

SHIRON 試論

Essays in English Language and Literature

CONTENTS

The Absurd Vision of Elizabethan Crime Drama :	
<i>A Warning for Fair Women, Two Lamentable Tragedies,</i>	
and <i>Arden of Faversham</i> Eiichi Hara	1
The Structuring of Desires in Aphra Behn's Plays :	
Problems of Prostitution and Gender. Riwako Kaji	37
Women's Reading and Creation in <i>Northanger Abbey</i>	
. Megumi Sato	55
Matters of Fact and Questions of Value Peter Robinson	69
解体する身体 『密偵』における観相学的語りとその解体	
(Disintegrating Bodies: Physiognomic Narrative and	
Its Disintegration in <i>The Secret Agent</i>) 伊藤 正範	95
	(Masanori Ito)

July 1999

No. 38

SHIRON 38 試論 第38集

1999

SHIRON

Essays in English Language and Literature

EDITORS

HIROSHI FUJITA

EIICHI HARA

TAKASHI NAKAMURA

HIROSHI OZAWA

PETER ROBINSON

No. 38

July 1999

Department of English Literature

Tohoku University

Sendai, Japan

SHIRON

Essays in English Language and Literature No.38

ISSN: 0387-7590

Department of English Literature, Faculty of Arts and Letters

TOHOKU UNIVERSITY

Kawauchi, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8576 Japan

Phone : 022-217-5961

試論 第38集 目次
(平成11年7月)

CONTENTS

Synopses of Articles	iv
The Absurd Vision of Elizabethan Crime Drama : <i>A Warning for Fair Women, Two Lamentable Tragedies, and</i> <i>Arden of Faversham</i> Eiichi Hara	1
The Structuring of Desires in Aphra Behn's Plays : Problems of Prostitution and Gender. Riwako Kaji	37
Woman's Reading and Creation in <i>Northanger Abbey</i> Megumi Sato	55
Matters of Fact and Questions of Value Peter Robinson	69
解体する身体 『密偵』における観相学語りとその解体 (Disintegrating Bodies : Physiognomic Narrative and Its Disintegration in <i>The Secret Agent</i>) 伊藤 正範 (Masanori Ito)	95
研究会会則	108
投稿規定	109
編集後記	110

Synopses

The Absurd Vision of
Elizabethan Crime Drama :
A Warning for Fair Women,
Two Lamentable Tragedies,
and *Arden of Faversham*

EPICHI HARA
Page 1

With the emergence of early modern urban culture the drama presenting commoners, gentry and merchants, manifested itself as an innovative vehicle for the expression of the new cultural situation. Although Elizabethan domestic drama still retains the traces of the homiletic Tudor interludes from which it developed, in some instances it departs radically from this tradition. Especially in crime drama where violations of human rather than divine order constitute the centre of interest, that peculiarly modern situation, the clash between civilization and the primordial desires of people increasingly fettered by the constraints of civil society, offers a surprisingly advanced outlook. In fact, the modernist view of the world as godless and absurd usually associated with the literature of the last hundred years is already present in these plays around 1600. In this essay, the way realism, its concern with the realities of the everyday life of the commoners, ultimately gives way to a surrealist presentation of the absurdity of early modern civilization is traced through three representative crime plays, *A Warning for Fair Women* (anonymous), *Two Lamentable Tragedies* by Robert Yarrington, and *Arden of Faversham* (anonymous). While realism is often undermined by the intrusion of allegorical devices in *A Warning for Fair Women*, Yarrington's play, with its relentless pursuit of realistic detail, transgresses the limits of the homiletic principles it professedly advocates, finally revealing the fragility of the homocentric microcosm of the city. The author of *Arden of Faversham* seems to have appropriated the physical restrictions of the stage of his day for the deliberate evocation of the nightmare world of absurdity. The same profound sense of the absurd is discernible in *The Spanish Tragedy* by Thomas Kyd who is sometimes thought to be the author of *Arden*. The distancing of the play from itself by means of detached narrators would suggest that Kyd's keen sense of the absurd led him to adopt a narrative device that could only adequately be described as post-modernist.

