics have worked on socio-political interpretations of Geoffrey Chaucer's poetry. *The Man of Law's Tale*, especially in the late 1990s, claimed contemporary critical attention with regard to genre, orientalism and gender. Its mixture of history, religion and romance produces the problem of genre. *The Man of Law's Tale* is based on an episode of Nicholas Trivet's *Chronicle*, written by a monk for a nunnery in the late thirteenth century. The story develops with repetitions of her trials and miraculous adventures. In addition, its setting in Syria has provided useful material for a study of medieval orientalism.<sup>1</sup> The representation of the heroine is, at the same time, dealt with by many critics.

A brief look at the story will be useful. *The Man of Law's Tale* centers on the heroine's adventures. Constance, daughter of the Roman Emperor, is at first sent to Syria to marry the Sultan — who converts from Islam to Christianity. However, his deceitful mother, the Sultanness, murders all the Christians, including her own son. Constance, alone in a small boat, floats all the way to the coast of Northumberland. There, she introduces Christianity to the natives, and marries the king of Northumberland. Unfortunately, she is once again set adrift with her little child through the guile of Donegild (King Alla's sinful mother). She meets the Roman Army and finally discovers her husband again at Rome, where she understands his guiltlessness. The tale ends with her final return from Britain to Rome after King Alla's death.

Constance's repeated adventures are held to follow the motif of the 'innocent calumniated queen', which is often found in medieval romances (Schlauch 156–58). The more important point to notice is that the pious heroine's passage has been generally taken as hagiogra-

phy. Michael R. Paull, for example, argues that the conventions of female saints' legends are elsewhere found in *The Man of Law's Tale* (184–87). As for her Christian aspect, V. A. Kolve minutely analyzes the iconographic history of the ship and regards Constance's voyage as a metaphor of the Roman Church (302–56). Some scholars compare Constance's passion with that of Griselda in *The Clerk's Tale* (Baldwin 183–89; C. Benson 160–63). Helen Cooney, on the contrary, maintaining that divine manifestations and miracles were important for medieval historians, lays emphasis on its sharing with the conventions of historical writings (266–68). Although interpretations vary according to which genre critics attach most importance to, it is generally remarked that *The Man of Law's Tale* concerns a mixture of religion and history. These critics have in general paid attention only to the main plot of the heroine's adventures; the other characters, especially King Alla and the Sultan, have remained overlooked.

The figure of the Man of Law and his relationship to his tale have also been important subjects of debate. He seems to be an improper person to be telling such a religious story, for in the *General Prologue* and the *Introduction* to *The Man of Law's Tale* Chaucer describes him as a layman rather than an ecclesiastical figure like the Parson or the Clerk. To explain such an ambiguous relationship, some have detected economic and materialistic elements in *The Man of Law's Tale* which make it appear more suitable for its narrator. Laurel L. Hendrix considers the exchange of the heroine as a form of metaphorical coin (151–62). Yet their articles are in the main concerned only with the heroine. Few critics have given any special heed to her husbands, King Alla of Northumberland and the Sultan.

However, it seems to me that the Sultan of Syria and King Alla of Northumberland play more important roles in the story than scholars have previously thought. Their characterizations are clues for an understanding of the intertwining of religion and history in *The Man of Law's Tale* and, furthermore, of the narrator's own political position. From a larger historical viewpoint, the Sultan's death is of no less importance, while the Man of Law's emphasis on the King of Northumberland is meaningful. If we consider the cultural and the political background of the Sultan's tragedy, what relationship it has to the narrator and what attitude Chaucer adopts toward him will become clear. To clarify the characterization of the Man of Law, I would like to engage with his handling of the Sultan's death in the following sections. First, I will define the Man of Law's political position with ref-

erence to his emphasis on the successful conversion of King Alla. Next, the representation of the Sultan will be compared with that of the 'martyr kings' in the English religious and historical writings. Finally, the relationship of the image of the 'martyr king' to contemporary politics will be discussed so as to decipher the political implications complexly compressed by Chaucer into *The Man of Law's Tale*.

## II

It is hardly possible to neglect the characterization of the Man of Law when we explore the tales. The Man of Law's livelihood concerns only worldly business, while the mixture of religion and history is peculiar to *The Man of Law's Tale*. Why does Chaucer appoint him to tell such a tale? We can perhaps explain the reason clearly if we look at the Man of Law's own profession. In this section, I will treat the problem of the Man of Law's characterization with reference to King Alla.

Critics generally agree on the point that the narrator tends only to be involved in secular affairs. What is more, they question the Man of Law's morality. Some scholar even find some satiric points in the description of the Man of Law. Concerning his morality, there is Chaucer's implication of his desire for wealth. In the *General Prologue*, the poet describes the Man of Law as:

So greet a purchasour was nowher noon:  
 Al was fee symple to hym in effect;  
 His purchasyng myghte nat been infect.  
 Nowher so bisy a man as he ther nas,  
 And yet he semed bisier than he was. (A 318–22)

The fact that he is so "greet a purchasour" shows that he is materialistic. As for his "purchasyng", Richard Firth Green notices Chaucer's satire on the lawyer's shrewdness concerning family inheritance (304–5).

Similarly, Ann W. Astell, in "Apostrophe, Prayer and the Structure of Satire in *The Man of Law's Tale*", argues that the Man of Law's frequent apostrophes suggest he understands only the superficial results of the divine interventions, while Constance never doubts God's mercy:

*The Man of Law is incapable of understanding providence as God's plan for man's eternal salvation, a loving plan that stands behind all events, even the most painful ones.*  
 ("Apostrophe" 94; italics mine)

Astell's point is worth noticing because the Man of Law's peculiarity is his sagacity. In the *General Prologue* he is depicted as the lawyer who understands all the cases:

In termes hadde he caas and doomes alle  
That from the tyme of kyng William were falle.  
Therto he koude endite and make a thyng,  
Ther koude no wight pynche at his writyng;  
And every statut koude he pleyn by rote. (A 323–27)

Chaucer's point about the Man of Law is to represent him as a professional lawyer with much knowledge of the cases back to the Norman Conquest. Astell demonstrates that Chaucer successfully makes an insinuation about the narrator's partially limited view. However, along with other explicators, Astell mainly puts emphasis on Constance and seldom refers to her husbands.

Whether he is regarded positively or not, the Man of Law is generally held to be a lawyer of the common law though what position he holds is unclear.<sup>2</sup> Joseph Hornsby recently examined the relationship of the teller to the tale in terms of the origins of the common law in relation to King Alla's marriage to Constance. He convincingly casts a light on the tale as a possible strategy for authorizing the Man of Law's profession:

Notably, the law of the "Man of Law's Tale" is the common law. Its divinity is insisted on not just in the way God works through it, but also in the law's central role in ensuring that Britain was Christianized. . . . Even while in the safekeeping of heathen rulers, the law remained God's instrument. In this way, the "Man of Law's Tale" dramatically attests to the divine origins of the common law, and perhaps as well to that of his profession. (132)

According to Hornsby the marriage between King Alla and Constance is a symbol of the unification between English common law and the divine law. His argument provides a starting point for surveying the religious and historical viewpoints in the narrator. His seeking the origin of the common law provides a historical basis for *The Man of Law's Tale*, and its divine authorization results in his treatment of the Christianization of England.

Let us consider the King Alla and the Sultan. They have some aspects in common, for both convert from paganism to Christianity and as a result suffer from their sinful mothers' wickedness. The important point is, however, the difference in their lots. The Sultan is

murdered by a trick of the Sultaness, while King Alla lives happily with his wife and his son. What does their difference derive from? What explanation does the Man of Law give for it? It seems to me that he demonstrates a deep concern for the combination of political and religious elements in the two kings.

The first thing to notice is that the Man of Law delineates the strong kingship of King Alla. The king first appears in the narrative when Constance is falsely accused by a villainous knight<sup>3</sup>:

This constable was nothyng lord of this place  
Of which I speke, ther he Custance fond,  
But kepte it strongly many a wyntres space  
Under Alla, kyng of al Northumbrelond,  
That was ful wys, and worthy of his hond  
Agayn the Scottes, as men may wel heere;  
But turne I wole agayn to my mateere. (B<sup>1</sup> 575–81)

Here the teller illuminates Alla's political authority. Alla not only establishes his supremacy in his own region, but also has ascendancy over the neighboring tribes in Scotland.<sup>4</sup> It is suggested that his power derives from his own virtue because he was "ful wys and worthy". Needless to say, King Alla is a pagan just as are the others in Northumberland. He is similar in this point to Theseus in *The Knight's Tale* as being a good pagan ruler. In other words, the Man of Law appreciates King Alla's political ability even though he is a pagan at this stage.

It is worth noticing that as Alla becomes more mature as a Christian after he marries Constance, his authority gains in strength. The punishment of his sinful mother is a conspicuous example of his power when united with religion. After he returns from the expedition to Scotland, the king realizes all the stages of the wicked plot concocted by Donegild, who succeeds in compelling Constance and Maurice to relinquish Northumberland. King Alla vehemently denounces and punishes her (B<sup>1</sup> 893–96). Donegild is condemned to death as a traitor to her "ligeance" which means "allegiance". The narrator addresses her:

O Donegild, I ne have noon Englissh digne  
Unto thy malice and thy tyrannye!  
And therfore to the feend I thee resigne;  
Lat hym enditen of thy traitorie! (B<sup>1</sup> 778–81)

The narrator's apostrophe claims that Donegild is to be blamed for her

political and religious plotting. The fate Donegild is forced to accept is "meshance". This word is also used in the Roman expedition to Syria:

For which this Emperour hath sent anon  
His senatour, with roial ordinance,  
And othere lordes, God woot, many oon,  
On Surryens to taken heigh vengeance.  
They brennen, sleen, and brynge hem to meschance  
Ful many a day; but shortly — this is th'ende —  
Homward to Rome they shapen hem to wende. (B<sup>1</sup> 960–66)

The Roman expedition is in an allegorical sense similar to Alla's slaying of his sinful mother, for both of them destroy the enemies of Christianity as an expression of God's ire. It may be concluded from this evidence that Christianity and political power are united in the figure of King Alla.

Such an authorization of King Alla's kingship is meaningful if we take its historical background into consideration. Its unification forms a basis for the Man of Law's political position. Paul A. Olson offers more political views about the Man of Law's relationship to his narrative. He analyzes the figures of two kings in relation to medieval theories of kingship. The Man of Law represents the absolute kingship of King Alla while Theseus' Athenian parliament in *The Knight's Tale* can be construed as a consultative kingship (Olson 85–92). King Alla's marriage to Constance is a metaphor for the inviolable absolutism which Richard II, Chaucer's monarch, vociferously claimed to wield over the magnates and the upper nobles, who instead hailed the latter type of kingship (Olson 86–89). He also surmises that Chaucer makes the Man of Law reveal this royalistic view in his tale:

In the *Canterbury Tales*, the Sergeant at Law—eligible by role to be a justice of the King's bench or of the common bench but presently representing royal justice in the assize courts—presents the royalist, theocratic position. He does so in his Man of Law's tale . . . through a narrative account, purporting to be history, of a model monarch married to the saint who converts England. (90)

According to Olson, the relationship between the teller and the tale depends on this legal controversy about what good kingship should be. Although it may be possible to assume that the Man of Law is a royalist, does his tale fully support Olson's argument? In other words, can the teller achieve the divine authorization of kingship?

As for King Alla, the Man of Law's claim is fully acceptable. Alla

unifies political ability and religious authority into his own person. His figure may be regarded as a personification of ideal kingship. The narrator seems to address the king (as an imagined reader) and to embody the wished-for sovereignty. In fact, the narrator tells how the happiness that King Alla and Constance welcome does not last long.

For Deeth, that taketh of heigh and logh his rente,  
Whan passed was a yeer, evene as I gesse,  
Out of this world this kyng Alla he hente,  
For whom Custance hath ful greet hevynesse. (B<sup>1</sup> 1142–45)

These most blissful days for the king of Northumberland last for no more than one year because his death prevents him from enjoying the happy life. Constance returns to Rome. If Constance is an allegory of the Roman Church, King Alla's death and Constance's departure may bode ill for Northumberland. The narrator, however, refers to the sequel of his tale, for he mentions Alla and Constance's child:

This child Maurice was sithen Emperour  
Maad by the Pope, and lyved cristenly;  
To Cristes chirche he dide greet honour. (B<sup>1</sup> 1121–23)

Here, the narrator ends by removing any ominous atmosphere which had begun to prevail at the end of his tale. The royal succession indeed brings England both Christianity and at last some political advancement.

Such a story might have been a panegyric to Richard. As Olson notes, the monarch himself tried to claim a divine authority. Indeed, as Constance is the Roman Emperor's daughter, Anne of Bohemia, Richard's well-beloved queen, was the sister of the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Richard's love for his queen was so deep that at her death he became a tyrant with his mind in despair (Thomson 160). The Man of Law's tale of King Alla and Constance then can be seen as a eulogy for the benevolent marriage life of Richard and Anne.

It seems possible from these descriptions to assume that the Man of Law was an established royalist who is quite faithful to his supreme sovereign. The narrator thus emphasizes King Alla as an ideal Christian monarch with religious piety and political authority. As far as he is concerned, there seems no flaw in Hornsby's or Olson's interpretations. Chaucer here lets the teller describe a personified idealistic king. However, the Man of Law's position, I think, will become problematic when we turn our eyes to the Sultan.



## III

Many scholars have referred to Constance as a female saint. On the other hand, the Sultan has been seldom regarded as a Christian although some admits that Chaucer shows sympathy towards him. Morton W. Bloomfield puts emphasis on Chaucer's tolerant descriptions of the impending Saracen conversion (309–10). Recently, the Sultan and Syria in *The Man of Law's Tale* have attracted critical attention concerning orientalist representation. Susan Schibanoff, maintaining Chaucer's treatment of the Sultan as the 'Other', argues that the narrator represents the Saracen and women not as heathens but as heresies inside the orthodoxy, which were more detestable to orthodox Catholic beliefs in the Middle Ages (61–62). Kathryn L. Lynch keeps an eye on Chaucer's using of the cultural difference of East and West as a "way of talking about larger issues of freedom and constraint in storytelling" (410). My standpoint is near to Bloomfield or Lynch, though I agree that the Man of Law and his tale are definitely part of medieval orientalism. Nevertheless, the tragedy of the Sultan does not mean only Chaucer's cultural liberalism. I would rather demonstrate how the Sultan has elements of a Christian monarch. If we compare the Sultan's death with royal figures in the religious and historical writings, it will be clear Chaucer implies that the Sultan follows the example of the 'martyr kings' in medieval England.

The Man of Law obviously portrays the Sultan as a meek and mild man. The story begins with the Syrian merchants' journey to Rome. There they hear about the beauty and chastity of Constance. When the merchants come back to Syria, the Sultan invites them to his court "of his benigne curteisye" (B<sup>1</sup> 179). The narrator refers to the Sultan's being wounded to the heart by imagining Constance's beauty (B<sup>1</sup> 183–89). If we contrast such a conspicuous feature of the Sultan with the emphasis on King Alla's personal strength, the Man of Law's representation unmistakably conveys the impression that the Sultan, though courteous, is intensely introverted and weak. His infatuation with Constance leads to his political fragility, for he heavily depends on parliament to settle his marriage:

And he answerde, "Rather than I lese  
Custance, I wol be cristned, douterles.  
I moot been hires; I may noon oother chese.  
I prey yow hoold youre argumentz in pees;  
Saveth my lyf, and beth noght recchelees  
To geten hire that hath my lyf in cure,

For in this wo I may nat longe endure." (B<sup>1</sup> 225–31)

Here he clearly declares that he accepts Christianity. The Sultan describes himself as in a state of 'wo' and in need of urgent remedy for his lovesickness. His dependance on his parliament consequently implies that his kingship is not absolute. The Sultan, in this sense, is like the lover in a Petrarchan poem. If we compare King Alla to The-seus, it is also possible to regard the Sultan as a lover like Troilus. The Sultan is thus represented as an amorous, meek and, even more, politically weak man by the narrator.

Different from the case of King Alla, the Sultan's conversion contributes to his kingship in no respect. The Syrian parliament, approving of the Sultan's request, finally decides to accept Christianity (B<sup>1</sup> 233–38). The narrator speaks about the condition of the agreement (B<sup>1</sup> 239–243). The conversion adds no authority to the Sultan since the Sultanness easily succeeds in sabotaging the conversion in Syria. The teller likens his tragedy to those of Greek mythology and Roman history:

In sterres, many a wynter therbiforn,  
Was writen the deeth of Ector, Achilles,  
Of Pompei, Julius, er they were born;  
The strif of Thebes; and of Ercules,  
Of Sampson, Turnus, and of Socrates  
The deeth; but mennes wittes ben so dulle  
That no wight kan wel rede it atte fulle. (B<sup>1</sup> 197–203)

The figures that he mentions here are in the main pagan heroes in the Trojan War or great Roman rulers. This is interesting enough when we consider the description of the Sultanness, who is compared to Biblical figures like the serpent (B<sup>1</sup> 360–61). While the Man of Law characterizes the Sultanness absolutely as the enemy of Christ, he sheds light only on the unfortunate pagan aspect of the Sultan.

The Sultan, however, though described by the Man of Law as a pagan, is obscurely provided with a Christian aspect at the same time. This will be explained when we analyze the religious and historical writings. Medieval legends of saints often include worshipful kings, who died holy deaths as martyrs for Christianity mainly in the Anglo-Saxon period. Such 'martyr kings' had importance for political ideology especially in Chaucer's age. To examine the 'martyr king' will be to clarify what attitude the Man of Law adopts toward his contemporary monarch. When we locate the Sultan's death in this context, the Man of Law's royalism becomes problematic. However, before we

discuss these political implications in *The Man of Law's Tale*, it will be necessary to deliberate upon the saint's legends and an English chronicle concerning the 'martyr king' in order to evince the similarities between them and *The Man of Law's Tale*.

There were kings who were eminent for their sacred lives, pious behaviour, or, particularly, their martyrdoms in the early Middle Ages. Some kings were even canonized. *South English Legendary*, the anthology of saints' lives which is thought to have been written at the end of thirteenth century, provides exemplars of the 'martyr king'. Notable instances are the legends of King Oswald and of King Edward the Martyr. Both legends focus on the cruel destinies of reverent kings. King Oswald was the King of Northumberland in the six century and was renowned for his faith.<sup>5</sup> He perished by the sword of the pagan Saxons:

... •hy [pagan Saxons] smite togadere faste  
Ac seint Oswold is Holyman • aslawe was attelaste  
And imartired of is lu er men • for oure Louerdes loue  
(“St. Oswald” 33–35)

Here it is stressed that Oswald is killed for the love of God by the heathens. In other words, Oswald is described as a martyr. Also in *The Man of Law's Tale*, the narrator describes the Sultaness's insistence on Islam: “Makometes lawe” (B<sup>1</sup> 336). The Man of Law deftly depicts her as an obstinate heathen. So the Sultan is equivalent to King Oswald in being slaughtered by the pagans.

Edward the Martyr's fate is more strikingly parallel to the Sultan's. Edward was the young king of England in the tenth century and a descendant of Alfred the Great. He came to a violent end by his stepmother, when he stayed at the castle of his half brother, Aethelred. Aelfthryth, Edward's stepmother, to make her own son the king, had him murdered by her maleficent servants. The situation has much in common with the Sultaness and her parties. In *The Man of Law's Tale* the Sultaness conspires against the Sultan with her sympathizers. The Man of Law graphically narrates their riotous gathering. The Sultaness appeals the trick to deceive the Christian party:

“We shul first feyne us cristendom to take —  
Coold water shal nat greve us but a lite! —  
And I shal swich a feeste and revel make  
That, as I trowe, I shal the Sowdan quite. (B<sup>1</sup> 351–54)

The Sultaness suggests to the Sultan that he should hold a great feast

to celebrate his marriage to Constance and the conversion of all his people. Just as the Sultaness colludes with her rascals, Edward's stepmother feigns to entertain the victim king at their castle:

Pe luþer men he[o] clupede sone • þat were at hure rede  
And bispeke bi wuch felonie • do þis luþer dede  
Po þis holyman was ney icome • þe quene aȝen him ȝeode  
Wiþ fair manie & gret honur • & gret loue him gan beode  
Pe feste þat he[o] wiþ him made • no tonge telle ne may  
And swor þat he ssolde alizte • & wiþ hure bileue alday  
(“St. Edward the Elder” 61–66)

The feasts in both texts form the occasions for bloodshed. The fact that the ruthless murderers are their mother (or mother-like figures) also emphasizes the similarity between the fates of the Sultan and Edward the Martyr. The next quotation is about how the regicide takes place:

... • þo me is wombe rende  
As luþer he was as Iudas • þat so fellich him custe  
And wiþ tricherie is wombe rente • ar he it euere weste  
Po þis holyman ymartred was • ...  
(“St. Edward the Elder” 84–87)

Here his death is patently described as a martyrdom. The death of King Edward sufficiently reminds us of the Sultan's fate:

This olde Sowdanesse, cursed krone,  
Hath with hir freendes doon this cursed dede,  
For she hirself wolde al the contree lede.  
  
Ne ther was Surryen noon that was converted,  
That of the conseil of the Sowdan woot,  
That he nas al tohewe er he asterted. (B<sup>1</sup> 432–37)

The massacre of the Christians is as disastrous as Edward's martyrdom since both of them are murdered without the least resistances. In both cases, the assassinated kings are worshipped devoutly in the later period as saints. In this sense, to be martyred is a way to produce religious value for a king at the cost of his own death. This is a constant pattern that can be readily found both in the hagiographies and in the chronicles. Such similarities between the 'martyr kings' and the Sultan, though not apparently represented by the narrator, suggest that without doubt he is to have the aspect of a martyr.