The Structuring of Desires in
Aphra Behn's Plays:
Problems of Prostitution and
Gender

RIWAKO KAJI
Page 37

With the introduction of actresses in the Restoration theatre, female sexuality becomes more appreciated as a social issue than before. Around 1680, Aphra Behn produced a series of comedies, in which the heroines, acted by Elizabeth Barry, were prostitutes or disguised courtesans. To clarify the structuring of various desires in Behn's plays, the relation should be considered between 'representing' and 'represented' women who had influential power in the theatre of this period.

Female sexuality, on and off the Restoration stage, is

so complicated that its distinctions can no longer be drawn clearly. Neither can the female categories, such as ladies or prostitutes, wives or mistresses. Under these circumstances, Behn tried to express experimentally the possibilities of female sexuality in a theatrical space where reality and fictionality were intersecting. By showing the possibilities and impossibilities of women pursuing their sexual desires in the Restoration period, Behn poses questions about the dominant social ideology that categorizes female positions.

Women's Reading and
Creation in
Northanger Abbey

MEGUMI SATO
Page 55

Jane Austen's earliest work, *Northanger Abbey*, burlesques the popular sentimental and Gothic novels of her day. There is no supernatural or unusual world in this romance; instead it represents some ordinary walks of life, in which Austen unfolds a story endorsed by the economic philosophy of the middle classes during a period of transition. In a consideration of the work's social situation, I would like to examine the problems concerning women's reading and creation in this novel, focusing upon its locations and the conversation exchanged between characters in each place.

In the manifold construction of her fiction, Austen tries to depict and justify women's historical positions as reader, knower and creator in a patriarchal society—by doubling the story both of Catherine's and the General's reading and creation of fiction. The heroine's situation confined, as it were, within her own and his fiction, reflects Austen's reading-experience and her early creative activity as a woman writer searching for a release from influence. Readers absorbed in her fiction are, then, also to search for their own interpretations of a story about a silent and reading woman. These issues are fully developed in Austen's last completed work, *Persuasion*, which will help us to trace her attempts to resolve them through writing.

Matters of Fact and
Questions of Value

PETER ROBINSON
Page 69

Given that everyone makes mistakes, what is to be done with art's hapless errors? In 'Literature and the Matter of Fact', Christopher Ricks examines the question: 'Are works of literature affected if the facts they proffer as facts are not facts and demonstrably so?' There are three problems with his essay: (1) it moves between brief accounts of factual error and broad critical censure without addressing in any detail why and how and whether the latter can follow from the former; (2) its many examples of mistakes lump together facts of different types; (3) the representational behaviour with which his essay is morally concerned ranges from an oversight about a detail to a consciously promulgated deception. I examine in detail three instances of factual error in poems as described by Ricks.

What is it that supports the 'ought' in the literary critic's added premise that facts proffered as facts in literature

ought to be accurate? To answer this question, I briefly examine David Hume's identification of what has come to be called the fact/value distinction, and the efforts made by a number of recent philosophers to show its limitations. I then argue that literary works are institutional facts of an informal kind—like, for example, promises between friends. The various types of facts, and our assuming their independent existence, are necessary for literary evaluation at every level. They are also necessary for aesthetic ordering, since they contribute crucially to the surroundings in which any act of aesthetic intervention must take place or be visible as an intervention. Both assertions are supported by the necessity of independently existing facts for our taking part in any form of language use.

Factual accuracy is one challenged aspect of the literary culture's customary aesthetico-ethical values. Thus, it may be regarded as crucial in some works, less so in others, but never necessarily and never in itself. Despite the problems with his heterogeneous examples and under-described criteria, the main thrust of Ricks's argument is in this sense wholly justified, justified in so far as his essay is itself an example of cultural custom in action. It is a contribution to the conflictual life of negotiation and evolution concerning how literary art is to be made and received.