Examples parallel to the Sultan's disastrous death are also found in

the English chronicles. Robert of Gloucester's *The Metrical Chronicle*, which is thought to have been completed by the monk in the later thirteenth century, treats the history of England from the settlement of Brut, the legendary founder of Britain, to Henry III, his contemporary monarch. Robert of Gloucester also narrates the martyrdoms of King Oswald of Northumberland and King Edward the Martyr. King Oswald was unfortunately slain in the battle against Penda, king of Mercia:

Seint oswald & þe duc penda • an bataile nome •  
 Penda þere þe luper duc • in batayle slou •  
 & Martred seint oswald • & al is body to drou •  
 & mony a pousend of is men • aslawe ek þer were • (4973–76)

King Oswald's misadventure as king of the Saxons contributes to the rightful succession of England by his tribe since the medieval chronicles had the idea that Christianization was inevitable for the authorization of the ruler of Britain. Turville-Petre proposes that the chroniclers regarded highly a religious approval for the succession of kingship (85–91). For example, in Robert of Gloucester's chronicle, "[i]t is the progress of Christianity that represents the unifying principle in the transition from British to English history" (Turville-Petre 89). King Oswald's agonizing death can then be evidence of an English right to inherit Britain from the Britons, since "[t]he martyrdom of the 'holimon' Oswald seals the fate of the Britons" (Turville-Petre 90). Oswald's martyrdom can be construed as a self-sacrificial behavior meant to assure his race of the inheritance as well as to attach a religious value to his sad end.

The effect of such a martyrdom is not limited to the martyr king's own body. Its significances are reversely cast upon the murderers. King Edward, who had a half brother, became king as a boy and was eventually killed by his stepmother (*The Metrical Chronicle* 5850–66). Edward's martyrdom is followed by Aethelred's accession to the throne, but during his reign England suffered the armed invasion from the North (6086–96). So Edward's fate consequently implies the ensuing political disturbance and disorder. Robert of Gloucester here indicates that to kill a 'holy king' may produce a bad result. These baptisms of blood are motifs which the chronicles and hagiographies shared in the fourteenth century, but in the chronicle their political implication is placed more clearly in the foreground.

The important point, however, is that although these elements could

be enough to frame the hagiography of the Sultan, the narrator does not intend to tell it like this since he evidently represents the Sultan as a non-Christian. As for martyrdom and the Sultan, it is noteworthy that the teller indeed alludes to the 'saint's legend' of Love in the *Introduction* to his own tale. Here he names the heroines in *The Legend of Good Women*:

"In youthe he [Chaucer] made of Ceys and Alcione,  
 And sitthen hath he spoken of everichone,  
 Thise noble wyves and thise loveris eke.  
 Whoso that wole his large volume seke,  
 Cleped the Seintes Legende of Cupide,  
 Ther may he seen the large woundes wyde  
 Of Lucesse, and of Babilan Tesbee; (B<sup>1</sup> 57–63)

These women are paragons of morality for the Man of Law while he condemns a story of incest like Canacee or Apollonius of Tyre (B<sup>1</sup> 77–85).<sup>6</sup> Yet it is impossible to neglect that these martyrs for Love, like Lucretia or Thisbe, have a similarity with the tragedy of the Sultan. As I have argued, the Sultan is characterized as a gloomy lover like Troilus. Considering such a preoccupation in his love for Constance, the Sultan's death may be construed as a case like Thisbe's or Lucretia's, but not, it seems, like those of the Christian 'martyr kings'. The Sultaness's slaughter of the Sultan has in common the killing by the heathens and the royal relatives. The Man of Law disregards the Sultan's Christianity. Such an attitude in the teller will prove problematic when we consider the relation between the 'martyr king' and the contemporary political scene. The connections, which will be discussed in the next section, are important for our reexamination of the Man of Law's position as a royalist.

#### IV

The image of the 'martyr king' was not confined to the field of religious literature or chronicle. This emblem was not only presented as a literal icon, but also as material for a more practical political strategy in late fourteenth-century England. The Man of Law's narrative unconsciously reveals an ambiguous implication in the 'martyr king' as it describes the Sultan's death. If we survey the image as used in royal policy, Chaucer's implied comment on the Man of Law's political position will be clarified.

Although the controversy about the date of *The Man of Law's Tale*

has not been completely settled, the probable date can be confined to the earlier half of the 1390s. Helen Cooper, for instance, suggests that around 1390 would be a possible date (125). These years were significant for the political crisis in the court (Thomson 151–58; Tuck, *Crown and Nobility* 186–99). The struggle between the king, Richard II, and the magnates so intensified that the latter, described as the Lord Appellants (Thomas of Gloucester, the earl of Arundel, Henry of Derby, the earl of Warwick and the earl of Nottingham) even intended to dethrone the king (Tuck, *Crown and Nobility* 186–87). Their hostility rose because of the taxation and the king's partial patronage for his favorite courtiers (Thomson 152–54). It is interesting that, as Anthony Tuck points out, the king's and the Appellants' discourses were both based on the political past of England during the tumult:

The king's approach to government in the 1380s, and especially in 1385 and 1386, is notable for its resemblance to the methods adopted by Edward II in the last decade of his reign. *The resemblance was in all probability intentional*. . . . In both the methods of government and the rhetoric of political argument the first half of Richard's reign was characterized by a recalling of the events of Edward II's reign. (Tuck, *Richard II* 71; italics mine)

The reign of Edward II, Richard's great-grandfather, shared many similarities with that of Richard, such as "his use of the chamber, its close connection with the secret seal, and his realization of the ability and administrative potential of the clerks of the chapel royal" (Tuck, *Richard II* 71). Edward II was also in conflict with the magnates, especially Thomas of Lancaster (Tuck, *Crown and Nobility* 70–72). So Richard and the Appellants consciously played out the drama of the conflict between Edward II and the magnates. According to Tuck, at the king's refusal to hold parliament, the nobilities went to meet Richard at Eltham in October 1386 and told him of the necessity for a parliament:

The final and most telling point of their speech was their assertion that the community had the right to depose a king . . . , an oblique but unmistakable reference to the deposition of Edward II. (Tuck, *Richard II* 103)

The magnates, implying that they had the same idea for Richard, here alluded to the fate of Edward.

It is in this political milieu that the 'martyr king' was deployed as an image for the king. Richard intentionally played the role of Edward II, as if he had taken part in the drama of the disturbance at court. The

'martyr king', the conventional symbol in hagiographies and chronicles, was practically promoted by Richard, for through his worship of Edward II he attempted to have him canonized (Tuck, *Richard II* 71). To patronize Edward II as his royal saint was in a sense a religious strategy for Richard to authorize his own policy. Edward II was dethroned (and may have been killed) by his queen, Isabella and his magnate in 1327 (especially Roger Mortimer, the earl of March). If we turn our minds to Edward's last days, it is possible to see that Richard might have regarded him as a 'martyr king' like King Oswald or King Edward the Martyr. As I have pointed out in the previous section, their deaths not only produce religious value via martyr's holiness, but also imply the following subsequent calamities for the country and even the murderers themselves. As well as a divinely authorized kingship, the martyrdom could undeniably have provided Richard with a means of resistance. Ann W. Astell rightly comments:

Indeed, Richard must have been conscious early in his reign that his fate might well be a "martyrdom" like Edward's, should he insist, in theory and practice, on the royal prerogative of the king as God's anointed. (*Political Allegory* 106)

To put it differently, Astell interprets Richard's life as the story of a 'martyr king', one which Richard himself played out for his own purposes. Such a worship of the 'martyr king' by Richard II is indispensable to an interpretation of the political meaning in *The Man of Law's Tale*. If to behave like Edward II — namely, to be a 'martyr king' — was Richard's passive defense against the magnates' threatening, the Sultan's death could equally count as the political performance of the 'martyr king' role.

Chaucer might well have grasped the political situation. Astell also claims that Richard worshipped not the brave and militaristic kings like Richard I, Edward I or Edward III, but the more meek and contemplative kings like Edward II or Edward the Confessor.<sup>7</sup> The king entertained a deep veneration for Edward the Confessor and added a new section to Westminster Abbey which was originally founded by the Confessor (Astell, *Political Allegory* 103–5). Chaucer himself was linked to this royal policy. The poet was appointed as a clerk of works at Westminster Abbey, the Tower of London and other castles in 1389 and 1390 after Richard re-established his authority (Crow and Olson 402–13). Chaucer's own political position is not clear, but it is possible to assume that he had knowledge of the conflict between the king

and the magnates in 1386, since he attended the parliament in October (Crow and Olson 364–69). So it may not be inconceivable that Chaucer could have used this political disturbance as one of the sources for his character's tale.

If the 'martyr king' was an important image for the present monarch, what does the tragic death of the Sultan mean? The Sultan shares features with Richard II. The Sultan, like King Alla, marries the daughter of the Roman Emperor while Richard's queen came from the family of the Holy Roman Empire. That the Sultan is finally killed by his mother reminds us of the tragic death of Edward the Martyr and Richard's coming fate. It is true that in the earlier 1390s Richard II had not yet been murdered, but there was a strong possibility of his being dethroned and even worse, his death at the hands of royal relatives like Thomas of Woodstock (Richard's youngest uncle) or Henry of Derby (Richard's cousin).

As I have argued in the previous section, the Man of Law can be construed as a royalist, concerning his exaltation of King Alla's authority. I think, however, that here lies Chaucer's satire on the narrator. The fact that he hardly views the Sultan as a 'martyr king' is a problematic point for his royalist aspect. His narrative discloses that he is unaware of Richard's other strategy which was of much importance whereas in the description of King Alla the Man of Law seems to succeed in fashioning himself as a royalist, who tells the story of absolute divine kingship.

When we consider such political connotations, we can assume that Chaucer's satire lies not only in the teller's materialistic attitude or his limited earthly viewpoint, as critics have observed. His irony is also aimed at the narrator's ignorance of the 'martyr king' theme — a conventional motif in the religious, historical, and political narratives. The Man of Law, in Astell's phrase, is not only "incapable of understanding providence" ("Apostrophe" 94) but also unable to recognize the latent meaning of the 'martyr king'. Even if the Man of Law loudly tries to promote an absolutist kingship for Richard, his narrative reveals that his attempt is incomplete because he neglects the religious and political significance of the 'martyr king' strategy which Richard himself adopted. It is such a limitation in his understanding of royal policy that Chaucer mocks. In short, the Man of Law is more incomplete a royalist than he seems to be.

It can be concluded that Chaucer satirizes the Man of Law's political position. The satire lies precisely in the representations of the two

contrastive kings. King Alla of Northumberland is described by the narrator as an ideal Christian monarch with authority and religious piety, although he highlights the Sultan of Syria as an ill-starred pagan. However, if we concentrate our attention on the Sultan's death, it becomes clear that the value of his martyrdom is completely misunderstood by the Man of Law. The Sultan, though the narrator never intends to show it, follows the conventional image of the 'martyr king' which appears frequently in religious and historical texts. The Man of Law reveals his lack of knowledge concerning the 'martyr king', whose image was used as a political strategy by Richard. This view of the 'martyr king' material thus leads us to the conclusion that Chaucer lampoons the narrator's position as a royalist, for Chaucer subtly implies that despite his sagacity stressed in the *General Prologue*, the Man of Law has only a limited perception of the political situation in his contemporary England.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Orientalism in the Middle Ages has become a fascinating subject for contemporary critics. Some scholars pay attention to Chaucer's *The Squire's Tale*, for its setting is Asia, or possibly the Mongol Empire. John M. Fyler notices its description of otherness in Cambyuskan's court (13–14). In addition, Iain M. Higgins analyzes the doctrine of Christian expansionism in the legend of Prester John in Sir John Mandeville's *Travels*, which is considered one of the sources for *The Squire's Tale* (156–202).

<sup>2</sup> This was the time when the English language began to regain its authority. The language of law was also under the influence of linguistic transition. Chaucer's description suggests that the Man of Law should speak English. Norman F. Blake points out that although Richard II and his Queen were French speakers, English became more common as a language of the royal court (181). Blake also clarifies the decreasing importance of French as the legal language:

As a written language it [French] remained important in the law and statutes were printed in French until well into the sixteenth century. For most people, however, it ceased to play any significant part in their lives, for locally the law was conducted in English. (Blake 181–82)

Chaucer's Man of Law also uses legal terms in English. In the *Introduction to The Man of Law's Tale*, Chaucer vividly describes a comical conversation between the Host and the Man of Law in which they employ legal terms in English (Benson et al. 855)

<sup>3</sup> The historical source of King Alla is not clear. According to the note in *The Riverside Chaucer*, the model would be Aella, king of Deira (Benson et al.

861).

<sup>4</sup> R. James Goldstein, in a recent essay, points out the political meaning of the reference to his expedition to Scotland. According to Goldstein, the fact that Chaucer omitted the real places names in Nicholas Trivet's chronicle and that he defines King Alla as a positive hero so as to make the Scottish enemy seem morally bad manifests Chaucer's consciousness of England imperialism.

Recovering Chaucer's fictional erasure of the Scots thus demonstrates that despite his characteristic evasiveness about contemporary politics, his peculiar blend of transcendental spirituality and *Sassenach* historiography in the *Man of Law's Tale* is fully consistent with the project of English imperialism. (39)

<sup>5</sup> The miracle concerns Oswald's merciful behaviour. Oswald invited Aidan from Scotland to spread Christianity through his kingdom. When he dined with him, the poor appeared begging before him. The merciful king provided them with what he ate and the silver dishes. Aidan prayed for the Lord not to allow Oswald's reverent hands to decay forever. His hands, even after death, never decayed. This story is from "St. Oswald" 5–28.

<sup>6</sup> One of the ambiguous points in the *Introduction* is the Man of Law's reference to incest. This is considered as an allusion to John Gower, who told in *Confessio Amantis* the story of Canacee who is violated by her father (Benson et al. 856). Nevertheless, Chaucer himself treats Canacee as the heroine of *The Squire's Tale*, where he suggests that Canacee's lover could be her brother (F 667–69).

<sup>7</sup> Edward the Confessor is in a sense the last king of Anglo-Saxon England. He was eventually canonized in 1161 (Barlow 280–81). However, his political supremacy was rather weak, for he was under the influence of the great earl, Godwin of Wessex (Barlow 90). His queen was Godwin's daughter and his successor was Godwin's own son, Harold, defeated by William the Conqueror at the Battle of Hastings.

### Works Cited

- Astell, Ann W. "Apostrophe, Prayer, and the Structure of Satire in *The Man of Law's Tale*." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 13 (1991): 81–97.
- . *Political Allegory in Late Medieval England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Baldwin, Anna. "'The Man of Law's Tale' as a Philosophical Narrative." *Yearbook of English Studies* 22 (1992): 181–89.
- Barlow, Frank. *Edward the Confessor*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- Benson, C. David. "Varieties of Religious Poetry in *The Canterbury Tales: The Man of Law's Tale* and *The Clerk's Tale*." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* Proceedings No. 2 (1986): 159–67.
- Benson, Larry D., et al., eds. *The Riverside Chaucer*. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
- Blake, Norman F. *A History of the English Language*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Bloomfield, Morton W. "Chaucer's Sense of History." *JEGP* 51 (1952): 301–13.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *General Prologue*. Benson et al. 23–36.
- . *Introduction to The Man of Law's Tale*. Benson et al. 87–89.

- . *The Man of Law's Tale*. Benson et al. 89–104.
- . *The Squire's Tale*. Benson et al. 169–77.
- Cooney, Helen. "Wonder and Immanent Justice in the *Man of Law's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 33 (1999): 264–87.
- Cooper, Helen. *The Canterbury Tales: The Oxford Guide to Chaucer*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Crow, Martin M., and Clair C. Olson, eds. *Chaucer Life-Records*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- D'Evelyn, Charlotte, and Anna J. Mill, eds. *The South English Legendary*. E.E.T.S. O.S., 235, 236. 2 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1956.
- Fyler, John M. "Domesticating the Exotic in the *Squire's Tale*." *ELH* 55 (1988): 1–26.
- Goldstein, R. James. "'To Scotlond-ward, his foomen for to seke': Chaucer, the Scots, and the *Man of Law's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 33 (1998): 31–42.
- Green, Richard Firth. "Chaucer's Man of Law and Collusive Recovery." *Notes and Queries* 40 (1993): 303–5.
- Hendrix, Laurel L. "'Pennance Profytable': The Currency of Custance in Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale*." *Exemplaria* 6 (1994): 141–66.
- Higgins, Iain M. *Writing East: "The Travels" of Sir John Mandeville*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997.
- Hornsby, Joseph. "A Sergeant of the Lawe, War and Wyse." *Chaucer's Pilgrims: An Historical Guide to the Pilgrims in The Canterbury Tales*. Ed. Laura C. Lambdin and Robert T. Lambdin. Westport: Greenwood, 1996. 116–34.
- Kolve, V. A. *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative: The First Five Canterbury Tales*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1984.
- Lynch, Kathryn L. "Storytelling, Exchange, and Constancy: East and West in Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 33 (1999): 409–22.
- Olson, Paul A. *The Canterbury Tales and the Good Society*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Paull, Michael R. "The Influence of the Saint's Legend Genre in the *Man of Law's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 5 (1971): 179–94.
- Robert of Gloucester. *The Metrical Chronicle*. Ed. William Aldis Wright. Rolls Series. 86. Vol 1. 1887. Wiesbaden: Kraus, 1965. 2 vols.
- "St. Edward the Elder." D'Evelyn and Mill 1: 110–18.
- "St. Oswald the King." D'Evelyn and Mill 2: 357–58.
- Schibanoff, Susan. "Worlds Apart: Orientalism, Antifeminism, and Heresy in Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale*." *Exemplaria* 8 (1996): 59–96.
- Schlauch, Margaret. "The Man of Law's Tale." *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster. 1941. London: Routledge, 1958. 155–206.
- Thomson, John A. F. *The Transformation of Medieval England 1370–1529*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Tuck, Anthony. *Crown and Nobility 1272–1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England*. 1985. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- . *Richard II and the English Nobility*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.
- Turville-Petre, Thorlac. *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290–1340*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

## Serpents Named and Naming: Representations of Confrontation in Keats's *Lamia*

Chikako Saito

### I

John Keats composed his narrative poem *Lamia* from late June to early September 1819. The story of the poem is based on a short anecdote about a sage in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* by Robert Burton. The wise philosopher rescues his disciple from marriage to a woman who is “found out to be a serpent, a lamia” (188). While Burton’s narrator does not reveal that the woman is a serpent until the middle of the tale, Keats’s heroine appears as a snake at the beginning and then metamorphoses into a beautiful woman in the middle of the poem. According to the *OED*, “lamia” is the name of “a fabulous monster” which is “supposed to have the body of a woman, and to prey upon human beings and suck the blood of children.” However, it is not clear that Lamia in this narrative tries to prey on a man or a child. The female serpent of Keats’s poem dares to approach a young man purely for love and wishes to be loved by him. At the end of the story, she seems to be rather the victim. She is annihilated by the stare of an old philosopher, Apollonius, and a shout from her lover, Lycius; however, she retains a woman’s figure when she disappears.

The poem has been discussed as the confrontation between the magical enchantment of Lamia and the cold philosophy of Apollonius. The accusation aimed at Lamia has been considered as the recognition of reality by Lycius, and it causes him to die. Though there are many critics who admit that Keats stands by Lamia, most analyses have pointed out the moral ambiguity of her character.<sup>1</sup> Some scholars take her for a fatal serpent woman who lures young Lycius to his death and others appraise her as a victim.<sup>2</sup> Recent interpretations of *Lamia*, however, tend to avoid moral definitions and focus instead on the representation of the heroine as a woman.<sup>3</sup> Since the current gender criticism has offered numerous explications of “femininity” in the poetry

of Keats, *Lamia* has been discussed from this view point because it is one of his most problematic works in this respect.<sup>4</sup> However, some of these studies of femininity in his poetry treat his works generally and it seems that there remains room for a discussion focused on *Lamia*.

It is interesting that the critics who regard *Lamia* as a disastrous being consider her a tempter like Satan in *Paradise Lost*.<sup>5</sup> They seem to ignore that a lamia in its original form is not a tempter but a monster which preys upon human beings. The name *Lamia* has lost its original meaning, signifying simply a serpent woman as defined by Burton. *Lamia* in Keats functions as a womanly sexual seducer to a young man. Though the heroine succeeds in captivating Lycius, her power later decreases. A woman is given the force to control the opposite sex, but the male characters later recover their powers. The announcement of the male characters that she is a serpent makes her vanish at the end. Old Apollonius is a stronger male character than young Lycius. The text makes the philosopher more spiteful than the serpent woman. His stare deprives *Lamia* of her beauty and vigour, and it gives a cue to Lycius's fatal exclamation. The conclusion implies the powerful existence of a masculine superintendency which can define the other and, at the same time, its ironic, contradictory failure. I will consider why the heroine must finally be expelled, and why Apollonius wants to annihilate her, through an analysis of the representations of serpents manifested in the text.

## II

Keats's narrator tells how *Lamia* dissolves into nothing at the end of the story. The trigger for her vanishing is a shout from Lycius. He cries "A serpent!" (2. 305).<sup>6</sup> It is true that she has appeared as a snake, but she has changed her figure to "A woman's shape" (1. 118). Therefore, the accusation that she is a snake is made not against her present form but against her nature as a serpent. The strictures will need their ground.

It is true that, while the heroine takes the serpent form, the narrator of the poem describes it as the "snake" (1. 88), the "serpent" (1. 113), or "the brilliance feminine" (1. 92). He does not call her a woman.<sup>7</sup> Though he tells how she has "a woman's mouth," it is merely a reference to one part of the body and is not equal to defining her as a woman. The snake for itself says that "I was a woman" (1. 117), but this also reveals that she is not a woman. After the change of her

appearance from serpent to human, the narrator calls the heroine "a lady bright" (1. 171), "a maid" (1. 185), and "this fair creature" (1. 200). He does not call her a serpent or a snake after the metamorphosis; the narration distinguishes the heroine in a woman's shape from the same person in a snake's form. However, we can recognize that the woman is the serpent. Our perception is provided by the impression that there is some continuity between both *Lamias*, the snake and the woman.

There are two common factors between them. One is the femininity of both bodies and the other is the attachment to Lycius. Hermes finds "a palpitating snake" (1. 45), which is the heroine with puzzling colours and patterns.

She was a gordian shape of dazzling hue,  
Vermilion-spotted, golden, green, and blue;  
Striped like a zebra, freckled like a pard,  
Eyed like a peacock, and all crimson barr'd;  
And full of silver moons, that, as she breathed,  
Dissolv'd, or brighter shone, or interwreathed  
Their lustres with the gloomier tapestries—  
So rainbow-sided, touch'd with miseries,  
She seem'd, at once, some penanced lady elf,  
Some demon's mistress, or the demon's self. (1. 47–56)

The depiction seems to reject any precise definition, though the colours and patterns of the snake are exceedingly vivid and flowery. The pronoun tells us that the snake is female, but the last line of this quotation evokes an insecure feeling about the gender of the serpent. The narrator implies that the appearance of the snake apply to both sexes by "Some demon's mistress, or the demon's self." If we see only the depiction of the body, the demonstrative pronoun is apparently the chief support of our judgement that it is female. Although line 56 evokes the ambiguity of the sex of the snake, it is soon solved. The expressions after that line make it more clear that the serpent is female.

Upon her crest she wore a wannish fire  
Sprinkled with stars, like Ariadne's tiar:  
Her head was serpent, but ah, bitter-sweet!  
She had a woman's mouth with all its pearls complete:  
And for her eyes: what could such eyes do there  
But weep, and weep, that they were born so fair?  
As Proserpine still weeps for her Sicilian air. (1. 57–63)

There are two similes which compare her body parts to two famous



ancient Grecian princesses. Ariadne is a girl whose love is her undoing and Proserpine is a maid who is deflowered because of the love of Dis or Pluto. The “wannish fire / Sprinkled with stars” implies a feminine frailty like Ariadne and eyes that “weep” suggest a womanly violated helplessness. Her mouth is also described as “woman’s.” These phrases supply more decisive female elements for the snake. Moreover, as I mentioned above, she is described as “a brilliant feminine” (1. 92). The femininity of the serpent is thus repeatedly depicted.

After the transformation, it is said that the woman has a desire to see herself in “a clear pool” (1. 182). Looking in a mirror is one of the traditional icons of womanly behavior. The outward appearance of the woman is depicted as a beautiful maid.

Ah, happy Lycius! — for she was a maid  
 More beautiful than ever twisted braid,  
 Or sigh’d, or blush’d, or on spring-flowered lea  
 Spread a green kirtle to the minstrelsy:  
 A virgin purest lipp’d, yet in the lore  
 Of love deep learned to the red heart’s core: (1. 185–90)

Her feminine beauty is praised and the narrator lets out an envious exclamation to Lycius. Each wording of this praise follows a convention. She is compared with other maids, whose charms are supposed to consist in their twisted braids, sighing, blushing, and spread kirtles. Sighing and blushing are also traditional signs of loving somebody though they can be applied to both sexes. Braids and kirtles may indicate more female elements. The old romance represented by “the minstrelsy” has regarded these kinds of ornaments as for women. The word “maid” and “virgin” contains more sexual implication than “woman,” but they make it clear that she is a female. Her attractiveness is reported by the narrator. Though the quotation seems to show the womanly loveliness of the heroine, her femininity is depicted with conventional diction.

The constancy of her love to Lycius is more obvious. The serpent confesses to Hermes her affection for “a youth of Corinth” (1. 119) when she asks him to change her figure to a woman, and she cries “Lycius! Gentle Lycius!” (1. 168) when she finishes her transmutation. The call is one piece of evidences that she is attached to him and it makes the reader presume that Lycius is the name of the person whom she loves. After the transformation, the narrator talks about a prehistory of her affinity and it informs us that Lycius is a youth of Corinth and that her affection for him causes her formal change. Once she

becomes a woman, she makes her appeal, and easily succeeds in cajoling him with her overwhelming enchantment.

The heroine appears as a glaring snake and changes her figure to a brilliant woman. Her continuity through her metamorphosis consists in her conscience and her sex. In spite of her physical transformation, she is banished as a serpent at the end of the story. It is true that she has a strong enchantment for the young man and manipulates others in Part I. These abilities result from her nature as a serpent or a monster. In Part II, however, she is deprived of her power to dominate others and the male characters come to possess it. The power shift suggests that her quality as a snake is decreasing.

The serpent is originally discovered by Hermes, who was looking for a “sweet nymph” (1. 30) in Crete. He hears her voice before seeing her appearance.

There as he stood, he heard a mournful voice,  
 Such as once heard, in gentle heart, destroys  
 All pain but pity: thus the lone voice spake:  
 “When from this wreathed tomb shall I awake!  
 When move in a sweet body fit for life,  
 And love, and pleasure, and the ruddy strife  
 Of hearts and lips! Ah, miserable me!” (1. 35–41)

The introduction of “a mournful voice” has the power to cultivate the listeners’ pity or sympathy and it shows the narrator’s compassion for its speaker. The “wreathed tomb” indicates the form of a snake as a coiling figure. However, the diction suggests that the snake form is just a grave with a flowery appearance. The declaration about being “awake” indicates that the speaker thinks that being in the body of a serpent is like sleeping. The utterance is a lament that the speaker is buried in a tomb, in the body of a serpent. The voice wants a body, which is qualified as “sweet.” It is the common adjective given to the nymph whom Hermes seeks. This “sweet nymph” is adored and given gifts by “all hoofed Satyrs” (1. 14) and “the languid Tritons” (1. 15). However, her charm is not fully explained. She has “white feet” (1. 15) and it is the only concrete description of her. Certainly, the narrator exclaims “what a world of love was at her feet” (1. 21) but the direct epithet for herself is only “sweet.” The sweetness seems to be the main factor in her character that attracts satyrs, tritons and Hermes. It is not clear whether this quality of the nymph attaches itself to her nature or just to her looks; however, the “mournful voice” directs the word to “body.” A “sweet body” is supposed to enjoy the pleasure of

life and sensual satisfaction in the following phrase. Especially, “the ruddy strife / Of hearts and lips” suggests a vivid and lively sensation. The voice declares that the snake’s body is a “wreathed tomb” and it wants “a sweet body.” It demands to be revived from the state of death to an active existence.

After the formal change of the heroine, there is an expression given by the narrator which refers to the serpent. It is the phrase that “she could muse / And dream, when in the serpent prison-house” (1. 202–03). It means that the body of the snake is regarded as a “prison-house” and that she is now free from it. It also suggests the existence of some inner self imprisoned in the form of the snake. Therefore, the diction makes a contrast between the outer form and the inner essence of the heroine. We usually consider that the serpent and the lady have the same identity in spite of the physical transformation. It is because we take her consciousness for her essential quality and we think that the continuity of her nature guarantees her stable identity. The phrase shows that the snake body is given without her will. The heroine thinks that her identity does not depend on her changeable form but on the sequence of her senses.

The implication by Apollonius at the end of the story determines that the heroine is a serpent. Lycius accepts the suggestion of the sage. Their definition made her vanish. Readers of the poem may also infer that she is a serpent woman since they know that she was a serpent. The responsibility for the decision of the readers partly lies with the narrator. The name of Lamia is given to the heroine after her transmutation. Except for the title of the poem, this proper noun for the protagonist first appears at line 171, which is the very first appearance of “A full-born beauty new and exquisite” (1. 172). The heroine makes her appearance as a womanly figure. The name functions as a label informing us that she is a monster despite her formal change. She is known to be a lamia or a serpent by her name. Wolfson suggests that the name of Lamia is “a sign of her true identity” (*Questioning Presence* 337). However, if her identity is not in her form but in her consciousness, there is a possibility that the naming by the narrator provides another prison-house for her. She can not escape from this identity as a monster or a serpent as long as she is trapped by the act of naming.

Apollonius is the man who exposes her as a serpent. He is an old philosopher and sage. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, there is a possibility that the compulsion of Lamia by Apollonius is tyrannical. The sage related by Burton, on the other hand, seems to be judicious and righteous. Keats has given him another dimension. This section argues that Apollonius is not just a sage but a malicious man in Keats’s text and that he is described as like a serpent at several points. To begin with, I want to confirm the main evidence that he seems to be the champion of right. The following citation is Apollonius’s reaction when accused by Lycius, who had been astonished because the gaze of his teacher made his bride “no longer fair, there sat a deadly white” (2. 276).

“Fool! Fool!” repeated he, while his eyes still  
Relented not, nor mov’d; “from every ill  
Of life have I preserv’d thee to this day,  
And shall I see thee made a serpent’s prey?” (2. 295–8)

Apollonius seems to insist that he will prevent young Lycius from being “a serpent’s prey.” If his assertion were admitted, he would be the guardian of his disciple with justice and goodwill. He does not say directly that Lamia is a snake. He merely implies it. But his other discourses and behavior betray this sense. When they are considered, it is difficult to say he is simply a man of good faith.

Apollonius represents “cold philosophy” (2. 230). The text resolves the conflict between the “cold philosophy” of Apollonius and the magical enchantment of Lamia. This struggle in the poem has invoked a number of controversies. The narrator says that “all charms fly / At the mere touch of cold philosophy” (2. 229–30). Metaphysics is traditionally taken as a male force of intellect and Apollo is its ruling God. Apollonius’s authority is considered as a conventional male strength. Lucy Newlyn suggests that Apollonius is the reality principle. While commenting on the love of Don Juan and Haidee in Byron’s poem, she compares Lambro, who is the father of Haidee, with Apollonius (187).<sup>8</sup> His character has the aspect of a paternal male master.

He first appears towards the end of Part I, when Lamia and Lycius come to Corinth. This encounter episode is not found in Burton’s text; it is an insertion by Keats. It is conceivable that the teacher is an inhabitant of the same city. In fact, the first description of Apollonius comes after a brief report of town street with flaring lights at night, which describes the obscenity there.

As men talk in a dream, so Corinth all,  
 Throughout her palaces imperial,  
 And all her populous streets and temples lewd,  
 Mutter'd, like tempest in the distance brew'd,  
 To the wide-spread night above her towers.  
 Men, women, rich and poor, in the cool hours,  
 Shuffled their sandals o'er the pavement white,  
 Companion'd or alone; while many a light  
 Flared, here and there, from wealthy festivals,  
 And threw their moving shadows on the walls,  
 Or found them cluster'd in the corniced shade  
 Of some arch'd temple door, or dusky colonnade. (1. 350–61)

Immediately after this quotation, Lamia and Lycius see Apollonius passing nearby. The account of the town, which looks like a voluptuous shadow play, provides the impression that all over the city is the world of night and loose morals, and that there is every sort of unchaste person. Corinth has been considered notorious for its sensual corruption. One of the reasons for this is that there was a temple sacred to Aphrodite, that is, to Venus. It is said that there were hundreds of male and female temple prostitutes there. It is also well known that the first letter of Paul to the Corinthians treats sexual immorality as one of its main issues. The city's name, "Corinth," is also used as meaning a house of ill fame in *The Life of Tymon of Athens*.<sup>9</sup> Though there is a line space between the information of the dreamlike vision of this lewdness and the encounter of Lamia and Lycius with Apollonius, the sequence can raise a slight doubt about the authenticity of the teacher in Corinth.

The second time that he makes his appearance is at the reception of the wedding banquet for Lamia and Lycius. The old man seems to have something in mind due to his attitude to Lycius. Apollonius is not invited to the feast because Lamia has demanded that Lycius exclude the philosopher. Though uninvited, he comes to the palace established by the magic of Lamia. He speaks to Lycius as follows:

He met within the murmurous vestibule  
 His young disciple. "'Tis no common rule,  
 Lycius," said he, "for uninvited guest  
 To force himself upon you, and infest  
 With an unbidden presence the bright throng  
 Of younger friends; yet must I do this wrong,  
 And you forgive me." Lycius blush'd, and led  
 The old man through the inner doors broad-spread;  
 With reconciling words and courteous mien

Turning into sweet milk the sophist's spleen. (2. 163–72)

His way of talking and apologizing here is indirect. He may have reason to be in a bad temper, but he seems to carry something in mind. Moreover, the narrator reports "the sophist's spleen." "Spleen" is derived from a Greek word meaning one of the internal organs, which has been considered to have an influence on human emotion. Emotion is not in keeping with the sage of "cold philosophy." If "cold philosophy" includes "spleen," "cold" does not mean intellectual calmness, but heartlessness or anger that is barely controlled and this showing of Apollonius's spleen reminds us of a similar attitude in evil spirits from fairy tales like "Sleeping Beauty." In these fables, a bad fairy who is not invited to the feast celebrating the birth of a prince or a princess brings evil upon them. Apollonius, who is not invited either, effects the vanishing of Lamia and the death of Lycius in the middle of their celebration. The visit of Apollonius is based on ill will, like that of an evil fairy.

In the last part of the story, Apollonius gazes at Lamia and the force of his eyes makes her lose her charm and power. It causes Lycius to reproach him, though the philosopher used to be considered by the youth as a "sage, my trusty guide / And good instructor" (1. 375–76). Here is Lycius's accusation:

"Shut, shut those juggling eyes, thou ruthless man!  
 Turn them aside, wretch! or the righteous ban  
 Of all the Gods, whose dreadful images  
 Here represent their shadowy presences,  
 May pierce them on the sudden with the thorn  
 Of painful blindness; leaving thee forlorn,  
 In trembling dotage to the feeblest fright  
 Of conscience, for their long offended might,  
 For all thine impious proud-heart sophistries,  
 Unlawful magic, and enticing lies.  
 Corinthians! look upon that gray-beard wretch!  
 Mark how, possess'd, his lashless eyelids stretch  
 Around his demon eyes! Corinthians, see!  
 My sweet bride withers at their potency." (2. 277–90)

This indictment makes it clear that, for Lycius, Apollonius is no longer a trusty guide, but rather a "ruthless man" and a "wretch." The voice of the former young pupil grows more intense. The words, "forlorn," "impious proud-heart," "possess'd," indicate that Lycius takes his teacher for someone far from the grace of God, and these expressions represent Apollonius as a demonic figure. What is more, the power of

his cold philosophy is not the opposing force to magic but “Unlawful magic, and enticing lies.” From all of these descriptions, Apollonius could not be regarded as merely a sage. Rather, he appears malicious.

## VI

Apollonius is not portrayed as having only ill will. It has been pointed out that he has the element of a serpent also. His characterization should be considered in more detail from this viewpoint. Harmione de Almeida discusses the leading image of the serpent in *Lamia* (418). She insists that representations of snakes fill this narrative poem above and beyond the snake woman, Lamia herself. Building up her argument on studies of venom, the bionomics of serpents and some legends about adders during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century in Britain, she suggests that both Lycius and Apollonius have some of the qualities of predatory animals or serpents. Her view rests on the fact that Lycius stares at Lamia as if he would drink her beauty up unless she should vanish (1. 251–56) and that Apollonius destroys Lamia by his powerful gaze. According to de Almeida, the very force of eyes to possess the body and mind of the prey is considered as characteristic of serpents during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Bruce Clarke also thinks that the eyes of Apollonius have the destructive force of a basilisk. Though Apollonius says to Lycius, “shall I see thee made a serpent’s prey,” he himself has made Lamia the prey of his powerful eyes.

Lycius delineates the eyes and eyelids of his teacher as “juggling eyes,” “lushless eyelids,” and “demon eyes.” As de Almeida asserts, they can be read as the accounts of a serpent. Leaving aside the question of whether they are a portrait of reptiles’ eyes, there has been some discussion about the power of Apollonius’s eyes as a form of evil strength. These descriptions of the eyes of Apollonius are part of the evidence that he has the qualities of a snake. However, other elements also seem to imply his potency as a serpent.

Apollonius comes to the feast in Lamia’s magic palace among other guests:

Save one, who look’d thereon with eye severe,  
And with calm-planted steps walk’d in austere;  
‘Twas Apollonius: something too he laugh’d,  
As though some knotty problem, that had daft  
His patient thought, had now begun to thaw,  
And solve and melt: — twas just as he foresaw. (2. 157–62)

This portrait shows his eyes and his way of walking. This “eye severe” is characteristic for Apollonius, and it is the very thing that comes to play an important role at the end of the story. His manner of walking is also described in a strange phrase. According to the *OED*, to use “plant” as “the sole of the foot” is very rare. If the poet just wanted to say that Apollonius walks calmly, “planted” might not be needed. It sounds curious that he dares to use the expression which puts emphasis on “the sole of the foot.” The wording about the calmly planted sole of the foot may suggest the movement of a snake, which crawls silently on the belly. Furthermore, the expression may indicate another “plant” or vegetation, which is a homonym of this “plant” or sole. If the term intimates both a serpent and green plants, it is not difficult to associate it with Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, in which the serpent and the garden are closely connected. Then, Apollonius could be taken for a character associated with the Satan of *Paradise Lost* as their potent eyes and serpent-like movements indicate.

In *Paradise Lost*, Satan performs similar actions. He takes on the body of a snake and coils in front of Eve before he tries to seduce her.

As when a ship by skilful steersman wrought  
Nigh river’s mouth or foreland, where the wind  
Veers oft, as oft so steers, and shifts her sail;  
So varied he, and of his tortuous train  
Curled many a wanton wreath in sight of Eve,  
To lure her eye; (PL, 9. 515–20)

This is the very point when Satan tries to speak to Eve. Keats had his own two volume *Paradise Lost* and underlined “of his tortuous train / Curled many a wanton wreath in sight of Eve.”<sup>10</sup> Satan’s movement and Apollonius’s description could be considered to be in a parallel relation. It is useful to examine the portrayals of Apollonius again, taking the description of Satan in *Paradise Lost* into the consideration. He is a figure “With curl’d gray beard, sharp eyes, and smooth bald crown, / Slow-stepp’d, and robed in philosophic gown” (1. 364–65). As mentioned above, “curl’d” is the expression that Milton uses for Satan as a serpent, and “sharp eyes, and smooth bald crown, / Slow-stepp’d” implies the quality of a snake.

“[F]orlorn” (2. 282) and “the feeblest fright / Of conscience” (2. 283–84) propose that destiny is far from the grace of God. Pride in “thine impious proud-heart” (2. 285) is the worst of the seven deadly sins, and it is the cause of the fall of Satan. Furthermore, a curious

fact emerges from the lines that are “all thine impious proud-heart sophistries, / Unlawful magic, and enticing lies” (2. 285–86). Satan invades the body of a snake by “Unlawful magic,” and “entices” Eve with “lies.” Apollonius makes Lamia lose her vitality by his powerful eyes, which work like “magic.” However, he does not “entice” her with “lies” or “sophistries,” because he does not speak to her. It is possible that the “lies” were told to Lycius while he was an obedient disciple of Apollonius. Lycius criticizes his educator for his former teachings. Though he puts the responsibility for Lamia’s change at the wedding banquet on the old philosopher, there is a distortion. Furthermore, there is the likelihood that Lycius’s expression about Apollonius was written with a conscious awareness of Milton’s Satan.

It has been pointed out by Lucy Newlyn, Beth Lau, and other scholars, that Keats composed *Lamia* when he was reading *Paradise Lost* and writing large number of notes and comments in it. These critics also insist that the depiction of Lamia as a snake woman is influenced by Satan, the serpent, in Milton. However, the influential expression from *Paradise Lost* is not only that concerning the woman but also Apollonius. Lamia is a serpent, but Apollonius also has a serpent-like nature. Apollonius exercises the power of “cold philosophy” as a paternal guardian of youth. Although Burton writes that he was originally a conventional sage, his portrait by Keats invites suspicion about his righteousness. Recent study of the feminizing Keats shows that the poet often values powerful masculinity less than the effeminacy of sweetness and softness.<sup>11</sup> The “cold philosophy” that Apollonius represents is a masculine energy in reason. However, he also has the nature of a serpent.

## V

As I mentioned in section II, Lamia’s character seems different from that of the imagined monster that devours human beings. When she is named Lamia and accused of being a serpent, she has already shed the serpent form. The labeling given to her character does not come from her personal qualities nor from her physical appearance. However, since her attempt to keep hold of Lycius is considered an act that will effectually cut him off from his associates, her desire for him has the same aspect, in terms of his relationship to society, as eating him materially. Her act will deprive the old philosopher Apollonius of his young disciple. It is likely that the youth has been expected to

inherit the wisdom of his mentor. Lamia’s love for Lycius poses a threat to this inheritance of wisdom. Since the old age and austerity of the philosopher imply that his wisdom has some established authority in society, the failure of succession between the old man and the young can be damaging to the ruling force of that society. Then, the love of Lamia may be regarded as a power that destroys the continuity of male communal order.

Her destructive force derives from her sexual attraction for Lycius. The mysterious attractiveness of her body is repeated in the text by the narrator and she herself tries to conceal her nature, emphasizing what can be called womanly charm.

There is not such a treat among them all,  
 Haunters of cavern, lake, and waterfall,  
 As a real woman, lineal indeed  
 From Pyrrha’s pebbles or old Adam’s seed.  
 Thus gentle Lamia judg’d, and judg’d aright,  
 That Lycius could not love in half a fright,  
 So threw the goddess off, and won his heart  
 More pleasantly by playing woman’s part,  
 With no more awe than what her beauty gave,  
 That, while it smote, still guaranteed to save.