**Disintegrating Bodies:
Physiognomic Narrative
and Its Disintegration in
*The Secret Agent***

MASANORI ITO
Page 95

In Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent* (1907), the narrator often describes the characters' appearances as physically deformed. For instance, Stevie's lower jaw is shown vacantly drooping as if it were a proof of his innate mental deficiency. It is Cesare Lombroso's physiognomy that the novel's authorial narrator adopts in depicting Stevie's face. One must note that such a physiognomic narrative forms a singular contrast to the narrator's own sympathy for Stevie's inner tenderness. While presenting Stevie as a humane character, the narrative voice ironizes it by ruthlessly disclosing his physical deformity.

However, in failing to bomb the Greenwich Observatory, Stevie instead blows himself to pieces and leaves his own body completely 'unreadable'. Physiognomy, which works by 'reading' human faces, is no longer operative here.

Although Stevie's death itself may expose him to a further irony, physiognomy is repeatedly disturbed by two other degenerate types: Winnie and the Professor. I examine how these characters' bodies challenge the dehumanizing physiognomic narrative from within the text. *The Secret Agent*, though written when Lombrosian physiognomy permeated into fiction, and unexceptionally employing the same discourse, tests physiognomy by means of its own self-disintegrating narrative.

The Absurd Vision of Elizabethan Crime Drama:
A Warning for Fair Women, Two Lamentable Tragedies,
 and *Arden of Faversham*

Eiichi Hara

Despite contrary arguments the general idea or cliché that the English Renaissance is a time of expansion, of enfranchisement, of a breaking of closure, seems to be still widely accepted. Any doubt about this would be quickly dispelled by looking at the figures for the spectacular economic and demographic growth during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If we go back from the plays of Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson, and others to the moral interludes of the early Tudor period, we are invariably struck by their primitiveness, crudity, tedious repetition, and narrow-mindedness. Consequently, it is no wonder that we have often failed to see the rather prominent fact that this period of discovered freedom and newly opened horizons also marks, for a significant portion of England's population, the beginning of new forms of confinement and stifling closure.

The English Renaissance is an age in which the peculiarly modern situation, a dehumanized urban culture, has, for the first time in the history of Western civilization, definitely come into being. The marked increase in the population of London during the early modern period is the most striking marker for this age of expansion. In 1550 London was still an essentially medieval city of 120,000 persons. By 1650 the population has risen to 375,000; by the middle of the eighteenth century it has become the largest city in Europe with a population of 675,000 (Sharpe 85). During this period, modern man, a person living in a colossal, densely populated city increasingly difficult for him or her to grasp in its entirety, is born. It should be noted that he or she is often not the native of the metropolis. The demand for a human work force that was created by the rapidly expanding economy could not be met by supply from inside the city. Workers had to be recruited from the country, even from foreign lands including Scotland, Ireland, and

Wales as well as France and the Netherlands (Sharpe 85, Seaver 94–5). As a result, most of the city's inhabitants, especially those in the lower strata of society (servants, apprentices, journeymen, artisans and even small shopkeepers) were often people who had been transplanted from the country to the city. They were torn from the native soil and obliged to adjust themselves to living in confined artificial structures made of brick and stone.¹ Of all the classes that constituted Elizabethan London, the sense of confinement and alienation must have been most keenly felt by these men and women. When modern man was created, the drama featuring the common run of men found new depths and meanings, transforming itself into a powerful medium of expression for the modern cultural situation. The aesthetically superior plays of major Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights have dominated, perhaps not the actual stage of the day, but certainly our idea and assessment of the literature of the period. Yet the drama of the common man, city comedies and domestic plays, which presents not kings and princes but plain, ordinary people, often the nameless multitude of the teeming city, has more direct relevance to our present culture. Especially the Elizabethan domestic plays that have always been relegated to an inferior position in the history of the period's drama deserve fuller treatment as a radically innovative vehicle for the expression of peculiarly modern problems. Certainly they are often shackled with the remains of older forms of drama, which is probably the main reason why they failed to develop fully in this period, eclipsed by the greater achievements of the major dramatists. Nevertheless, it is also true that they retain the power to surprise and singularly affect us even now. In reading them one is often struck by the manifestations, among outdated modes of representation, of aspects that could only reasonably be called 'modernist'. In fact, these plays may well have been the first truly modern literature, the literature of the uprooted discontented living in alienation in a nascent urban civilization. As the modern age was to progress, this world would steadily increase in sophistication and eventually attain a high degree of organization in the present century. I would like to show, in the following argument, that in these plays around 1600 a whole spectrum of implications of the word 'modernist' is already present.