(1. 330–39)

Her “playing” a woman’s part is achieved by throwing off “the goddess” in her. This means that her implied natural status is actually higher than a real woman’s and Lycius’s. She has adopted the strategy of pretended inferiority in order to secure the love of Lycius. The inferiority of women to men makes up a part of admitted femininity as manifested in meekness and mildness. Lamia appeals to Lycius by such “womanliness.” As a sexually attractive woman she is dangerous to male society. A woman can form a relationship with a man that is satisfying both physically and spiritually to him but she can also cause damage to what he represents by shaking the foundation of society; if she leads him astray, the established order, which has given him his superiority over women, may collapse. Therefore, a woman can be simultaneously pleasing and accursed for a man. Love of a man for a woman may make her sacred and damnable at the same time. These contradictory views about a seductive woman are closely related to the image of the serpent permeating *Lamia*. It should be noticed that the serpent as an emblem indicates also both the omen of evil and the sign of goodness. It is a remarkable symbol that has multifarious and mutually conflicting meanings. The symbolism of the serpent has the

same ambivalence as that of the alluring woman. The labeling of the heroine of the poem as a serpent suggests that a woman has a markedly ambivalent potential in relation to society. The identification with a snake is a stigma which is given to an entity that can threaten the established social bond formed between its men.

*Lamia* can be read as the story of an unsuccessful attempt by a woman who has intruded into men's exclusive community. The elimination of the heroine at the end of the poem is effected by the old philosopher, who can be regarded as the champion of male society. However, as I suggested in previous sections, this poem implies the possibility that Apollonius is also a serpent. If the identification with a snake is associated with a menace to society, it is possible that he should be ejected from the community like *Lamia* because of his uncommon power. It is true that he has remarkable force. His attributes in being an old philosopher, as I have mentioned above, show that he possesses outstanding intelligence and authority. Despite his exceptional, potentially destructive power, he is not forced to go into exile. The difference in the final outcome of the plot for *Lamia* and Apollonius results from the contradictory functions that their respective powers have for the social order. While *Lamia* threatens the male homosocial bond between the wise man and his pupil, Apollonius plays the role of protector to the established relationship. Moreover, his superintendency stems from the foundations of the phallocentric society because the superiority of knowledge produces authority and maintains social order. It is his power that keeps the community intact. Therefore, this powerful, serpentine man is not to be expelled from the society he himself is supporting.

Both *Lamia* and Apollonius have a unique power of influence and both are described as serpents. The former is a challenger to the existing social bond and the latter is the guardian of its authority. Yet, however powerful they be, it should be noted that there exists in *Lamia* a yet more potent entity, namely, the narrator of the story. As for Apollonius, it is the narrator who gives descriptions which allow the identification of the old sage with a serpent. It is the narrator also who gives the heroine the name of *Lamia* after her metamorphosis. It is he again who depicts Apollonius as a stern man bearing something dark in his mind. Finally, at the end of the story, he makes the fatal encounter between *Lamia* and Apollonius a confrontation between two serpents. The battle of the two opposing snakes presents an emblematic image of ouroboros, which means eternal recurrence, and, conse-

quently, a stalemate.

Apollonius's power is comparable with this omnipotent narrator's; he can give a name, define the other, thus capturing it inside his system of signification. The conclusion of the poem seems to present the victory of Apollonius, the guardian of society, since *Lamia*, the challenger, vanishes with a scream. As a philosopher, he seems to bear the power of intelligence. In fact, he has the force to define and reveal that the heroine is a serpent while the others are unable to see that she is one.

"From every ill  
Of life have I preserv'd thee to this day,  
And shall I see thee made a serpent's prey?"  
Then *Lamia* breath'd death breath;

. . . . she[*Lamia*], as well  
As her weak hand could any meaning tell,  
Motion'd him to be silent; vainly so,  
He[Lycius] look'd and look'd again a level—No!  
"A Serpent!" echoed he; no sooner said,  
Than with a frightful scream she vanished: (2. 296–99, 301–06)

The cry by Lycius, "A serpent!," suggests that he finally accepts the definition made by the philosopher. The young man "echoes" the word of his teacher. The old man establishes the principle that this woman is a serpent, and this defining act makes her disappear. He seems to defeat the heroine in the confrontation between them. The weakness of *Lamia* makes her look like a loser. However, it is *Lamia* who actually dissolves their condition of ouroboros. Her disappearance may suggest that she refuses to obey the patriarchic order which Apollonius tries to save. She makes the authority ineffectual by means of escape. On the other hand, Apollonius, who occupies a central position in androcentric society, can not give up the conflict as *Lamia* does. He can not vanish from society if he continues to be himself. He must continue to fight to keep his authority because he is its producer. He may be potent enough to overwhelm any challenger against him and protect the hierarchical structure of his world. However, since the establishing of hierarchy is always accompanied with potential conflicts, the organizer of the social rule can never keep the confrontation between opposing forces from ultimately coming to the fore.

*Lamia*, by escaping from Apollonius and his system, has preserved her identity; she has nullified the definition that she is a serpent. Her vanishing forces the narrator to finish his story. She has escaped even

from the grip of the narrator. This means that, as she flees from the foreground of the story, she can be free from any forced labeling. The story seems to have come to an end with the exclusion of the invader into society. However, by making his narrative question the dubiousness of male social authority and consequently the authoritarian narrative itself, Keats has finally revealed the positive import in an escape that seems deceptively negative.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Many critics use “ambiguous” to describe Lamia. See Cox, Little, and Rajan.

<sup>2</sup> Stillinger also says that “we must . . . keep in mind that Lamia is still basically an evil character, a snake-woman who is associated with demons, elves and fairies . . .” (57). Little defines how she is “a beautiful, probably deceitful, and certainly uncategorizable woman” (107). Rajan says that “[t]hough deceptive, she is herself is the victim of Lycius and Apollonius, and originally of the being who may have changed her into a serpent” (128).

<sup>3</sup> Wolfson says that “Lamia herself is no portent of spiritual repetition in a finer tone but an embodiment of the deceptive operations of the artist’s illusions.” (*Questioning Presence* 334). Bennet treats her with allegories. Kuchich focuses the analogy between the poem and the Psyche myth.

<sup>4</sup> See, Brisman, Newlyn and Lau.

<sup>5</sup> Wolfson examines how Keats has some gender ambivalence and confirms his feminization with biological and historical details in her *Feminizing Keats*. As for general arguments, see Bewell and Homan. The relationships between Keats and two woman writers, Mary Tighe and Mary Wollstonecraft, has been analysed. See Daruwala, Gross, Henderson, and Kuchich.

<sup>6</sup> All quotations from the poetry of John Keats are to the Stillinger edition.

<sup>7</sup> It seems that the distinguishing the gender of the narrator is also difficult, but I will take it as male according to the custom.

<sup>8</sup> Newlyn discusses the influence of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* to the poets of Romanticism. As for the works of Keats, she mainly deals with *The Eve of St. Agnes*. However, there are some references to *Lamia*, and about Apollonius she says, “As the bearer of authority, law, and morality, Lambro is indeed closer to Keats’s Apollonius than to Milton’s arch-fiend.”

<sup>9</sup> *The Life of Tymon of Athens* (II. ii. 83).

<sup>10</sup> Lau has worked on the volume of *Paradise Lost* which Keats possessed.

<sup>11</sup> See Kuchich and Henderson.

### Works Cited

- Benett, Andrew. *Keats, Narrative and Audience: The Posthumous Life of Writing*. Cambridge Series in Romanticism 6. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Bewell, Alan. “Keats’s ‘Realm of Flora.’” *Studies in Romanticism* 31 (1992): 71–98.
- Brisman, Leslie. “Keats and a New Birth: *Lamia*.” *Modern Critical Views: John Keats*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1985. 147–155.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. 1621. Ed. Holbrook Jackson. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1978.
- Clark, Bruce. “Fabulous Monsters of Conscience: Anthropomorphosis in Keats’s *Lamia*.” *Studies in Romanticism* 24 (1985): 55–79.
- Cox, Philip. “Keats and the performance of Gender.” *Keats–Shelley Journal* 44 (1995): 40–65.
- De Almeida, Hermione. *Romantic Medicine and John Keats*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Duruwala, Maneck H. “Strange Bedfellows: Keats and Wollstonecraft, *Lamia* and *Berwick*.” *Keats–Shelley Review* 11 (1997): 83–132.
- Gross, George C. “*Lamia* and the Cupid–Psyche Myth.” *Keats–Shelley Journal* 39 (1990): 151–165.
- Henderson, Andrea. “Keats, Tighe, and the chastity of Allegory.” *European Romantic Review* 10 (1999): 279–306.
- Homans, Margaret. “Keats Reading Women, Women Reading Keats.” *Studies in Romanticism* 29 (1990): 341–70.
- Keats, John. *The Poems of John Keats*. Ed. Miriam Allott. London: Longman, 1970.
- . *John Keats: Complete Poems*. Ed. Jack Stillinger. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1978.
- . *John Keats: The Complete Poems*. Ed. John Barnard. 3rd ed. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Kuchich, Greg. “Gender Crossing: Keats and Tighe.” *Keats–Shelley Journal* 44 (1995): 29–39.
- Lau, Beth. *Keats’s Paradise Lost*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1998.
- Levinson, Marjorie. *The Romantic Fragment Poem: A Critique of a Form*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1986.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. London: Longman, 1971.
- Newlyn, Lucy. *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- O’Neill, Michael, ed. *Keats: Bicentenary Readings*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1997.
- Rajan, Tilottama. *Dark Interpreter: the Discourse of Romanticism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.
- Roe, Nicholas, ed. *Keats and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Shakespeare, William. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Stillinger, Jack. *The Hoodwinking of Madeline and Other Essays on Keats’s Poems*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1971.
- Wolfson, Susan J. *Formal Charges: The Shaping of Poetry in British Romanti-*

cism. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997.

———. “Feminizing Keats.” *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990. 317–56.

———. *Questioning Presence: Wordsworth, Keats, and the Interrogative Mode in Romantic Poetry*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.

## *Bleak House* and Brown’s Work: A Gaze upon the Poor

Takashi Nakamura

### I

Three giants of political economy exerted their influence on Britain in the nineteenth century: Bentham in the Panopticon writings (1787, 1791),<sup>1</sup> Malthus in *An Essay on Population* (1798), and Chadwick in the *Sanitary Report* (1842). As is well-known, an awareness of the potential danger brought about by the existence of impoverished laboring classes tied these political economists together. When Pitt the younger decided not to amend the Poor Laws in such a way as to encourage large poor families in 1800, he is said to have had Bentham and Malthus in mind, since both stood opposed to an unrestricted growth of paupers (Flew 12); instead, the two argued that the population of the poor should be controlled by the state, which ought to abolish outdoor relief for the poor in preference for terrifying poorhouses, which passed for, as it were, “magic wands” to expel poverty and unemployment (Briggs, *Age of Improvement* 280). Chadwick, likewise, as a disciple of Bentham and as secretary to the Poor Law Commissions, undertook to realize the Poor Law of 1834. As Briggs suggested, it is of great importance that the three political economists were specifically concerned with the concept of “centralization” as indicated by such terms as “central inspection,” “central supervision” or “central audit,” despite the fact that the would-be central system of the New Poor Law of 1834 gradually gave way to local government, particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century. At any rate, a centralized system and national administration prompted by what is called “utilitarianism” provided Victorian Benthamites and Malthusians with the starting point to drive the poor exclusively into poorhouses.<sup>2</sup>

This interaction of social pressure upon the poor and the centralization of power seems omnipresent through the Victorian era. To bor-



row Foucault's term referring to Bentham's Panopticon, Victorian paupers were kept under "constant surveillance" (Foucault 199). The aim of the New Poor Law was to enclose the poor within poorhouses, thereby reducing "waste and idleness" (Porter, *Benefit* 409). Needless to say, this central power system, or, the image of centralization,<sup>3</sup> was the guiding principle behind Chadwick's monumental *Sanitary Report*, whereby the "Sanitary Idea" was so pervasive that even poets, moralists and artists as well as officials and administrators were equally inspired by the notion (Briggs, *Victorian Cities* 20). If poets were involved with the "Sanitary Idea" around the middle of the century, why should such a novelist as Dickens, whom many consider as not merely a novelist but a social historian,<sup>4</sup> have escaped being affected by so influential an idea? In this paper, I argue that one of Dickens's novels from this period falls into the category of works that, to some extent, envisaged the "Sanitary Idea" of the day.<sup>5</sup> *Bleak House* (1852–53), otherwise "a fable for 1852," (Butt & Tillotson 179) is the novel in question, for it is evident that in this novel two important factors are related in a way that the sanitary idea is highlighted: the poor and the power which controls them. Paupers are treated, or "gazed" at in the light of a Chadwickian sense of sanitary reform; in other words, the novel depicts how the impoverished working classes are "foregrounded"<sup>6</sup> and why the idea of public health intervenes throughout the novel to identify the poor as if being gazed at by "thousands of eyes" (Foucault 214).<sup>7</sup>

Interestingly enough, the omnipresence of the sanitary idea or the consciousness of public health in the mid-Victorian period also becomes manifest in a different but sister art: genre painting. Ford Madox Brown's *Work* (figure 1) has been regarded as a typical Victorian picture, partly because it delineates multifaceted life by virtue of a panoramic presentation of characters from different classes: for instance, at the apex of the picture, a father and daughter on horseback appear to suggest a luxurious upper class atmosphere: the father is said to be an MP. In the upper-middle part of the picture, on the left, one of the bourgeois ladies with a parasol is distributing religious tracts whose message reads: "The Hodman's Haven, or drink for thirsty souls" (Brown 153), while on the right, a little lower down from the ladies' position, two gentlemen are portrayed as, according to the painter, "brainworkers," contrasted with the excavating "navvies" in the center (Brown 152). Nearly at the bottom of the picture, four children, who appear to wander about in the vicinity as orphans, are

clearly pictured in the foreground, and, on account of their helpless state, they attract the viewer's attention. In fact, it is the painter who insists that we should look at these miserable creatures. Brown says: "I would beg to call your attention to my group of small, exceedingly ragged, dirty children in the foreground of my picture, where you are about to pass" (Brown 153). Thus, the position that characters in Brown's picture occupy roughly corresponds to their rank in society; to put this another way, what Brown represents here is a hierarchy with many persons of varied classes — from an orphan, a "Pariah" (a vagabond selling flowers on the left), up to those belonging to the upper-middle and gentry classes. Nevertheless, this is not quite the whole story, for there also appears what is called a "Foucaudian" gaze, whether conscious or not, upon the poor who are likely to cause an overflow of the population in Britain — the point made by Malthusian and Benthamite political economists. This specific treatment of the poor, rendering them conspicuous, can be found in the painter and the novelist. It is of note that both the novel and the picture were begun almost concurrently (i.e. around 1852). The coincidence of the novel's and the painting's involvement with the sanitary idea seems not accidental, but an inevitable consequence of the fact that the sanitary idea, or the cult of public health had become a priority of the age (Porter, *Benefit* 409).

## II

As is often the case, in *Bleak House* Dickens employs many sub-plots which spread like a tangled web, one of which may be termed the "Jo plot" — in which Jo, the crossing-sweeper,<sup>8</sup> living in an obscure and notorious district known as Tom-all-Alone's is seen to be constantly persecuted throughout the novel by the police. To use Jo's own word, he has been "chivied" by the police, or, to be more precise, by Inspector Bucket, who finding the ill Jo taken care of by Esther and Charley in *Bleak House* drives him away to be incarcerated in "horsepittle." Jo explains to Allan Woodcourt how Bucket mistreated him despite the fact that he "[N]ever done nothink" (Ch. 46, 575):

'... I'm a-moving on to the berrying ground — that's the move as I'm up to.'

'No, no, we will try to prevent that. But what did he do with you?'

'Put me in a horsepittle,' replied Jo, whispering, 'till I was discharged, then give me a little money — four half bulls, wot you

may call half-crowns — and ses “Hook it! Nobody wants you here,” he ses. “Don’t let me ever see you nowheres within forty mile of London, or you’ll repent it.” (Ch. 46, 575)<sup>9</sup>

Bucket’s persecution and blackmail sounded so distressing that Jo, frightened in the extreme, could not help “making his way with wary hand from brick to brick and from door to door like a scared animal” (Ch. 47, 577). One of the reasons Jo becomes terror-stricken is that Inspector Bucket’s “gaze” seems omnipresent: Jo says, “He [Bucket] is in all manner of places, all at wanst” (Ch. 46, 575).<sup>10</sup> This sense of ubiquitousness is, in some measure, reminiscent of Bentham’s vision of Panopticon by which Foucault’s meditations on the modes of power in modern European society have been deepened as well as developed. With its central tower capable of seeing the prisoners without being seen by them, the Panopticon realizes an ideal power system in which total and complete control over the prison’s inmates was made possible. This panoptic image provides the master metaphor for the inmates of many kinds of institution where a transparent power observes and controls them. The panopticon is therefore applied to institutions, or “observatories,” so that individuals whether they be madmen, criminals, patients, school children or even “beggars and idlers” are supervised in a place where “one sees everything without ever being seen.” Like the inmates of the Panopticon, Jo is kept “under constant surveillance” by the Inspector, and around him, “The gaze is alert everywhere,” and yet Jo cannot see this “disciplinary power” which marks his “exclusion” (Foucault 195–205).

But why is Jo so persistently persecuted by Bucket, a detective officer of the Metropolitan Police,<sup>11</sup> to the extent that he is excluded from the friendly society of Esther and Charley, driven finally to death, although he is “innocent” as far as crimes are concerned? Or, put another way, in what respect is Jo dangerous or a threat to society? Bucket goes as far as to say that Jo must not live “within forty mile of London.” What is of relevance here seems to be the sanitary reformist argument given momentum by Chadwick; the realization of his agenda came with the first British Public Health Act of 1848. Chadwick identified the horrors of urban poverty especially in the laboring population, pauperism causing disease, and the unhealthy living conditions (such as dirty water and poor drainage) which spread disease (*Great Benefit* 410–12). It is obvious that Jo is involved with this trilogy: he is strikingly poor, he becomes infected and also infects with disease (smallpox, to be precise), and this epidemic is bred in a slum

called Tom-all-Alone’s where unsanitary conditions are conspicuous; hence, he ought to be pointed out as carrying these three dangerous things within his body: poverty, disease and filthiness. In a sanitary sense, he is a criminal against which the Chadwickian public health movement was struggling. This fight, however, turned out not to be a simplified punishment of the body, but a watchful gaze on a dangerous individual, restraining the object under strict surveillance; and the gaze, on account of its tendency to identify and control the person in question, inevitably foregrounds him or her.

This process of identification or specification in terms of sanitary regulations functions in the genesis of Jo and the “Jo plot.” The third-person narrator in the novel overtly calls attention to “Poor Jo,” when Jo is handed over to George’s “Shooting Gallery” after he is found utterly helpless in Tom-all-Alone’s. The narrator, alias Dickens, purposefully spotlights him: “Stand forth, Jo, in uncompromising colours! From the sole of thy foot to the crown of thy head, there is nothing interesting about thee” (Ch. 47, 581). The words, “stand forth” suggest the narrator’s intention to foreground Jo. The straightforward phrase, “there is nothing interesting about thee” sounds, however, paradoxical because Jo cannot cease to excite the reader’s interests, mainly because of his extraordinary unwholesomeness: he is not merely a “Miserable creature” but an intolerably unhealthy one “like a growth of fungus or any unwholesome excrescence” (Ch. 46, 573). Consequently, he is forced to “stand forth” and face the reader as if he were a strange monster. Thus pinpointing Jo, who is filthy, the melodramatic novelist then sets the stage for a flood of tears shed over Jo’s last moment as he is murmuring his prayers:<sup>12</sup>

‘Jo, can you say what I say?’  
 ‘I’ll say anythink as you say, sir, fur I knows it’s good.’  
 ‘OUR FATHER.’  
 ‘Our Father! — yes, that’s wery good, sir.’  
 ‘WHICH ART IN HEAVEN.’  
 ‘Art in Heaven — is the light a-comin, sir?’  
 ‘It is close at hand. HALLOWED BE THY NAME!’  
 ‘Hallowed be — thy — ’  
 The light is come upon the dark benighted way. Dead!  
 Dead, your Majesty. Dead, my lords and gentlemen. Dead,  
 Right Reverends and Wrong Reverends of every order. Dead,  
 men and women, born with Heavenly compassion in your hearts.  
 And dying thus around us every day. (Ch. 48, 588–89)

Deeply impressed, many contemporaries (reviewers, for instance) did

not refrain from admiration for the scene. To name but a few would suffice to demonstrate what "general acclaim" (Dyson, "Introduction" 14) was given to Jo. First of all, it is worth remembering that Forster mentions "the good Dean Ramsay" who exclaimed in a letter to Forster, "What a triumph is Jo! . . . To my mind, nothing in the field of fiction is to be found in English literature surpassing the death of Jo!" (Forster II: 117–18). The passion of Dean Ramsay was shared by many; one reviewer insisted that Jo "will be remembered always as one of the choice things that do honour to our literature" (*Bleak House Casebook*, 70), while for another he is "The gem of *Bleak House*" (*Bleak House Casebook*, 82); furthermore, "Poor Joe [*sic*], down in Tom-all-Alone's, has become a proverb" (*Bleak House Casebook*, 79). But if he is a proverb, what kind of meaning does he encapsulate for us? In my view, as he appears an exclusive target upon which the watchful sanitarian gaze is directed, he acts to proclaim an unsanitary, dangerous or evil reality.