1

The term 'domestic tragedy', which has been most commonly used, is less than satisfactory in designating those plays of the Elizabethan

period dealing with domestic scenes and situations. In contradistinction to orthodox tragedy, the term pertinently describes the nature of the tragic plays concerned with the life of the commoners. The scene is usually London and the action takes place mostly inside a household, an early modern one with servants and business facilities, hence they are 'domestic' in more than one sense.² Yet 'tragedy' is obviously an unduly restrictive term since it would preclude those plays which do not end tragically yet are undeniably supplied with 'domestic' elements, such as the anonymous *The Fair Maid of Bristow* (1604),³ Henry Porter's *The Two Angry Women of Abington* (1598), *Patient Grissil* (1600) by Chettle, Haughton and Dekker, and so on. Even *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (1606) by George Wilkins has a happy ending, upsetting (shamelessly in this case) the expectations raised by the title. Thomas Heywood's *The English Traveller* (1627) is a curious mixture of an adaptation of ancient Roman comedy and domestic tragedy. Viviana Comensoli is certainly right in using the term 'domestic play' in her recent study, bringing important plays that have been so far neglected into consideration, perhaps for the first time. On the other hand, it is still true that most domestic plays, especially those credited with classic status such as *Arden of Faversham* (1591), *A Warning for Fair Women* (1599), *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1606) (all anonymous), and Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603) are tragedies. Some plays with strong affinities to romantic comedies, such as *The Fair Maid of Bristow*, *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, and *Patient Grissil*, have potentially tragic situations: adultery, contemplated murder, family feud and even (feigned) infanticide.

When we consider these domestic plays as constituting a genre the key element that is common to almost all of them seems to be a crime. So it might be possible to use 'crime drama' as a generic term. However, it would have the same drawbacks as the phrase 'murder play' sometimes used to describe certain plays in which real life murders have supplied the material for the playwright (Adams 100). This term is obviously misleading because murders abound in orthodox tragedies; it is difficult not to call Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* (1604), Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1601), John Webster's *The White Devil* (1612), and Thomas Middleton's *Women Beware Women* (1621) murder plays. Crime drama would also seem to be laying too much stress on a single, sometimes minor, aspect of a play; it could adequately describe some 'tragic' plays but not others in which comedy or romance is the

predominant mode. In spite of this, the appellation 'crime drama' has distinct advantages when the focus is on 'domestic tragedies', because crime is a peculiarly apposite term in describing this kind of drama in a number of ways. First, it refers primarily to the violation of human not divine order; sins are committed against the gods and the universe, crimes against the law and civil society. Secondly, the range of human behaviour covered by the term is extensive enough as to be applicable to almost all pivotal acts in domestic plays such as murder, adultery, fraud, and witchcraft. Thirdly, crime could describe the deeper implications of these plays; here the violation of human law and order entails a rebellion of untamable human desires and impulses against the systems of modern civilization, which will produce reverberations reaching far beyond the Elizabethan era. It would be interesting to see how in those plays which seem to have little to do with crime, domestic comedies and romances, instances of this mutiny are observable almost without exception (especially the uncivilized behaviour of women as manifested in adultery, irrational hatred, and witchcraft).⁴ 'Crime drama' may not be as restrictive a term as it would at first seem. The focus of the present discussion, however, is on three plays in which crime as violation of human law occupies the centre of interest, the uncontested pivot around which the action of the play evolves.