It deserves notice that in this death scene the narrator, not a little excited, tries to draw the reader's special attention to "poor Jo" by addressing the Queen, peers, "Reverends," men and women in general "born with Heavenly compassion." Indeed, both metaphorically and literally, he is exceedingly poor, and his poverty and misery are linked with Tom-all-Alone's which is none other than "the infernal gulf" (Ch. 22, 283). Slums were generally thought to be more or less breeding-grounds where poverty, disease and filthiness abounded. Hence in terms of the Chadwickian sanitary reformist argument, Jo is not innocent but guilty insofar as his hygienic condition is concerned. Some of the evils which Jo carries with him are overtly depicted. In the first place, it turns out that Jo is an evil spirit in that he infects Charley with his smallpox, which in turn ravages Esther's spotless face. Of course, the disease is not necessarily to be defined as wholly bad, for the smallpox, which deprives Esther of her unsullied face, provides her with a touchstone by which she can evaluate the quality of Woodcourt's love towards her, leading to the final denouement of marriage.<sup>13</sup> But what is of significance is that this disease is an epidemic, which was inescapably associated with a filthy and unhealthy slum, because slums were the arena for the fearful outbreaks of epidemics such as cholera, typhus, and smallpox.<sup>14</sup>

A deep-seated fear of such lethal epidemics is grimly shown at the beginning of Chapter 46 in which Jo, goaded by the merciless Bucket, reappears in the midst of Tom-all-Alone's after his sudden disappear-

ance from Bleak House. In the passage, Jo is almost analogous to Tom who personifies the horrors of Tom-all-Alone's, and acts as a gruesome harbinger of whatever evils come with his "tainting, plundering, and spoiling":

But he [Tom] has his revenge. Even the winds are his messengers, and they serve him in these hours of darkness. There is not a drop of Tom's corrupted blood but *propagates infection and contagion* somewhere. It shall pollute, this very night, the choice stream (in which chemists on analysis would find the genuine nobility) of a Norman house, and his Grace shall not be able to say Nay to the infamous alliance. There is not an atom of Tom's slime, not a cubic inch of any pestilential gas in which he lives, not one obscenity or degradation about him, not an ignorance, not a wickedness, not a brutality of his committing, but shall work its retribution, *through every order of society*, up to the proudest of the proud, and to the highest of the high. Verily, what with tainting, plundering, and spoiling, Tom has his revenge.

(Ch. 46, 568, my italics)<sup>15</sup>

The quotation seems to be spellbound by Chadwick, since his legendary "miasmatism" re-echoes everywhere. His miasmatic theory presupposes that disease is caused by noxious gases emitted by rotten things: "That the various forms of epidemic, endemic, and other disease caused, or aggravated, or propagated chiefly *amongst the labouring classes* by atmospheric impurities produced by decomposing animal and vegetable substances, by damp and filth. . ." (Chadwick 422; my italics). The narrator in the novel, like Chadwick, gloomily announces that the winds are Tom's "messengers," who will propagate "infection and contagion." Chadwick proposed two principles for the improvement of hygienic conditions in general: one was the construction of sewage or drainage systems for the removal of refuse, and the other was the supply of clean water (Chadwick 422–23). It is noteworthy, however, that a third principle may be found in his discourse: namely, almost all sanitary evils were found in the "lowest districts" where most of the laboring population were living in such horrible slums as, say, St Giles or Jacob's Island. As Roy Porter observes, a middle-class or bourgeois "class-consciousness" paved the way for Public Health politics. The politics of Chadwickian hygiene was voiced from and supported by the "nobles and gentlemen, rich merchants, clergy and civic worthies" because their "economics and utility taught that neglecting disease ran counter to enlightened self-interest." It was believed that diseases readily spread from the poor to the better

off, and that poverty- or disease-stricken laborers proved inefficient employees (Porter, *Disease* 33). In brief, the spirit of public health was on bad terms with philanthropic altruism, but on good ones with bourgeois self-concern. The passage above has a lot in common with this egoism in that it reveals the horrors of Tom, whereas Tom's targets are, for instance, a "Norman house" and "the proudest of the proud."

But did Tom, or Jo, have revenge thoroughly? The answer to this may be negative, at least seemingly, since the line of smallpox infection did stop at Esther, who caught Charley's disease, which had been transmitted by Jo. As far as Esther, therefore, the horrifying disease, the origin of which is an abominable slum, rapidly ascends the ladder of a hierarchical society, but the noble characters in the novel, the Dedlocks, for instance, remain uninfected by smallpox or any disease relating to the lowest districts. Indeed, the horrors of Tom-all-Alone's are not experienced by aristocratic people. Nevertheless, this is not the end of the story, for it is possible to suppose that the Jo plot is symbolic or metaphoric in that the evils of urban poverty, noted by hygienists, are devouring the sacred face of Esther Summerson, who is the illegitimate child of Lady Dedlock; the Lady's secret relationship with Captain Hawdon, alias Nemo, casts a dark shadow over the mother's noble position. In this sense, the appalling horror of the infernal slum is not ended but permanently alive as long as Esther lives. As to Esther's disfigurement, Susan Sontag's remarks on the relation of disease and its damage to the face are worth citing; according to her, the deepest dread is aroused by illnesses that "deform the face," not by lethal ones like heart attacks. Referring to smallpox in particular, Sontag points out that the scar left by this disease functions as a marker of the survivor, and that marks of smallpox are "precisely the stigmata of a survivor" (Sontag 128). Esther's "stigmata," however, do not reveal a Christian holiness but suggest the Christian guilt of her mother, as the marks on her face indicate that her mother's sinful sexuality is not erased but is kept intact, threatening Lady Dedlock's stable position. Esther's stigmata crystallize three things in compacted form: first, the horrors of Tom-all-Alone's; second, Jo's or Tom's ferocious will to "revenge" on "the proudest of the proud, and to the highest of the high;" finally, the Lady's sinful past which produced Esther.

If this novel is interpreted, in part, as the tragedy of Lady Dedlock, who ends her life in despair in front of the graveyard where her ex-

lover Nemo is buried, the *hamartia* of the drama is, in essence, to be ascribed to the Lady's *hybris*:<sup>16</sup> *hybris*, in the form of her Ladyship's vanity to assume a dignified position as the spouse of Sir Leicester Dedlock, despite her comparatively lower rank in society: "A whisper still goes about, that she [Lady Dedlock] had not even family" (Ch. 2, 10). Her husband's greatness as a member of a very old family is stressed with sarcasm: "Sir Leicester Dedlock is only a baronet, but there is no mightier baronet than he. His family is as old as the hills, and infinitely more respectable" (Ch. 2, 10). And there is another *hybris*: her self-conceit of possessing a regal splendor: ". . . my Lady Dedlock has been at the centre of the fashionable intelligence, and at the top of the fashionable tree" (Ch. 2, 10). The picture of the *beau monde* thus far represented with the Lady commanding a panoramic view of society is well contrasted with the horrible picture of Tom-all-Alone's.

Esther's stigmata, left by the smallpox, therefore, indicates her survival, and her prolonged existence serves to prove her mother's sinful relation with Nemo; this disgrace, finally revealed by the wily Tulkynghorn, led to the Lady's perdition. Thus, the fearful oracle by Esther's godmother (her real aunt) at the beginning, "It would have been better . . . that you had never been born" (Ch. 3, 16) becomes all the more significant if one bears in mind that the *hamartia* of the novel or the cause of the tragedy is altogether due to Esther's survival, which had precipitated her mother's disgraceful downfall. The web of the novel is finally completed; and in the center of the web there is an "infernal" slum from which every single thread of the plot had been extended so as to entrap, at least, three characters: "poor Jo," who died murmuring blissful prayers, Esther, who was disfigured, and Lady Dedlock, who was "fallen"<sup>17</sup> in spite of, or because of, her dignity.

### III

As has already been noted above, the hellishness of the infernal slum is suggested by and inseparably linked with the so-called Foucauldian or Benthamite conception of power which holds constant gaze without being seen and keeps strict surveillance upon inmates such as prisoners, patients, or schoolchildren. Hitherto, the poor, among others, have been specifically treated in order to demonstrate that they are foregrounded; and by the same token, in what follows, I intend to show that the poor in relation to the Foucauldian gaze can be dis-

cussed in a different but concurrent work of art: Ford Madox Brown's well-known picture *Work*, which was begun in 1852,<sup>18</sup> the year Dickens's *Bleak House* was started. As regards the gaze upon the poor, power is expected to keep a constant watch, chiefly because the aristocracy and bourgeoisie feared that the poor, whose main living domains were extremely unhealthy slums, would spread insanitary evils, notably epidemics such as cholera, typhus, scarlet fever and so forth "through every order of society." The frightful message of "with tainting, plundering, and spoiling, Tom has his revenge" in the novel, I shall argue, re-echoes in Brown's painting.

As in the novel, the first step in the painting is to foreground the poor in order to specify their likely dangerous or evil existence. In the painting, Jo's counterparts are four children, who are depicted, like Jo, as poverty-stricken and helpless: four "dirty children" represented at the very front of the painting. According to the painter, they have recently lost their dear mother — the loss indicated by the black ribbon worn by the baby held in the left arm of its elder sister. To be precise, Brown explains, they do have a father but he is virtually nothing to them, as he "drinks, and will be sentenced in the police-court for neglecting them" (Brown 153). It is important here that the correlation of drunkenness, immorality and poverty calls to mind Hogarth's enormously famous pair of plates entitled "Beer Street" (figure 2) and "Gin Lane" (figure 3) both of which exercised a great influence upon Brown's *Work*. A remarkable similarity between Hogarth's series and Brown's painting is found, for instance, in Brown's treatment of beer as good alcohol to improve health; in the picture "a prosperous beer-man" is depicted calling aloud, "beer ho!" According to Brown, this beer-man symbolizes "town pluck and energy," whereas "gin" is accused, partly because the beer-man's "hunchbacked" dwarfishness is due to gin's evil effect: as a child he was "stunted with gin" (Brown 154). It is therefore possible to suppose that the same social milieu that prompted Hogarth to create a pair of prints, admiring beer as the "Genius of Health," while denouncing gin as a "cursed Fiend" still existed almost a century later. And the fact that by and large in mid-Victorian England gin was regarded as a "cursed Fiend" is supported in prints by Cruikshank — a "fanatical teetotaller" (Johnson 331) — such as "The GIN Shop" (a family is trapped in the jaws of the vicious gin, figure 4 [1829]), "Gin Shops" (the Dickens-Cruikshank joint work asserting "Gin drinking is a great vice in England" [1835]), *The Bottle* (a series showing a workman's destruction because of gin

[1847]) and *The Drunkard's Children* (the sequel to *The Bottle*, the final plate depicting the girl's suicidal fall from London Bridge, figure 5 [1848]).<sup>19</sup> Figure 5, for example, discloses that Cruikshank owes much to Hogarth, for a falling girl may be compared to the baby dropped by its drunken mother. In these prints, the vices of gin are articulated as in the case of Hogarth's "Gin Lane": gin is the cause of poverty, misery and total destruction. Dickens, however, referring to *The Bottle* and *The Drunkard's Children*, maintains that drinking is not the cause of vices, but the result of social vice such as "foul smells, disgusting habitations . . . scarcity of light, air, and water" (Forster II: 40). In sum, he correlates gin drinking with the insanitary conditions of the lower classes. Given the close link between the unhealthy life of the wretched poor and gin drinking suggested by Dickens, it becomes clear that the invisible father in Brown's picture is probably drunk in slums like St Giles; and, interestingly enough, it was St Giles that Hogarth adopted as the stage for "Gin Lane" (Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* 147). It is reasonable to think that the four miserable children in the picture come from some insanitary areas and are carrying with them smallpox, for example.

In any case, it is obvious that by erasing the drunken father from the canvas Brown rendered the four children virtually orphans with the eldest sister at the center of this vagrant family. Put differently, the orphanage was needful for the painter, for he doubtless thought he could draw the viewer's attention to the orphans by stressing their helpless state, with a subtle implication of their foul or evil backgrounds; the apparent message is that they have neither father nor mother. In addition, it is noteworthy that Brown's tone of compassion sounds even greater when he alludes to the eldest daughter, who, as a mother, holding the baby in her arm, scolds her naughty brother, who is playing with the workman's barrow; certainly she is forced to be a mother-like figure, but she is a mere girl: "The eldest girl, not more than ten, poor child! is very worn-looking and thin. . ." (Brown 153). The exclamation, "poor child!" is, as it were, Dickensian, because the subject of poor children is Dickens's "magic wand" thereby foregrounding them to be pitied, often with tears, by his readers. This can be illustrated by endless examples such as Oliver, Little Nell, Little Dorrit, Tiny Tim, Pip, little Davy, little Paul, and of course, Jo. Still, one more example from *Bleak House* should be mentioned in connection with Brown's four poor orphans: Charley. Hearing of Coavinses's death, which leaves his three children in a terrible plight, Esther, Ada

and Jarndyce go to the chandler's shop in Bell Yard where Coavinses's children pinch and scrape, and they find that the two children are locked in a poor room; Esther's narration runs as follows:

I tapped at the door, and a little shrill voice inside said, 'We are locked in. Mrs Blinder's got the key!'

I applied the key on hearing this, and opened the door. In a poor room, with a sloping ceiling, and containing very little furniture, was a mite of a boy, some five or six years old, nursing and hushing a heavy child of eighteen months. There was no fire, though the weather was cold; both children were wrapped in some poor shawls and tippets, as a substitute. (Ch. 15, 191, my italics)

One child is five- or six-year-old boy (Tom) and another is almost a baby (Emma); the brother and sister are "locked in," and the "key" is kept by the landlady (Mrs. Blinder). The relation of lock and key suggests a prison-like image, so metaphorically speaking at least, poor orphans, trembling with cold, are in a prison. Into this prison-like room, Charley rushes in a great hurry after her "out-a-washing." Charley's "fingers were white and wrinkled with washing, and the soap-suds were yet smoking which she wiped off her arms" (Ch. 15, 191–92). Upon seeing Charley entering, the brother and sister gather around her, and the baby "stretched forth its arms, and cried out to be taken by Charley." Awestruck by this piteous picture in which a mere girl was working for her brother and sister to earn "sixpence and shillings" to lead a mean life, Jarndyce groaned:

'Is it possible,' whispered my guardian, as we put a chair for the little creature, and got her to sit down with her load: the boy keeping close to her, holding to her apron, 'that this child works for the rest? *Look at this! For God's sake look at this!*'

*It was a thing to look at.* The three children close together, and two of them relying solely on the third, and the third so young and yet with an air of age and steadiness that sat so strangely on the childish figure. (Ch. 15, 192, my italics)

The orphans in extreme poverty are thus foregrounded with a somewhat excited tone of compassion by the narrator as well as Jarndyce, and, at the same time, the narrator (in this case, Dickens rather than Esther) seems, overtly, to direct the reader's or viewer's attention exclusively upon the group of poverty-stricken children, among whom Charley, as a little mother, takes care of her brother and sister, despite her own childishness (being "over thirteen").

This picture of the orphans in *Bleak House* is, beyond doubt, analo-

gous to that of Brown's in a way that, firstly, there are poverty-stricken orphans, with a mother-like sister standing at the center, around whom her siblings huddle together, secondly, those children are brought into focus by exclamatory expressions: "Look at this! For God's sake look at this!" on the one hand, while, on the other, Brown compassionately says, "The eldest girl, not more than ten, poor child!" The painter, also, staring at the orphans, requires us to share this compassion: "I would beg to call your attention to my group of small, exceedingly ragged, dirty children in the foreground of my picture" as though it were indispensable to throw a gaze upon them so that the orphans in the novel and the painting can be represented in the form of "foregrounding" linguistically as well as visually. The only difference between the orphans in the novel and in the painting may be the absence of the Chadwickian sanitary idea in the scene of the novel, as contrasted with the Brown's, where the construction of the waterworks is seen to be in progress in the background. In *Bleak House*, not in a literal but in an allegorical background, we can assume a sanitarian gaze upon Charley and her siblings. Indeed, Charley turns out to be a dangerous figure when later she catches Jo's smallpox, which infects Esther. Consequently Brown's picture and Dickens's novel have the "Sanitary Idea" in both their backgrounds, and also, the piteous but insanitary, dangerous children are overtly represented in the foreground.

It is worth remembering that, concerning Tom's revenge and the fear of it, bourgeois egotism or egocentricity considered insanitary conditions as social danger; the fear of paupers is articulated by both upper and upper-middle classes. Similarly, this kind of bourgeois egocentricity can be detected in Brown's *Work*, and particularly in his sonnet explaining the burden of his picture. Brown composed the accompanying sonnet to his *Work* in February 1865 when he held a "one-man exhibition of one hundred pictures and drawings" (Parris, *Pre-Raphaelite Papers* 143). The sonnet reads:

WORK! which beads the brow, and tans the flesh  
Of lusty manhood, casting out its devils!  
By whose weird art, transmuting poor men's evils,  
Their bed seems down, their one dish ever fresh.  
Ah me! For lack of it what ills in leash,  
Hold us. It's want the pale mechanic levels  
To workhouse depths, while Master Spendthrift revels.  
For want of work, the fiends him soon immesh!  
Ah! beauteous tripping dame with bell-like skirts,

Intent on thy small scarlet-coated hound,  
 Are ragged wayside babes not lovesome too?  
 Untrained, their state reflects on thy deserts,  
 Or they grow noisome beggars to abound,  
 Or dreaded midnight robbers, breaking through.

(Brown 151, 156)

It is evident that the “evils” of idleness are opposed to the virtue of work, with the latter highly admired, while the former is virulently criticized. The sonnet declares that “devils” and “evils” of manhood are found in the lack of “Work!” which “beads the brow, and tans the flesh.” By contrast, idleness or “want of work” soon sends a man “To workhouse depth, while Master Spendthrift revels.” This phrase referring to the horrors of the “workhouse” is reminiscent of Dickens’s *Oliver Twist* (Ch. 2, 13).<sup>20</sup> Brown, however, does not satirize workhouses like Dickens, but utilizes them to menace paupers, implying that if you do not work, you would only starve to death in workhouses. As Poovey has argued, the workhouses that the new Poor Law of 1834 institutionalized were to create the widespread impression that the “machinery” of the Poor Law would introduce a life less eligible than starvation” (Poovey 11, 110).<sup>21</sup> Brown makes use of this widespread fear of workhouses to encourage industry, while abusing the immorality of idleness, just as in Hogarth’s glorious twelve prints issued in 1747 “call’d INDUSTRY and IDLENESS: Shewing the Advantages attending the former, and the miserable Effects of the latter, in the different Fortunes of two APPRENTICES” (Paulson, *Hogarth II*: 289). However, to Brown, idleness was not only restricted to the poor but was true of the well-to-do, because the rich who do not work but waste money on luxurious things as “bell-like skirts” and “scarlet-coated hound” are as equally immoral as the idle poor. In *Work*, the wicked extravagance took the form of, say, the splendid or showy dresses with “bell-like skirts” worn by bourgeois ladies, the grand horses of an MP, a beautiful greyhound in a red jacket, and the pastry cook’s tray (a green box in the painting). As to this last, Brown especially referred to it as a “symbol of superfluity,” for he could not get over a “socialistic twinge” whenever he saw such pastry-cook’s tray in England (Brown 153). Brown was hence at odds with the wealthy who do nothing but waste money while forgetting or affecting to forget the suffering of the poor — envisaged as “ragged wayside babes” in the sonnet, and miserable orphans in the foreground of the picture. Moreover, he commented in the pamphlet that the rich never

work for the “bread of life”; and it was because of the praiseworthiness of this “bread-winning” labor that Brown adopted the theme of “excavation” and painted a young navvy who showed “manly health and beauty” to occupy “the place of hero” (Brown 152–53). This “socialistic tinge” and class consciousness in Brown naturally have encouraged art criticism of a Marxist orientation. There are ample reasons why art criticism has tended to center on Hogarthian, Carlylean and Marxist critiques of class-relations in the light of, broadly, what is called the “Puritan work ethic” as outlined by Max Weber.<sup>22</sup>

However, both sonnet and painting reveal, if unconsciously, a deep-rooted fear of the poor, especially the younger poor, that Brown as a middle-class artist was not immune from, in spite of the fact that, “middle by birth,” he in his youth suffered from poverty because of his father’s ill health (Newman & Watkinson 120). In lines 11–14, the poet warns against the dangerous presence of “ragged wayside babes” left alone to English “deserts” where the wealthy are more or less unwilling to rescue the poor from their lowly conditions, so that the deserts would proliferate “noisome beggars” or “midnight robbers.” Needless to say, beggars and robbers were the negative product of insanitary, poverty-stricken slums. If this sonnet and *Work* are placed side by side, it will become instantly clear that the targets Brown aims at as socially dangerous presences are not only the “babes” but the “exceedingly ragged, dirty children” in the foreground of the painting, because, as he says, those offspring, born into the lower classes or laboring population, bred on merciless English ground, a ground cultivated by bourgeois egocentricity, are likely to fall into degradation whether moral or physical. Bourgeois egotism is exemplified by “beauteous tripping dame with bell-like skirts” in the sonnet and the picture.

In fact, an awareness of the inseparable correlation between slums and degradation in mind and body was felt by anyone who was interested in the “Condition-of-England” question at all. Engels, among others, in his epochal *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845) underlines “the whirlpool of moral ruin” and the “demoralizing influence of want, filth, and evil surroundings,” citing a notorious slum, St Giles<sup>23</sup> in London, where, “filthy within and without,” live “the poorest of the poor . . . with thieves and the victims of prostitution” (Engels 71). Hence both in Engels and Brown a similar procedure of correlating the dangerous poor to their degradation is at work.