2

One of the most distinguishing features of Elizabethan crime drama, especially of the 'domestic tragedies', is undoubtedly its stark realism. This is more than expected from the basic premises of the genre because such representative plays as *Arden of Faversham*, *A Warning for Fair Women*, and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* are based on actual murder cases. They can be considered, just like Shakespeare's histories, as artistic reinterpretations of historical events (*Arden of Faversham* follows closely the events narrated in Holinshed's *Chronicles*). However, the kind of realism that can be found in Elizabethan crime drama has its own peculiar features that are not found in Shakespeare or Marlowe. This is not to claim that there is no realism in the works of either dramatist. For example, *Othello* (1604), which has more things in common with crime drama than any other Shakespeare play, is undoubtedly realistic; the hero's growing doubt about his wife is presented with an intensity and immediacy which can be adequately described only in terms of psychological realism. Yet realistic repre-

sentation of a character's inner feelings and emotions differs markedly from the more mundane and banal realism of crime drama. Othello and Desdemona have virtually no private life; we simply cannot imagine them going through all the petty details of day-to-day exchanges between man and wife. They are creatures in the elevated sphere of politics and history where the boundary between the private and the public is difficult to draw; it would do them an injustice to reduce the killing of Desdemona to the vulgar and circumscribed plane of a crime. On the other hand, in crime drama faithful pictures of everyday life for the common people are often presented. Here is a scene from *A Warning for Fair Women*. Anne Sanders, the wife of the merchant, is waiting for her husband to come home from the Royal Exchange:

Enter Anne Sanders with her little sonne, and sit at her doore.

Boy. Praie ye mother when shal we goe to supper?

Anne. Why, when your father comes from the Exchange,
Ye are not hungrie since ye came from schoole.

Boy. Not hungrie (mother,) but I would faine eate.

Anne. Forbeare a while vntil your father come,
I sit here to expect his quicke returne.

Boy. Mother, shal not I haue new bow and shafts,
Against our schoole go a feasting?

Anne. Yes if ye learn,
And against Easter new apparel too.

Boy. Youle lend me al your scarfes, and al your rings,
And buy me a white feather for my veluet cappe,
Wil ye mother? yea say, praie ye say so.

Anne. Goe prating boy, go bid your sister see
My Closet lockt when she takes out the fruite.

Boy. I wil forsooth, and take some for my paines. *Exit Boy*

Anne. Wel sir sauce, do's your master teach ye that?
I praie God blesse thee, thart a verie wagge. (B2v)⁵

A housewife waiting for her husband to return from his business of the day, mildly admonishing her importunate little son. Such a scene must have been daily observable in Shooter's Hill, the place of the Sanders' residence or in any other commercial neighborhood of London. Here is the real life of the common people faithfully recreated; indeed, this is so life-like that it feels as if one were watching a fragment of real Elizabethan city life recorded by a video camera (allowing, of course, for the rather contrived artlessness of the conversation which is doubtlessly tailored to suit the abilities of the child actor).

Yet this kind of realistic representation of the life of the common people is not unusual in Elizabethan and Jacobean comedies of city

life. In Dekker and Middleton's *The Roaring Girl* (1611) the scene where three gallants flirt with the wives of shopkeepers can be regarded as an almost photographic presentation of actual London street life of the period (II.i). The christening of Mrs Allwit's newborn baby (actually begotten by Whorehound) in Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* (1613) where the behaviour of the Puritan 'gossips' is exposed to harsh criticism would be another example of everyday realism (II.iii.). As the commoners appearing in these comedies are usually of the merchant class, it is natural that transactions involving actual exchanges of money often give rise to instances of superb realism. In Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West, The First Part* (1604) the heroine Bess Bridges makes Clem, her servant, explain the contents of a reckoning; we can gain useful information about the prices of wine, beer, anchovies, bread and so on at a typical public house in the early seventeenth century (279–80). In *A Warning for Fair Women* the occasion for Anne's quarrel with her husband which makes her vulnerable to the advances of her would-be lover George Browne, leading finally to the murder, is actually a payment for linen, a pair of gloves and other small articles she would have bought from a draper and a milliner (C2r–v). Perhaps the moment for the most realistic representation in crime drama comes when the criminal is tried at the court of law. In *A Warning for Fair Women* we can witness how the Elizabethan criminal court actually works in almost all its details in a rather lengthy scene where the indictment is read, witnesses are examined, a verdict is brought in and the prisoners are formally convicted ([H4]r–I2v). Again this is not unprecedented. In *Nice Wanton* (1550), a moral interlude of the early Tudor period, Ismael is tried for an unnamed felony at the assizes where Judge Daniel gives him the sentence of death in formal terms (Wickam 155–8). We realize that the scene, though very concise, strictly follows in its essence the actual proceedings of the court when we compare it to the much longer one in *A Warning for Fair Women*.⁶ What is interesting, however, is that the kind of realism in Elizabethan crime drama, unlike that in city comedies, seems not to content itself with endeavouring to provide a faithful representation of reality. In fact, in some plays there seems to be found an almost obsessive addiction to realistic details. Realism in these plays sometimes surpasses reality itself, far outreaching the confines of the literature and the stage of the time. In Robert Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies* (1594) we can see how far realism in crime drama can go, indeed how far the play is removed from its precursors,