In any way, there is no denying the construction of waterworks (to

be strict, this was a sewer line)<sup>24</sup> was a reality in Hampstead of which Brown made a sketch in "hot July sunlight" in 1852. In the same year, *Bleak House* was commenced to be serialized in March, as "a fable for 1852" (Butt & Tillotson 179); heaviness of the novelistic "topicality" was owing to such "fashionable" things as "Chancery suits" or "Sanitary Idea." Nonetheless, it is too simplified to condemn Dickens and Brown as egocentric bourgeois proponents of the Chadwickian "Sanitary Idea." The omnipresence of an awareness of the public hygiene and the intensity of bourgeois egotism were perceived by many contemporaries such as Engels who accused the English bourgeoisie for the lack of educating the working-class poor to improve the "Condition of England":

So short-sighted, so stupidly narrow-minded is the English bourgeoisie in its egotism, that it does not even take the trouble to impress upon the workers the morality of the day, which the bourgeoisie has patched together in its own interest for its own protection!  
(Engels 142)

Elsewhere, in *The Morning Chronicle*, Oct. 18, 1849, just after the second outbreak of cholera in Britain, claiming 53,000 deaths, had ravaged in London,<sup>25</sup> an editorial expresses a concern about a shocking coexistence of the rich and the poor almost in the same place: "No man of feeling or reflection can look abroad without being shocked and startled by the sight of enormous wealth and unbounded luxury, placed in direct juxtaposition with the lowest extremes of indigence and privation." The same editorial also identifies the poor with "the dangerous class": "... the starving or mendicant state of a large portion of the people . . . if suffered to remain unremedied many years longer, will eat, like a dry rot into the very framework of our society, and haply bring down the whole fabric with a crash." Razzell, with reference to the editorial above, observes that "dangerous classes" is a phrase which appears frequently in *The Morning Chronicle* (Razzell 2). *The Morning Chronicle*, "the leading Liberal voice in the British press" (Slater xii) had some relation with Dickens, who was its permanent staff, contributed to the journal — the five "Street Sketches," for example, from September to November 1834, which were to form parts of his *Sketches by Boz*. Interestingly, there is a close relationship between the editorial of *The Morning Chronicle* and the beginning of Chapter 46 of *Bleak House* in which the gruesome message is announced that "Tom has his revenge"; Tom's "messengers" are his

"corrupted blood," "pestilential gas" and "Tom's slime" (Ch. 46, 568). Tom is, therefore, blackmailing; the burden of his message is to the effect that, as the writer of an editorial of *The Morning Chronicle* fears, "if suffered to remain unremedied" the poor or the laboring population "will eat . . . and haply bring down the whole fabric with a crash." The equation of the poor with the "dangerous classes" can be seen as common bourgeois ideology thereby foregrounding the paupers to whom a watchful sanitarian gaze should be directed. Indeed, this cold-blooded egotism is operating behind the pitiful scenes of Charley and her siblings, Jo's death, and the orphans in the oil painting. Nevertheless, it is also undeniable that the novelist, at least, with his tremendous verbal power to incite the reader's sympathy did succeed not only in attracting a sanitarian attention toward the poor, but rendered such heart-breaking scenes as where Jo whispers his first but last prayers, or where Esther "saw two silent tears fall down" upon the face of Charley who was "looking at us" mutely (Ch. 15, 193). At these moments, the reader of the day would have felt a responsibility to do something that was over and above egotism. By the same token, we, living today, are unable to be indifferent to little but brave Charley, poor Jo, and the nameless orphans fairly claiming attention on the canvas.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Bentham's conception of the panopticon was brought to the attention of the wider public in 1975 when Michel Foucault and Jacques-Alain introduced Bentham in their studies, *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison (Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of Prison)* and "Le Despotisme de l'Utile: la machine panoptique de Jeremy Bentham" respectively. See Bozovic 1–27.

<sup>2</sup> Briggs states that the New Poor Law of 1834 which, at its outset aimed at a central system, had become nearly subject to local government by the second half of the century. Anthony Wood, however, argues that the Poor Law Amendment from the beginning heavily relied on the local systems of "Boards of Guardians." As for the abolition of outdoor relief, Altick points out that it was not abolished altogether, because, in 1839, for example, there were as many as 560,000 persons who received the dole in their own cottages. See Briggs, *Age of Improvement* 280, Wood 89–91, Altick, *Victorian People and Ideas* 122–23.

<sup>3</sup> The public health movement is often characterized by its "bureaucratization" and "state administration," as Alison Bashford has noted (Bashford 3). The common correlation of the public health idea and centralization is, however, questionable according to some medical historians. Christopher Hamlin, for example,



insists that the Public Health Act of 1848 gave local government broad powers to promote sanitary reforms. Hence Dorothy Porter's suggestion that "the historical model of inevitable centralization of public health administration in industrial societies *requires serious revision*" (emphasis added). See Hamlin, "State Medicine in Great Britain" 144–45, and Dorothy Porter, "Introduction" 13.

<sup>4</sup> This aspect is described by, for example, Richard Altick, who defines Dickens as being "as topical . . . as any other novelist of his day." As for *Bleak House*'s actuality, the ground-breaking study by John Butt and Kathleen Tillotson shows the novel's close relationship with its time, concluding that three of the novel's subjects were highly topical: "Chancery," "the political chaos" and "London sanitation." See Altick, *The Presence* 52, 71, and Butt & Tillotson 177–200.

<sup>5</sup> Although much criticism deals with the relation between the sanitary idea and the novel, one of the best studies in this context, I think, is Schwarzbach's wide-ranging commentary on *Bleak House*; its discussion of the novel is full of information and insight; for instance, Schwarzbach relates Dickens's concern with the "housing issue" during the early 1850s to the "dissolving" houses in the novel, such as Chesney Wold, Bleak House, and the Jellyby house, insisting that the badly managed home becomes a key metaphor suggesting the necessity of building sanitary houses for the poor. See Schwarzbach 114–42.

<sup>6</sup> In my argument, terms such as "foreground" and "foregrounding" are basically used according to the poetics of the Prague school. This poetics presupposes that "background" is used in customary and predictable contexts; if something is specifically seen or treated intentionally so as to be highlighted against this background, the act of "foregrounding" is accomplished. For more details see Lodge 2–3.

<sup>7</sup> Broadly speaking, by the deconstructive strategy, while bearing in mind Foucault's key concepts of "surveillance," "discipline" and "power," D. A. Miller, regarding *Bleak House* as a "contradictory text," discusses how Chancery is replaced by the Police Detective, which by virtue of the omniscient Bucket is legitimized to exercise power over the hitherto supreme power of Chancery. Thus the novel envisages power within power, or the relationship between two powers: the law and the police. Similarly, inspired by Foucault's discussion of disciplinary technology inherent in the Panopticon society, Jeremy Tambling examines the relation of *Great Expectation*'s mode of autobiography and the novel's inescapable entanglement within a particular set of power relations. Because language itself is a mode of oppressive power making the writer prison-bound, the formation of identity or individuality by Pip is impossible as well as delusory; Tambling argues that the novel presents Pip's development as "no development." See D. A. Miller 58–106, Tambling 117–34.

As to a deconstructive reading of the novel, Hillis Miller's essay is a classic; by focusing on "self-contradiction" in the novel he argues that the work as a whole is an "allegory" made up of "cross references among signs" in which one meaning is constantly defined or referred to by another, so that meaning is made unstable or indeterminable: consequently, *Bleak House* is obsessed with "the interpretation of documents." Hillis Miller 11–34.

<sup>8</sup> One remarkable similarity between Jo and the crossing-sweepers in London that Mayhew witnessed is that those engaged in the job were, like Jo, always afraid of the police, for they could not "ask for money" if "there's a policeman

close at hand." Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor* Vol. 2: 466, 494–98. John Sutherland anatomizes the composition of the London mud Jo is supposed to sweep, concluding that, although mud was mingled with much *merde* (i.e. shit), to think that mud/*merde* was an "ankle-deep tide of filth" is going too far. Sutherland 90–98.

<sup>9</sup> The text used here is that of the Dent Edition, ed. Andrew Sanders. Citations hereafter are first to chapter, then to page from this edition in parentheses.

<sup>10</sup> The omnipresence or ubiquity of Inspector Bucket is stressed elsewhere: ". . . extraordinary terror of this person [Bucket] who ordered him [Jo] to keep out of the way; in his ignorance he believes this person *to be everywhere, and cognisant of everything*." (Ch. 47, 579; my italics)

<sup>11</sup> Norman Page notes that Inspector Bucket was "the first detective in English fiction," who was based on Inspector Charles Field, whom Dickens referred to several times in his *Household Words* (14 June 1851, for instance). Andrew Sanders's detailed note on Bucket is equally of importance. Norman Page, ed. *Bleak House* 960; Andrew Sanders, ed. *Bleak House* 825.

<sup>12</sup> Dorothy and Roy Porter argue that the key role of the physician particularly from the late eighteenth century onward at deathbeds was to attend the dying patient "not as doctors but as friends" in order to restore tranquility by removing bodily pain, thereby "orchestrating an end serene and blissful." Doctors in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, at large, were expected to act as friends who attend to comfort the dying. This role as "priest" rather than medical doctor can be found in Doctor Allan Woodcourt, who gives prayers to the dying Jo. See Dorothy & Roy Porter, *Patient's Progress* 144–52; Roy Porter, *Disease, Medicine and Society* 62.

<sup>13</sup> Miriam Bailin argues that sickness or the sickroom is of great importance in Victorian fictions in general, since the union of hero and heroine is accomplished under the secluded condition of the sickroom, which offered a "model of exchange" for love. See Bailin 23–26.

<sup>14</sup> As regards infectious diseases and the symbolic significance that such diseases evoke in relation to class-relations, the Leavises find a Carlylean echo, since in *Past and Present* "typhus fever" is considered as the sole link between high and low. F. R. Leavis touches upon mutual borrowings among Victorian novelists: ". . . the Victorian novelists read and used each other's work quite as freely as Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists did theirs" F. R. & Q. D. Leavis 166. Dyson finds in Esther's smallpox another perspective, for the disease shows the "dangers inherent in virtue itself in our fallen world." Dyson, *Inimitable Dickens* 180.

<sup>15</sup> The recurrence of "Tom-all-Alone's" as a suitable title in Dickens's working plans for this novel reveals that the "Sanitary Idea" as well as the Chancery gave the author imaginative inspiration; his social concern and awareness of the necessity for social reform, of course, indicates Dickens's journalist aspect. Examples of the titles are, "Tom-All-Alone's The Ruined House," "Tom-All-Alone's The Soritary House," "Tom-All-Alone's The Ruined Mill" and the like. See *Bleak House*, ed. Ford and Monod 773–75, Page, *Bleak House: A Novel of Connections* 13–14.

<sup>16</sup> Frye's explanation concerning *hamartia* and *hybris* is true of Lady Dedlock's downfall. Frye points out that *hamartia* must have an essential connection with sin or wrongdoing, and that *hamartia* is inevitably involved with *hybris* in

tragedies; *hybris* is a "soaring mind which brings about a morally intelligible downfall." In this sense, Lady Dedlock suffers according to tragic convention. Frye 210.

<sup>17</sup> The theme of the fallen women deserves attention, since it is one of Dickens's *topoi*. He is known to have been engaged in an institution named "Urania Cottage" for prostitutes. In this house they were educated with a view of shipping them to the colonies (mainly Australia) as eligible wives. Considering Emily's journey for Australia after her misconduct with Steerforth in *David Copperfield*, Emily is almost equivalent to one of the "fallen." In this context, Lady Dedlock can be also defined as "fallen" because her relation with Nemo was sexual. As for "Urania Cottage," see Schwarzwach 118.

<sup>18</sup> As far as I know, the only criticism which deals with the relationship between Brown's *Work* and public health is Christopher Hamlin's. He regards the work as celebrating "the act of public health rather than the idea." Hamlin's consideration of the Brown is, however, very short, covering only two pages. Hamlin, *The Age of Chadwick* 333–34.

<sup>19</sup> Many critics mention the frictional relationship between Cruikshank and Dickens from their first joint work for *Sketches by Boz* onwards. Cruikshank's *The Bottle* and *The Drunkard's Children* both disgusted Dickens, in spite of his veneration of Cruikshank's social realism; see, for instance, Schwarzbach 119, Harvey, James, Stone and Patten. The text of "Gin Shop" used here is *Sketches by Boz and other Early Papers 1833–39*, ed. Slater 180–85. Slater points out that "Gin Shop" and "The Pawnbroker's Shop" strike a grimmer note than any other of Boz's stories; the subject of the pawnbroker is again Hogarthian, since in "Beer Street" and "Gin Lane" a pawnbroker's shop is pictured; in the latter, the business is successful but in the former failing. See Slater xiii–xiv.

<sup>20</sup> Together with *Bleak House*, *Oliver Twist*, whose protagonist was born into a workhouse, obviously poses sanitary questions in the Malthusian or Chadwickian context. *Oliver Twist* is, in this sense, a precursor of *Bleak House*. Such words as orphan, poverty, filthiness, insanitary conditions, crime, moral degradation, and so forth in *Oliver Twist* indicate its close relationship with *Bleak House*.

<sup>21</sup> What is of importance in Poovey's discussion of Chadwick's *Sanitary Report* is her close, subversive reading of the text against the background of patriarchal Victorian society. Within the so-called feminist criticism at large, Poovey discloses a male chauvinistic standpoint in Chadwick's discourse, by pointing out that in his *Sanitary Report* Chadwick frequently stresses the importance of "domesticity," thereby drawing attention to the women's role and duty as a housewife who should keep their house tidy and clean, i. e., in good sanitary conditions. Poovey 115–131.

<sup>22</sup> Much art criticism, in line with the socialistic inclination Brown himself confessed concerning his *Work*, has found in the painting, firstly, Hogarthian subjects of the opposition between idleness and industry, secondly, a Carlylean critique of modern industrial society based on "capitalism" and "Mammonism"; Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* (1832) and *Past and Present* (1843) in fact left their marks on Brown and the painting; Brown calls one of his characters "Bobus," the untrustworthy sausage maker in *Past and Present*. See Newman & Watkinson 119–30, Treuherz, *Victorian Painting* 87, Treuherz, *Pre-Raphaelite Painting* 49, Brown 151–56, Huefer 415, Bendiner, *Victorian Painting* 131, Paulson, *Hoga-*

*rth's Graphic Works* 145–48, 367–69, Paulson, *Hogarth III*: 17–26, Engels 129.

The more or less straightforward puritan work ethic that the picture supports is underscored by the biblical quotation on the frame: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" (*Genesis* 3: 19). See Treuherz, *Pre-Raphaelite Painting* 41. It is a famous manifesto of Max Weber's that capitalism and the protestant work ethic are in harmony because the idea of "*Beruf*" or "calling" promotes hard work with no intention of making money, only for the devotion of oneself to God; accumulation of wealth by protestants is a mere result of the belief in the gospel of work, not of a mercenary drive. This moral value of labor supported by protestants was shared and proclaimed by Carlyle to the extent that it became a "key tenet of the Victorian." See Warner 98–100, and Weber.

<sup>23</sup> According to Andrew Sanders' annotation, Tom-all-Alone's is partly based on St Giles, where Dickens made an expedition with Inspector Field — a model for Bucket — and others in 1851, and partly on the "decaying area" around Wych Street. Still another possibility is suggested by John Butt, who relates the description of Tom-all-Alone's in chapter 46 with Dickens's visit to Bermondsey, and possibly, Jacob's Island in the neighborhood on January 7, 1853. The installment including the chapter was published in April 1853. In any case, it is clear that Dickens was well versed in the appalling circumstances of the London slums. Concerning Bermondsey and Jacob's Island, the well-known report entitled "A Visit to the Cholera District of Bermondsey" by Mayhew was published on September 24, 1849 in *The Morning Chronicle*. In his reportage, Mayhew offers a horrible, insanitary picture of the area, heavily alluding to miasmatism: "On entering the precincts of the pest island, the air has literally the smell of a graveyard" (Mayhew 32). See *Bleak House*, ed. Sanders 818, 825; Butt & Tillotson 192–95.

<sup>24</sup> In reality, the sanitary construction in progress in Hampstead which Brown witnessed was for drainage, despite Brown's belief that the excavation "was connected with the supply of water." And yet, it is notable that the site was linked with the sanitarian movement in the middle of the century, whether it was for drainage, or supply of water. See Treuherz, *Victorian Painting* 87.

<sup>25</sup> For further information on cholera epidemics in the nineteenth-century Britain, see Margaret Pelling, and Mayhew, "A Visit to the Cholera Districts" 31.

## Works Cited

- Altick, Richard. *Victorian People and Ideas*. New York: Norton, 1973.  
 ——. *The Presence of the Present*. Columbus: Ohio UP, 1991.  
 Bailin, Miriam. *The Sickroom of Victorian Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.  
 Bashford, Alison. *Purity and Pollution: Gender, Embodiment and Victorian Medicine*. London: Macmillan, 1998.  
 Bendiner, Kenneth. *An Introduction to Victorian Painting*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.  
 ——. *The Art of Ford Madox Brown*. Ed. Kenneth Bendiner. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1998.  
 Briggs, Asa. *The Age of Improvement 1783–1867*. London: Longman, 1959.

- . *Victorian Cities*. 1963; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990.
- Brown, Ford Madox. "The Exhibition of Work, and other Paintings." *The Art of Ford Madox Brown*. Ed. Kenneth Bendiner. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1998. 131–56.
- Butt, John, and Kathleen Tillotson. *Dickens at Work*. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Chadwick, Edwin. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965.
- Connor, Steven. "Introduction." *Longman Critical Readers Dickens*. Ed. Steven Connor. London: Longman, 1996. 1–33.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Ed. Steven Connor. London: Dent, 1994.
- . *David Copperfield*. Ed. Jeremy Tambling. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Bleak House*. Ed. Norman Page. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.
- . *Bleak House*. Ed. George Ford and Sivère Monod. New York: Norton, 1977.
- . *Bleak House*. Ed. Andrew Sanders. London: Dent, 1994.
- Dyson, A. E. "Introduction." *Dickens: Bleak House A Casebook*. Ed. A. E. Dyson. London: Macmillan, 1969. 11–19.
- . *The Inimitable Dickens*. London: Macmillan, 1970.
- Engels, Friedrich. *Condition of the Working Class in England*. Ed. Victor Kierman. 1845; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.
- Flew, Antony. "Introduction." *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. 1798, 1830; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- Flinn, M. W. "Introduction." *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965. 1–73.
- Forster, John. *The Life of Charles Dickens* Vols. I & II. London: Dent, 1966, 1969.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Tr. Allan Sheridan. 1975; New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Johnson, Edgar. *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph*. 1952; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
- Hamlin, Christopher. *Public Health and Social Justice in the Age of Chadwick Britain, 1800–1854*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- . "State Medicine in Great Britain." *The History of Public Health and the Modern State*. Ed. Dorothy Porter. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994. 132–64.
- Harvey, John. "George Cruikshank: A Master of the Poetic Use of Line." *George Cruikshank: A Revaluation*. Ed. Robert L. Patten. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992. 129–56.
- Huefer, Ford M. *Ford Madox Brown: A Record of his Life and Works*. London: Longmans, Green, 1896.
- Leavis, F. R. & Q. D. *Dickens the Novelist*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1973.
- Lodge, David. *The Modes of Modern Writing*. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.
- James, Louis. "An Artist in Time: George Cruikshank in Three Eras." *George Cruikshank: A Revaluation*. Ed. Robert L. Patten. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992. 157–88.
- Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. 1798, 1830; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

- Mayhew, Henry. "A Visit to the Cholera Districts of Bermondsey." *The Morning Chronicle Survey of London Labour and the Poor: The Metropolitan Districts*. Sussex: Caliban Books, 1980. Vol. 1: 31–39.
- . *London Labour and the London Poor*. 1861; New York: Dover Publications, 1968. Vol. 2.
- Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Miller, Hillis. "Introduction." *Bleak House*. Ed. Norman Page. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971. 11–34.
- Page, Norman. *Bleak House: A Novel of Connections*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990.
- Patten, Robert, ed. *George Cruikshank: A Revaluation*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.
- . *George Cruikshank's Life, Times, and Art Volume 1: 1792–1835*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
- . *George Cruikshank's Life, Times, and Art Volume 2: 1835–1878*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1996.
- Paulson, Ronald. *Hogarth's Graphic Works* (Third Edition). London: The Print Room, 1989.
- . *Hogarth Volume II: High and Low, 1732–1750*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
- . *Hogarth Volume III: Art and Politics, 1750–1764*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1993.
- Pelling, Margaret. *Cholera, Fever and English Medicine 1825–1865*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Porter, Dorothy, ed. *The History of Public Health and the Modern State*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Porter, Dorothy, and Porter, Roy. *Patient's Progress*. Cambridge: Polity P, 1989.
- Porter, Roy, ed. *Patients and Practitioners*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- . *Disease, Medicine and Society in England 1550–1860* Second Edition. 1993; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- . *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind*. London: Harper Collins, 1997.
- Poovey, Mary. *Making a Social Body British Cultural Formations, 1830–1864*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Razzell, Peter. "Introduction." *The Morning Chronicle Survey of London Labour and the Poor: The Metropolitan Districts*. Sussex: Caliban Books, 1980. Vol. 1: 1–29.
- Schwarzbach, F. S. *Dickens and the City*. London: The Athlone Press, 1979.
- Slater, Michael, ed. *Dickens' Journalism: Sketches by Boz and Other Early Papers 1833–39*. London: Dent, 1994.
- . "Introduction." *Dickens' Journalism: Sketches by Boz and Other Early Papers 1833–39*. London: Dent, 1994. xi–xxii.
- Stone, Harry. "Dickens, Cruikshank, and Fairy Tale." *George Cruikshank: A Revaluation*. Ed. Robert L. Patten. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992. 213–47.
- Sutherland, John. *Is Heathcliff a Murderer?: Puzzles in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Treuherz, Julian. *Pre-Raphaelite Paintings*. Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1993.
- . *Victorian Painting*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1993.
- Warner, Malcolm, ed. *The Victorians: British Painting 1837–1901*. New York:

Harry N. Abrams, 1997.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Tr. Anthony Giddens. 1930; London: Routledge, 1992.

Wood, Anthony. *Nineteenth Century Britain 1815–1914* Second Edition. London: Longman, 1982.



fig. 1. Ford Madox Brown, *Work* (182-65) ©Manchester City Art Galleries



fig. 2 Hogarth, *Beer Street* (1751)



fig. 3 Hogarth, *Gin Lane* (1751)



fig. 4 Cruickshank, from  
*Scraps and Sketches* (1829)



fig. 5 Cruickshank,  
*The Drunkard's Children*, plate 8 (1848)

## ヴィクトリア朝のプロメテウス 『テス』における歴史のダイナミズム

鈴木 淳

### I

ハーディ(Thomas Hardy)の『テス』(*Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, 1891)については、1980年代には、ブーメラ(Penny Boumelha)や、アウアバック(Nina Auerbach)などのフェミニズム的解釈が隆盛を極め、ヴィクトリア朝のイデオロギーに対するテスのセクシュアリティという構図で論じられてきた。また、マテリアリズム的な解釈を試みたウォットン(George Wotton)や、イヴと蛇の双方の資質を備えたテスの characterization に見られる曖昧性に着目し、実際にテスが清純なのかどうかを考察したブレディ(Kristin Brady)や、クラリッジ(Laura Claridge)などがいた。最近では、シャイアズ(Linda M. Shires)が、美学やリアリティといった観点から『テス』を論じ、1830年代以来の功利主義的な美学がハーディの執筆に大きな影響を及ぼしていると指摘している。

『テス』という作品が人間の尊厳を描いたヒューマニズム的な小説であることは、かつてジョンソン(Lionel Johnson)やビアー(Gillian Beer)、あるいはビョルク(Lennart A. Björk)によって指摘された。しかし、依然として、そのテーマと作品構造の関係が詳しく取り上げられることは少ない。さらには、そこに家系との関連性を視野に入れてテスの悲劇を取り扱っているものは、ミラー(J. Hillis Miller)の論を除けば、皆無に等しいと思われる。本論は、ハーディの描くヒューマニズムが『テス』のなかでどのように表象されているかを考察するものである。ビアーによれば、ハーディのヒューマニズムとは、作品の主人公の死とともに物語を語らなくなることで、その死を絶対的なものではなく、議論を引き起こすものにするというものである。ビアーは、かつてハーディのヒューマニズムはテス個人の人生に重きを置くものと述べた。しかしながら、本論では、テスの悲劇の構図を、ハーディのノートに記されたアイスキュロスの定義する因果性と

家系という視点から捉え直し、そこから『テス』のなかに様々な形で具象化された「繰り返し」という特徴的な構造の機能を再考する。その結果、この悲劇的な小説の構造とそのなかに描かれたヒューマニズムとの間には、実は「歴史」という共通の関係があることを確認したい。最終的には、『テス』のなかに、ピアーのいう「一世代の人間を描いたヒューマニズム的な様相」とは異なった、むしろ何世代にもわたって繰り返されてきた悲劇とヒューマニズムの歴史のダイナミズムが存在していることを明らかにしたい。

## II

テスの悲劇の根本原因については、これまでも多くの批評家が論じてきたことであるが、大抵の場合、それは、アレックのレイプとヴィクトリア朝の倫理観に基づくコンベンションとの関わりにおいてのものであった。ヴィクトリア朝のコンベンションではテスの婚前の処女喪失は罪とみなされる。そのため、多くの批評家が、その事件をテスの悲劇の始まりと受け取り、アレックを非難するのにもたしかに頷ける。しかしながら、実際のテキストはどうなのであろうか。まず始めに、問題となる事件の場面を改めて確認してみたいと思う。

Darkness and silence ruled everywhere around. Above them rose the primeval yews and oaks of The Chase, in which were poised gentle roosting birds in their last nap; and about them stole the hopping rabbits and hares. But, might some say, where was Tess's guardian angel? where was the Providence of her simple faith? Perhaps, like that other god of whom the ironical Tishbite spoke, he was talking, or he was pursuing, or he was in a journey, or he was sleeping and not to be awaked. (57)

アレックにより、処女を奪われたテスの悲劇に対して、語り手は悲痛の声をあげ、「守護神はどこにいたのか」、そして「彼女の信仰していた神はどこにいたのか」と非難する。しかしながら、それに対する答えは皮肉なものであった。神々は「話をしていたか、獲物を追いかけていたか、旅に出ていたか、あるいは寝ていたか」のいずれかであろうというのである。すなわち、守護神や神は、テスになど見向きもせず、思い思いの行動をとっていたのだ。しかも、次の引用から、我々は、神々の行動がある意味では意図的なものであったことが分かる。実は、そこにこそテスの悲劇の根本原因があったといえるのである。

Why it was that upon this beautiful feminine tissue, sensitive as gossamer, and practically blank as snow as yet, there should

have been traced such a coarse pattern as it was doomed to receive; why so often the coarse appropriates the finer thus, the wrong man the woman, the wrong woman the man, many thousand years of analytical philosophy have failed to explain to our sense of order. One may, indeed, admit the possibility of a retribution lurking in the present catastrophe. Doubtless some of Tess d'Urberville's mailed ancestors rollicking home from a fray had dealt the same measure even more ruthlessly towards peasant girls of their time. (57)

語り手も不思議がるように、なぜ、運命が、本来ならば無関係なものにこうも襲いかかるのか。それがハーディの疑問であった。しかし、ここで語り手は、考えられる理由として「罪の償い」(retribution)をあげている。つまり、ダーバヴィル家の先祖たちがしてきたことの罪の償いを、テスは現在行っているのだ。

上記の引用からも分かる通り、テスの悲劇の原因は、アレックによるものというよりは、むしろ、神々によって意図されたダーバヴィル家の先祖の罪の償いであった。つまり、それは、ギリシャ古典悲劇によく見られる「親の罪を子が引き継ぐ」というある種の「因果性」の意識であり、20代の頃からハーディが深い影響を受けていたアイスキュロスやソフォクレスの考え方からすれば不可避なものである。<sup>1</sup> そういった意識がテスの住むマーロット(Marlott)に深く浸透していたことは、決定論的な「なるべくしてなった」(58)という言葉にも現われているといえよう。<sup>2</sup> しかも、『アガメムノン』(Agamemnon)にも見られるように、罪の意識は決して消えるものではない。何世代をも越えて意識されるものである。というのも、プリンスを事故で死なせてしまったときのテス自身の罪の意識は、過去における鹿の殺害のエピソード(5)と自然に結び付き、さらには、それは、先に触れた少女たちへの罪の償いと相俟って、テスの処女喪失へと結び付いていくからである。実際、プリンスが柵に突き刺さり、血まみれになって死んだとき、テスもまた大量の返り血を浴びている(22)。言うまでもなく、このシーンは後の事件によるテスの処女喪失を暗示しているものであった。つまり、テスもまた、過去のダーバヴィル家の先祖の犯した罪とその償いという「繰り返し」のパターンの網の目に取り込まれているのである。<sup>3</sup>

## III

テスの悲劇は、アレックによるものというよりは、過去のダーバヴィル家の罪の意識によって誘引された必然的なものだった。すなわち、アレック自身ではなく、むしろアイスキュロスの『アガメムノン』に見られる



ような因果性の考え方に、その責任があったのである。というも、実は、アレックに対して、テスは一瞬であったが本能的に魅了されていた。たとえ「わたしの目は、ほんの少しだけあなたに惑わされたの。ただそれだけのことだったわ」(59)と言ったにしても、事件から数週間たっても相変わらずアレックと一緒に暮らしていたテスは、明らかにアレックの肉体の魅力にひかれていたと言えるだろう。多くの批評家が、あの晩の出来事は、アレックによる陵辱ではなく、テスにも責任がとわれるべきだと主張するのは、テスのこのような態度によるのである。このようなテスの曖昧さは、大抵の場合に、濃い霧のなかで、つまり、それまでの世界とは違った異空間で見ることができる。そのことは、ある意味では因果性が支配する不条理な世界を解体する可能性を含んだものとして受け取ることができる。というも、霧や暗闇などの曖昧な空間は、そこに決定論的な解釈を不可能にしてしまうからである。さらには、ハーディ自身もすぐさま描写をやめてしまい、決定的な解釈は提示されないままとなる。だが、そこには、その逆の可能性も潜んでいる。チェイスの森(The Chase)の晩のことで、テスがアレックと言い争っていたとき、ハーディは、ふと、後のアレック殺害の予兆をにおわせるのである。

“How can you dare to use such words!” she cried, turning impetuously upon him, her eyes flashing as the latent spirit (of which he was to see more some day) awoke in her. (60)

この「アレックがいつかもっと見ることになる」というテスに潜在する気質とは、まさしく、グローブでアレックを叩くテスの姿や、ナイフでのアレックの殺害を予感させるものである。それはダーバヴィル家の本来の気質（罪の歴史）であり、これもまたいずれ起きるであろう「罪と償い」というパターンを予期させる。つまり、テスは、過去の迷信や言い伝えの影響も手伝っているが、因果性のパターンの犠牲者となっているのだ。<sup>4</sup>このパターンからはもはや抜け出すことはできない。その証拠にテスがアレックを叩いたときのテスの言葉は、「一度犠牲者になってしまったら、いつでも犠牲者なのよ。それが掟なのよ」(261)というものであった。

ダーバヴィル家の罪は、古くから神々の戯れ(314)の対象となってきた。もちろん、ダーバヴィル家の騎士や貴婦人たちはそんなことも知らずに墓のなかで眠っている(314)。しかしながら、ダーバヴィル家の罪は決して償いきれるものではない。というも、一つには、それは因果性による神々の意図であるからであり、同時に、戯れだからである。すなわち、神々が存在しているうちは、テスの苦しみは終わることがないのだ。その

証拠に、いくらテスが努力しても結果は必ずアイロニカルなものとなる。たとえば、結婚前夜のテスの罪の告白の手紙もカーベットの下になり、エンジェルには届かなかった(165)。さらには「聖なる十字架」(Holy Cross)の前で、アレックにもう誘惑しないということを誓わされたテスであるが、実はその十字架が全く聖なるものなどではなかったことがすぐ後で分かるのである。その十字架の説明は、読者に、テスの逃れられない罪を痛切に感じさせるものである。

“Cross—no; ’twere not a cross. ’Tis a thing of ill-omen, miss. It was put up in wuld times by the malefactor who was tortured there by nailing his hand to a post, and afterwards hung. The bones lie underneath. They say he sold his soul to the devil, and that he walks at times.” (245)

テスはここでもまた過去(wuld times)の罪を意識せざるを得ない。悪魔に魂を売ったという犯罪者の十字架に誓いをたてたことになるテスは、必然的にダーバヴィル家の罪の歴史を請け負ったことになるのである。その他、小説のところどころに挿入されるダーバヴィル家の馬車の逸話や、ダーバヴィル家の縁りの地のプロットなどは、ピアアの言う通りに、一連のゴースト・プロットとなり、テスの悲劇を引き伸ばしにする結果となる。ピアアによれば、ハーディ小説のプロットとは、いつでも不慮の災難による死の必然性が付きまといっている、悲劇性、あるいは悪意のあるものである。そこには最初から決定論が存在しているのだが、最後の瞬間まで、それは緊張状態を保っているのだ。

悲劇的なプロットについて具体例をあげるならば、エンジェルとの結婚のために教会に向かうときなど、馬車の御者が「60歳の少年であり、過去が再びやってくる」(166)ようにテスは感じている。さらに、結婚式が終わった後、テスはエンジェルにその馬車を夢のなかで見たことがあるといった話をする。すると、エンジェルはそれが伝説のダーバヴィル家の馬車ではないかと答える。その話を聞いたことのなかったテスは、エンジェルの話に落胆する。それはまたもや罪に関係する話であった。

“Well—I would rather not tell it in detail just now. A certain d’Urberville of the sixteenth or seventeenth century committed a dreadful crime in his family coach; and since that time members of the family see or hear the old coach whenever—. But I’ll tell you another day—it is rather gloomy. Evidently some dim knowledge of it has been brought back to your mind by the sight of this venerable caravan.” (168)

それに対して、テスはつぶやく。「馬車を見るのは、死ぬときか、それ



とも罪を犯すときか」と。エンジェルはキスをしてテスを黙らせる。しかし、この問いへの答えは、後に、テスの父親ジョンが死に、村を追い出されそうになったダービーフィールド家を訪れたアレックによって明らかにされる。実はそのとき、テスは、アレックの姿ではなく、伝説のダーバヴィル家の馬車を見てしまっていた。

“If you are a genuine d’Urberville I ought not to tell you either, I suppose. As for me, I’m a sham one, so it doesn’t matter. It is rather dismal. It is that this sound of a non-existent coach can only be heard by one of d’Urberville blood, and it is held to be of ill-omen to the one who hears it. It has to do with a murder, committed by one of the family, centuries ago.” (279)

アレックによれば、伝説のダーバヴィル家の馬車は殺人に関係していた。すると、読者は、テスのアレック殺害を、当然のようにダーバヴィル家の先祖の罪の繰り返しであると思うようになる。やはり、テスの人生の歴史は「長い列の一部分にすぎなく」(99)、これまでも「何千もの同じ気質と過去、そして何千もの同じ未来と行動」(99)が繰り返されてきたのだろうか。

このように、罪の意識は、ほとんど全てのプロットに付きまとうものである。テスが、結婚した後でウェルブリッジ(Wellbridge)の宿に泊まったとき、エンジェルは、テスにその宿が「テスの先祖の建物」であったことを告げる。しかしながら、結果としてそれは、過去を忘れないテスに対して、罪に彩られた過去を嫌でも意識させることになる。もちろん、エンジェルにその意図があったわけではない。しかし、これは神々の定めた必然なのだ。ダーバヴィル家の壁にあった肖像画に怖れを感じるテスであるが、語り手はその肖像画を次のように描写している。

He looked up, and perceived two life-size portraits on panels built into the masonry. As all visitors to the mansion are aware, these paintings represent women of middle age, of a date some two hundred years ago, whose lineaments once seen can never be forgotten. The long pointed features, narrow eye, and smirk of the one, so suggestive of merciless treachery; the bill-hook nose, large teeth, and bold eye of the other, suggesting arrogance to the point of ferocity, haunt the beholder afterwards in his dreams. (170)

女性の肖像画は、200年くらい前のものであり、一度見たら忘れられないような特徴をしていた。特に注目すべき点は、それが「背信」を示していたことである。このエピソードは、丁度、定期的に、エンジェルへのテスの過去の告白の失敗と重なるものであった。その告白とは、イノセンスに見えていたテスが、実はもう処女ではなかった、というものである。テス

の怖れは、肖像画の示唆する背信と自分の立場の偶然の一致にあった。ところで、ダーバヴィル家の罪のシンボルとなっているこの肖像画であるが、それは「壁に埋め込まれていて取り外すことができない」(170)とされている。このことが何を示しているかといえは、おそらく、肖像画と同じく、ダーバヴィル家の罪も取り外しができないということ、つまり決して償うことができないということであろう。神々(divinities)はテスの罪を許したりはしないのだ。その結果、エンジェルへの「わたしを許してください」(179)というテスの声が、何度もむなしく響くだけなのである。

#### IV

ハーディとギリシャ古典悲劇との関わりについては、ラトランド(W. R. Rutland)の *Thomas Hardy: A Study of His Writings and Their Background* のなかに詳しい記述がある。ハーディが若い頃に深く影響を受けたギリシャ古典悲劇では、生きるものはいかなるものでも幸福ではありえないというのが伝統的な考え方とされていた。しかしながら、ハーディが文学のなかで追求したのは、いかにすれば人間は幸福になり得るかということであった。その考えは、伝記に記された彼の個人主義の思考にも現われている。

I consider a social system based on individual spontaneity to promise better for happiness than a curbed and uniform one under which all temperaments are bound to shape themselves to a single pattern of living. To this end I would have society divided into groups of temperaments, with a different code of observances for each group. (Later Life 23)

個人の幸福というものは、単一的な社会システムのなかでは実現不可能であるというのが、ここでのハーディの主張内容である。すなわち、個人の幸福にとって必要とされているのは、神という倫理的絶対者ではないのだ。ハーディの説く真の哲学とは、あくまで人間に幸福をもたらすものである。伝記のなかで、ハーディはそれが「自然のなか」にあることを述べている(*Early Life*, August 1888)。さらには、1892年版の『テス』の序文にあるように、ハーディがテスの「清純さ」を「自然を介した際の意味で描いた」ということから、そもそもハーディの執筆の意図が人間の幸福に関係していたということが窺えるだろう。ピアースは、そういったハーディの哲学の特徴を次のように定義している。つまり、「ハーディの書きものは、知覚できるものを探究している。人間の知識は、現在という時間において認識できるものであり、人間の幸福は、現在において経験される。現在とは物質的秩序の一部であり、過去はもはやそうではない」(Beer

456)。ここで大切なことは、ハーディが知覚できるものを重視していたことである。ピアーはそういったハーディの哲学体系を「ロマン派的マテリアリズム」(456)と呼んでいる。

人間の知覚というものは、言うまでもなく、五感を用いたものである。「幸福は現在における知覚のなかにある」というのがハーディの哲学であったと思われるが、小説を見ると、たしかにテスの幸福というものは、身体の接触や温度といった感覚上の直接的経験を通して現実のものとなっている。たとえば、テスがエンジェルのハーブに魅了されたとき、自然のなかの無生物でさえもが、「たとえ五感の全てではないにしても、二つか、あるいは三つの感覚を与えられているようであった」とされている(96)。さらには、そのハーブの音色は「裸体」(96)と表現されている。身体の接触という点では、その他にも、エンジェルがテスを抱いて水たまりを渡ったときの描写は、注目に値する。そもそも事の発端は、教会に行こうとしていたテスたちが川が溢れたために道を通ることができずに困っていたことにあった。そこに、エンジェルが通りかかり、次々と女性を抱いて水たまりを渡っていく。注目すべきは、順番が回ってきたときのテスの反応である。

She was embarrassed to discover that excitement at the proximity of Mr Clare's breath and eyes, which she had contemned in her companions, was intensified in herself; and as if fearful of betraying her secret she paltered with him at the last moment.

(113)

ここからも分かるように、テスは、マリアンやレティなどの場合には男性との身体の接触を軽蔑していたのだが、いざ自分がエンジェルの息や目に接近することを思うと、高まる興奮を隠せなくなっているのである。

さらには、テスがエンジェルの求婚を受け入れてキスをしたときなどは、マテリアリズム的な自然に基づいたテスの幸福感というものが顕著に描写されている。

So they drove on through the gloom, forming one bundle inside the sail-cloth, the horse going as he would, and the rain driving against them. She had consented. She might as well have agreed at first. The "appetite for joy," which pervades all creation; that tremendous force which sways humanity to its purpose, as the tide sways the helpless weed, was not to be controlled by vague lucubrations over the social rubric.

(149)

ここで述べられている「歓喜への欲求」とは、本来、全ての創造物に浸透しているものである。その力は、潮の流れのような大きなものであり、

「社会の掟書についての曖昧な黙想」によって制御できるような代物ではない。このように見てくると、ハーディが、ここでピアーの言う「ロマン派的マテリアリズム」を幸福の根源として読者に提示していることは確実なことであろう。

しかしながら、では、ダーバヴィル家の罪という宿命を抱えたテスが、なぜ一方ではこのような幸福を実現できていたのかという疑問が湧いてくる。しかし、それは驚くことではない。というのは、小説の冒頭では、たしかにダーバヴィル家の血を受け継いでいるとされているが、テスはそのことに対して否定的である。テスは次のように言う。「わたしのなかには、お父さんの血と同量だけ、お母さんの血が流れているんだわ。わたしの愛らしさは全てお母さんからきているの。お母さんは単なる酪農婦だったのに」(80)。すなわち、テスの肉体的な魅力は、ダーバヴィル家の血とは関係がないのだ。それは、自然本能的に歓喜を求めるものであり、自然のままに行動するといった性格を備えているものである。したがって、テスは、懸命に、できるだけダーバヴィル家の末裔であることを意識しないようにしていたのだ。しかしながら、結局のところ、テスは、エンジェルにより、自分が「ダービーフィールドではなく、ダーバヴィルである」(147)ということを嫌でも認めさせられてしまう。さらには、テスがダーバヴィルであることを知って、エンジェルはテスに向かって「今日からダーバヴィルとならなきゃね」(148)と言っているのだ。それを嫌がるテスであるが、ここを境界線としてテスが犠牲者に逆戻りしていることは否めない<sup>5</sup>。その結果、テスは受動的になり(159)、エンジェルによって「理想として、そして空想として愛されるのである」(159)。

ところで、ダーバヴィルという家系が、神々の犠牲となっているのは、そもそも家系という概念自体に、そういった意志が内在しているためでもある。ニーチェは『道徳の系譜』のなかで、家系と神との関係について次のように述べている。

祖先と祖先の力に対する恐怖、祖先に対する債務意識の増大は、この種の論理にしたがって、種族そのものの力の増大と厳密に比例し、種族そのものの勝利、独立、荣誉、畏怖の増大と厳密に比例する。(略)このような素朴な論理がその終点に達した場合を考えて見るがよい。結局、最も強力な種族の祖先は、恐怖の増大を想像することによって自ら巨怪なものにまで増大し、無気味な神秘の暗闇のうちへ押し込められてしまうほかはない、つまり、祖先は必然的に一つの神に変形される。おそらくここに神々の本当の起源、すなわち恐怖からの起源があるのだ。(『道徳の系譜』106)

ニーチェの思想を通して考えると、そもそもダーバヴィルという家系

の概念それ自体に神の起源があるといえる。つまり、テスは、ダーバヴィル家の罪をいくら償おうとも、神の起源となる由緒ある「家系」に属している限り、その手を逃れることはできないのだ。神という形而上学的存在から逃れようとするテスのなかには、皮肉にもその概念の起源であるダーバヴィル家の血が流れているのである。よって、テスへの神々の戯れは、続くのである。殺害の伏線となるアレックとの再会がダーバヴィル家の縁りの地であるキングズピア(Kingsbere)であったことにも、家系と罪の密接なつながりが窺えるといえよう。結果として、テスはどうしてもこのような因果性のパターンを抜け出すことはできない。

たしかに、最終場面において、テスは、ストーンヘンジに身を捧げ、それまでの人生のパターンを逃れたと言えるかもしれない。しかしながら、ミラーは、太陽崇拜の遺跡であるストーンヘンジのなかに、小説のなかに幾度となく繰り返されてきた赤色のイメージを読み取り、そもそも、この赤色のモチーフが、テスのリボンに始まりアレックの殺害に結び付き、一連の「繰り返し」のパターンの一つであったことを指摘している(Miller 123-4)。さらに、問題となるのは、テスの妹であるライザ・ルーの存在の持つ意義である。テスの悲劇が、もともとテス個人に責任があったわけではなく、ダーバヴィルという家系に代々引き継がれてきたものであったということに注意しなければならない。すなわち、ライザ・ルーの存在は、テスの悲劇の終焉ではなく、単なるその継承にすぎないのだ。テスが「何千もの人間の連なりの一人」であったように、同じ家系に属するライザ・ルーの運命も、テスと同じように神々の戯れの犠牲となるものが定められているのである。それは、ライザ・ルーが「テスの精神化されたイメージ」(313)であることにも現われていると言えるだろう。つまり、彼女もまた、形而上学的世界の網の目に取り込まれた一人であり、新たなテスなのである。

## V

テスの悲劇は、これまで見てきたように、因果性をめぐる神々の戯れによって引き起こされたものであった。ダーバヴィル家の過去の罪が世代を超えて引き継がれていくという、いわば、ギリシャ古典悲劇の伝統とも言える構図について、ハーディがアイスキュロスに負うところが大きいことは、テスを苦しめていた神々(the President of the Immortals)を描写するにあたって、「アイスキュロスのフレーズを用いれば」という語が使われていることから明らかである。さらには、ハーディは、ノートの中に、ア

イスキュロスの因果性の神学について、次の部分を書き留めている。

No modern theology has developed higher & purer moral notions than those of Aeschylus & his school, developed afterwards by Socrates & Plato, but first attained by the genius of Aeschylus. . . . He shows the indelible nature of sin, & how it recoils upon the 3rd & 4th generation—thus anticipating one of the most marked features in Xtian theology.

このなかで、アイスキュロスの因果性の神学が言及され、それは世代を超えるものであると説明されている。まさしくこれは、作品中のテスとダーバヴィル家の罪をめぐる構図そのものを示唆しているといつてよい。しかしながら、このノートの抜粋ではアイスキュロスの神学は賛辞を受けているが、おそらくハーディは、その逆の考えをもって『テス』を執筆したといえる。というのも、ハーディの哲学は、人間の幸福を目的とするものであって、ギリシャ古典悲劇のように、生きるものの本質を不幸として規定するようなものではないからである。それは、先に触れたハーディのマテリアリズム的思考にも現われていた。さらには、作品のなかでナレーターは、因果性を示唆すると同時に、実はそれが不当なものであることを指摘していた。アレックのレイプの場面で、ナレーターは次のように言う。

But though to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children may be a morality good enough for divinities, it is scorned by average human nature; (57)

罪が父親から世代を超えて子へ引き継がれるというのは、たしかに、神々には適切であるとしても、普通の人間には拒絶されるものである。この場合、おそらくナレーターの声はハーディ自身のものとして考えられるだろう。すなわち、ハーディにとって、ここでアイスキュロスの規定しているような因果性の神学とは、人間に幸福をもたらすようなものではなく、非人間的なものなのである。

## VI

ハーディの『テス』の執筆の動機は、一つには、ギリシャ古典悲劇のような、因果性による悲劇を描くことにあったといえる。しかしながら、ハーディの目的は、副題や序文にもあるように、それをただ「忠実に提示すること」にあった<sup>6</sup>。というのも、実は、ハーディ自身もまた、ミラーも指摘するように、テスの悲劇の原因の所在をつきとめることができないのである。実を言えば、その悲劇の歴史は、これまでも他の作家たちの様々な文学作品のなかで繰り返されてきたものであり、その痕跡は、『テ

ス』のなかに全て記録されて残っている。たとえば、それはアイスキュロスへの言及であり、また、「汝の、滅びは、寝ねず」(62)や、「汝、犯す、なかれ」(63)といった、ペテロやモーゼなどの聖書の言葉として記録されていた。さらには、テスの名前は、ターナー(Paul Turner)も指摘しているように、クラシヨーの詩に描かれた聖テレサに由来していた。彼女もまたテスと同じく、殉教という、他者のために死を迎えた一人であった。そのほかにも、シェイクスピアや、ミルトン、ワーズワース、そして、テニスン、あるいはブラウニングなど、『テス』のなかでの他の作家からの影響が多岐にわたっているのも、一つには、そうした人間の悲劇の歴史の痕跡としての意味があったと思われる。

しかしながら、先に触れたような、人間の幸福追及の媒体としてのマテリアリズム的な世界の提示もまた、ハーディの執筆の動機の一つであったといえよう。というのも、たとえライザ・ルーがテスの悲劇を継承することになったとしても、実はそこには、テスに見られたような幸福の実現の可能性も、遺伝形質として刷り込まれているのである<sup>7</sup>。さらには、実は『テス』のなかには、悲劇の歴史と同様に、幸福の歴史の痕跡も、作品の外側から流れ込んでいたのである。たとえば、ヨハネの黙示録の言葉である「生命の河」がフローム川のたとえとして用いられている。その他では、自己を賛美した『わたし自身の歌』の作者であるホイットマンの詩が、トールボットヘイズ(Talbothays)の場面で引用されている。さらには、テス自身についても、デメーターという豊穡の女神にたとえられているのだ。すなわち、『テス』のなかには、因果性による悲劇の歴史と平行して、人間の幸福の歴史も常時並立して存在しているのである。

ハーディは、1912年のウェセックス版に付した序文のなかで、事象の相反する面の「同時存在性」を認めている。すなわち、それは、「小説とは、事実の飾らない再演であり、確信、あるいは議論ではなく、その瞬間における複数の印象の表象である」というハーディの理念へとつながるものである。それは、『テス』の1892年版の序文で、さらには、1912年版の序文においてもまた繰り返して述べられ、終始一貫してハーディの創作理念であった。この理念は、実際に『テス』のなかでは、ギリシャ古典悲劇の形態と、それに対する人間の幸福という二つの対立概念の並立として提示されていた。その結果として、神々によるテスの悲劇は形骸化され、代わりに、解釈における流動性が喚起されることとなった。すなわち、それは、神々が定めた悲劇のなかに、人間の幸福の可能性が許容されることを意味したのである。

以上のことから考えても、『テス』という作品は、多くの批評家たちが指摘するように、まさしくハーディのヒューマニズムを反映した小説であったといえよう。しかし、それは、ピアーのいう「一世代の人間の死による人間の尊厳」を描いたものではない。むしろ、テスの姿は、ターナーの言うように、ヴィクトリア朝後期の小説に描かれた「プロメテウス」の姿なのである。ターナーは、テスとプロメテウスの類似性を、アイスキュロスのプロメテウスが嵐のなかで消えていく際の最後の言葉である「どんなに不当にわたしが苦しんでいるか、お分かりになるだろう」と、『テス』の最後のアイロニカルなフレーズである「正当な処置がとられた」という、両者の「正当性」についての問題の提示のなかに読み取っている<sup>8</sup>。さらに、ターナーは、『テス』において狩猟で傷ついたキジの姿を描写する語り手の言葉と、ゼウスによって苦しめられるプロメテウスの言葉のなかに類似点を見ている。

テスとプロメテウスの関係については、ハーディの詩である『テスの嘆き』(“Tess’s Lament”)のなかのテスの言葉と、アイスキュロスの描くプロメテウスの嘆きの言葉のなかにも密接なつながりを窺うことができる。プロメテウスは、かつてイオに対して、自らが死ぬことのできない存在であるために苦しみが続くことを語った。そのような運命を背負ったプロメテウスは、独白部分で次のように嘆く。

よく見ておいてくれ、どのような辱めに  
身を切り苛まれつつ、永劫の歳月を  
私がこれから苦悩にすごしていくかを。  
かくも無惨な縛めを、私に対して、  
あの新しい神々の主権者は、工夫し出したのだ、  
ああ、ああ、今もまた襲ってくる苦しみには  
ただ呻吟するばかりだ、この苦悩はいったい  
いつ、どのように、終りをつげるはずなのかと。

(『縛られたプロメテウス』15)

ここで、プロメテウスは、神々の戒めによる苦しみがいづつ終るのかということに嘆いている。つまり、逆に言えば、プロメテウスの苦しみは、永劫の歳月にわたって続く運命にあるのだ。実は、テスの運命も、プロメテウスのそのように、神々の戒めにより代々家系に継承されてきたものだった。その結果、テスは、次のような嘆きの声を挙げる。

I cannot bear my fate as writ,  
I’d have my life unbe;  
Would turn my memory to a blot,  
Make every relic of me rot,  
My doings be as they are not,

And gone all trace of me! (Complete Poems 177)

この詩のなかで、テスは、自分の運命を耐えられないものと嘆き、自らの人生が消し去られることを望んでいる。しかし、結果的には、テスの運命はライザ・ルーに継承され、消し去ることはできなかった。この点においても、詩のなかのテスの言葉は、プロメテウスの独白を想起させるといえる。すなわち、かつてのアイスキュロスの劇の観客が「よく見ておく」ことになるのは、プロメテウスの苦難そのものだけではなかったのだ。何世紀も後になって、テスという女性が、プロメテウスの運命を背負うことになるのである。

プロメテウスとしてのテスの姿は、トポグラフィカルな点からも読み取ることができる。『テス』において、テスは、エグドン・ヒースという「自然を伴侶とし、異教的な空想を心のなかに留めている」と描写されているが(81-2)、実は、エグドン・ヒースの姿は、『帰郷』(*The Return of the Native*, 1878)においては、タイタン族、つまりプロメテウスとして描かれていた。

The place became full of a watchful intentness now; for when other things sank brooding to sleep the heath appeared slowly to awake and listen. Every night its Titanic form seemed to await something; but it had waited thus, unmoved, during so many centuries, through the cries of so many things, that it could only be imagined to await one last crisis—the final overthrow. (RN, 3)

エグドンをプロメテウスとして論じているのは、ブルックス(Jean R. Brooks)や、マイセル(Perry Meisel)、あるいはフライシュマン(Avrom Fleishman)である。なかでもフライシュマンは、ハーディが、アイスキュロスよりも、シェリーの描くプロメテウスに賛同していたと論じている。つまり、シェリーのプロメテウスは、苦難のなかでも、解放の期待を常に潜在させているのである(Fleishman 106)。そのように考えると、たとえば、私生児であるソローを失い、悲しみに暮れるテスが、それにもかかわらず、生きることへの熱意(full of zest for life)を持ってエグドンを歩くシーンなどは、ヴィクトリア朝後期のプロメテウスの姿として象徴的であるといえる。

このように、プロメテウスの姿は、『テス』なかの「繰り返し」の構造それ自体にも現われているが、先にも触れたように、アイスキュロスから、旧約聖書、新約聖書、シェイクスピア、クラショー、ミルトン、ワーズワース、シェリー、テニスン、ブラウニング、そして、ホイットマンを経て、ハーディの小説、あるいは詩のなかで、形を変えながら、再び「繰

り返されて」描かれたのである。<sup>9</sup> プロメテウスとしての人間の姿は、縛られたり、また、シェリーの描いたプロメテウスのように、縄を解かれたり、悲劇と幸福の双方を内包しながら、これからも間違いなく、時代を超えて繰り返されながら描かれていくであろう。それは、『テス』の最終ページにおいて暗示されている。テスのメタファーである黒旗は、揺れ「続け」、エンジェルとテスの化身であるライザ・ルーは「再び」手をつなぎ、歩き「続けた」のである(314)。序文にもあるように、ハーディは、『テス』のなかで、有史以前から継承されてきた「出来事の連なりに、芸術的な形を与えようとした」。結論として、『テス』は、いわば古代ギリシャから続く人間の悲劇と幸福の歴史のダイナミズムを内包している小説であり、そしてヴィクトリア朝後期に、それを「忠実に提示した」小説であったといえるであろう。

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> 罪の償いという概念がテスの運命を支配しているという解釈を他にしているのはシャイアズである。シャイアズは、テスが家系のなかに流れる罪と報復という歴史的サイクルに取り込まれていることを指摘し、運命がアナロジーや、偽装や、彼女の住む地域の神話化された歴史的な物語の形をとって、作中に表されていると述べている(Shires 150)。

<sup>2</sup> テスがストーンヘンジで捕まったときも、「なるべくしてなった」(312)というフレーズが使われている。

<sup>3</sup> ミラーもまた『テス』に繰り返しの構造を見て取っているが、彼の場合は、その繰り返しが、ギリシャ悲劇の因果性というよりは、むしろアリストテレスの『詩学』に述べられたロゴスの解体を示唆しているものである。ミラーは、ハーディが、繰り返しの構造により、事象の起源の不在を提示し、ヨーロッパの形而上学的基盤を崩そうとしていると解釈している。

<sup>4</sup> テスの性格が非常に従順であることが、小説の冒頭部分で、母親ジョーンによって示されている。アレックとの最初の出会いについても、そもそもの原因は、テスがジョーンに説得されたからであった。そのときに、ジョーンはテスが“tractable”であると言っている(18)。

<sup>5</sup> ウォットンは、テスの変化がトールボットヘイズ(Talbothays)において、つまりエンジェルとの出会いによって起きたとしている。ウォットンの解釈は、マテリアリズム的な解釈であり、経済を基盤としているものである。彼は、アレックとテスの関係は、個人が個人との社会的な関係を結ぶものであるとしている。しかしながら、エンジェルとテスの関係は、“abstraction”を基にしており、その曖昧さは、ダービーフィールド家の経済的基盤の欠如に結び付いていくものであるとしている。この場合、テス個人の主体としての存在はもはや認められなくなっている。そこでは精神という抽象概念による支配が、物質的な支配にとって代わっているのである(Wotton 36-7)。

<sup>6</sup> ハーディは常々、自分のことをウェセックスの歴史を記録する年代記学者で

あると言っていた。*Dorset Chronicle* の愛読者であった彼は、小説に描かれた様々なエピソードをここから借用していた。

<sup>7</sup> 遺伝については、ブランデン(Edmund Blunden)が、ハーディへのメンデルの遺伝の法則(1865年)の影響を指摘している(74)。

<sup>8</sup> ハーディの文学ノートの中に、実際に、アイスキュロスのプロメテウスの最後の言葉がメモとして記されている。‘Outraged “What treatment I, a god, am enduring at the hands of the gods!”’(The Literary Notes, 32)

<sup>9</sup> シェイクスピアについては、『テス』のタイトルページに、*Two Gentlemen of Verona* からの一節が置かれている。ミルトンについては、*Paradise Lost* の楽園喪失のイメージをイブとしてのテスに読み取ることができる。ワーズワースについては、「自然の聖なる計画」について、ハーディがアイロニカルな引用の仕方をしては、ハーディの小説については、1878年の『帰郷』と1891年の『テス』のトボグラフィが、エグドン・ヒースという点で繰り返されている。さらには、1888年の*The Withered Arm* のなかで登場した呪術師トレンドルの息子が、『テス』のなかで言及され、一連の作品のなかで流れる歴史のダイナミズムを示唆している。ハーディの詩については、『テス』の悲劇が、“Tess’s Lament”という詩のなかで再び繰り返されている。関係の仕方はそれぞれにおいて異なっているが、それらはテスのストーリーに密接に組み込まれている。

## Works Cited

- Auerbach, Nina. *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Beer, Gillian. “Finding a Scale for the Human: Plot and Writing in Hardy’s Novels.” Ed. Scott Elledge. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991. 451–460.
- Björk, Lennart A. *Psychological Vision and Social Criticism in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1987.
- . Ed. *The Literary Notes of Thomas Hardy*. Göteborgs: Acta Iniversitatis Gothoburgensis, 1974.
- Boumelha, Penny. ““Tess of the d’Urbervilles’: Sexual Ideology and Narrative Form.” Ed. Peter Widdowson. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: Macmillan, 1993. 44–62.
- Brady, Kristin. “Tess and Alec: Rape or Seduction?” Ed. R. P. Draper. *Thomas Hardy: The Tragic Novels*. London: Macmillan, 1991. 158–75.
- Blunden, Edmund. *Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1958.
- Brooks, Jean R. “*The Return of the Native*: A Novel of Environment.” Ed. Harold Bloom. *The Return of the Native*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 21–38.
- Claridge, Laura. “Tess: A Less than Pure Woman Ambivalently Presented.” Ed. Peter Widdowson. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: Macmillan, 1993. 63–79.
- Fleishman, Avrom. “The Buried Giant of Egdon Heath.” Ed. Harold Bloom. *The Return of the Native*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 95–109.
- Hardy, Frolence. *The Life of Thomas Hardy*. London: Studio Editions, 1994.
- Hardy, Thomas. Ed. Scott Elledge. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.
- . Ed. James Gindin. *The Return of the Native*. London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969.

- . Ed. James Gibson. *The Complete Poems of Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Johnson, Lionel. “The Argument.” Ed. Scott Elledge. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991. 390–400.
- Meisel, Perry. “The Return of the Repressed.” Ed. Harold Bloom. *The Return of the Native*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 49–65.
- Miller, J. Hillis. *Fiction and Repetition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1982.
- Rutland, W. R. *Thomas Hardy: A Study of His Writings and Their Background*. Oxford: Basis Blackwell and Mott, 1936. Tokyo: Senjo, 1962.
- Shires, Linda M. “The radical aesthetic of *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*.” Ed. Dale Kramer. *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge UP, 1999. 145–163.
- Turner, Paul. *The Life of Thomas Hardy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Wotton, George. ““Tess of the d’Urbervilles’: Towards a Materialist Criticism.” Ed. Peter Widdowson. *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. London: Macmillan, 1993. 33–43.
- 『ギリシア悲劇 I アイスキュロス』呉 茂一訳 筑摩書房 1999.
- ニーチェ 『道徳の系譜』木場深定訳 岩波書店 1999.

## 研究会会則

### 第1章 総 則

第1条 本会は「試論」英文学研究会と称する。

第2条 本会は、事務局を東北大学文学部英文学研究室内に置く。

### 第2章 目的及び事業

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

第4条 本会は、第3条の目的を達成するために次の事業を行なう。

1. 研究誌「試論」の発行（年一回）。
2. その他必要な事業。

### 第3章 組 織

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

第6条 本会は次の役員を置く。

会長 1 名

編集委員若干名（うち事務局幹事 1 名）

第7条 役員は次の会務にあたる。

1. 会長は本会を代表する。
2. 編集委員は、会長と共に編集委員会を構成し、「試論」への投稿論文の審査、「試論」の編集、及びその他の会務にあたる。
3. 事務局幹事は、庶務会計の任にあたる。

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

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

第9条 本会には名誉会員を置くことができる。

### 第4章 会 計

第10条 本会の会費は年額 8,000 円とする。

### 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 11 年 7 月 1 日発効）

## 投 稿 規 定

原稿締切 2 月末日。

原稿はタイプ、ワープロなどによる清書原稿 6 部を提出すること。ワープロにより作成した場合は、そのファイルもフロッピーで提出すること。可能な場合には、「標準テキストファイル」を含めること。

手書き原稿は原則として受け付けない。ただし、執筆者がその費用を負担する場合は事務局がワープロ入力を代行する。論文は和文、欧文いずれでもよい。

和文の場合は原則として 400 字詰原稿用紙 35 枚程度（注を含めて）。

欧文の場合は原則として 6,000 語程度。採用の場合、ネイティブ・スピーカーの校閲は編集委員会が行う。

論文には英文のシノプシス（300 ～ 400 語程度）を添付すること。

特殊活字、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る。

注は末尾にまとめ、通し番号をつけること。

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 に従うこと。

## 編 集 後 記

本号では4編の論文を掲載しました。論文の書き直し、英文の校訂などに予想外の時間を費やしたため、発行が遅れてしまいました。会員各位にはお詫び申し上げます。

『試論』では投稿された論文はできるだけ掲載するように努めるのが伝統となっております。これまでの水準を維持するために、著者に対して大幅な書き直しを求める場合もあります。また、英文の論文については、徹底的な校訂を行っております。論文は書き直せば必ず質が向上するというのが私自身の経験です。『試論』の投稿論文は、他の研究誌の場合に比べて、書き直しの機会が与えられているという有利さのみならず最終的な質の向上という利点があるわけです。それに加えて、相当な長さの論文でも、審査の上その長さの必要性が認められれば、掲載されます。会員の皆様にはこのような事実を考慮され、ふるってご投稿いただければ幸いです。

ニューズレターでお知らせした通り、『試論』のホームページが開設されました。本号もPDF版で公開されております。会員名簿もアクセス制限付きですが、見ることができます。せっかく作ったものですので、内容の充実を図りたいと思っておりますので、各方面からのご指導、ご意見をお待ちしております。

(原)

試 論      第 39 集      定価 500 円
<p>平成 12 (2000) 年 8 月 1 日印刷発行</p> <p>発 行 「試論」英文学研究会 会 長 原 英 一</p> <p>〒 980-8576 仙台市青葉区川内 東北大学大学院文学研究科 英文学研究室</p> <p>電 話 022(217)5961 <a href="http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp">http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp</a></p> <p>振替口座番号 02200-1-4966</p> <p>印 刷 (株)東北プリント</p>