Tudor moral interludes like *Nice Wanton*, in its deeper implications.

Nothing is known about 'Rob. Yarrington', the name shown on the title page of the first quarto edition of the play. Very probably it is a pseudonym assumed by more than one writer when the two plays originally written separately were combined into one ('two tragedies in one' as the running headline of the original quarto edition shows).⁷ He may have been an amateur who tried his hand just once in writing the sole play published under his name. In any case, Yarrington has very little claim to outstanding achievement. *Two Lamentable Tragedies* is awkwardly constructed; there is no artistic reason why there should be two tragedies in one play. The language is humdrum; the characterization is cursory and often very sentimental. Yet there are moments in the play when the relentless pursuit of realistic detail seems to give the audience not only horror and trepidation but a sense of upheaval, a shudder at something which is profoundly unsettling. What seems at first to be mean sensationalism is unconsciously converted into a surprising revelation of the fundamental predicament of the modern man.

Two Lamentable Tragedies deals with two murders, one committed in London, the other in Padua. Though multiple-plot plays are nothing unusual in the theatre of the time, the two plots in this play are quite unique in that they are completely independent. The characters in one plot have nothing to do with those in the other; the two murder plays are joined together only by the rather unsophisticated device of allegorical figures, Homicide, Avarice, and Truth, acting as narrators or commentators. In the English plot, the actual murder case of John Beech by Thomas Merry which occurred on August 23, 1594 (Chambers III 518) is dramatized. The Italian plot, which is probably fictional, relates the murder of young Pertillo at the hands of two assassins hired by his uncle Farellia who is bent on robbing his nephew of his father's inheritance.⁸ Though the two plots develop independently, Yarrington, in order to justify his rather strained conjunction, takes care that they have more things in common than the pivotal criminal act. As Avarice reminds the audience (quite unnecessarily) the motives behind both cases of murder are the same, greed for money. Also two innocent characters, Merry's sister Rachel and Farellia's son Allenso,⁹ are compelled by circumstances to be unwilling accomplices in the crimes committed by their near relations and consequently are made to suffer for it. It is undeniable that recurrences in the two tragedies of similar incidents, situations and characters add to the depth and scope of the whole play. Yet a skilled dramatist would

have had no need to combine two separate plays into one in order to achieve this. The Italian plot is colorless and savours too much of artifice. It is also marred by the excessive sentimentalism of Allenso who, after his beloved cousin Pertillo is murdered, tries in vain to save his unworthy parent by putting on a disguise. But the story of Merry with its stunning realism engages the attention of the audience so intimately that the conspicuous weaknesses of the play are often forgotten.

In presenting the story of Merry, Yarrington seems to devote himself to following the actual murder case in all its (often squalid) details. Thomas Merry is a young shopkeeper of London who tries to kill his well-to-do neighbour John Beech, a chandler in Thames street, for his money. He lures the victim into his shop on the pretence that some friends of Beech are waiting for him. The murder is committed on the upper stage, which is supposed to be a first-floor room in the shop. The stage direction shows how precisely the killing of Beech must be performed:

Beech. I wonder who they are that aske for me.
Mer. I know not that, you shall see presentlie,
 Goe vp those stairs, your friends do stay aboue.
 Here is that friend shall shake you by the head,
 And make you stagger ere he speake to you.
Then being in the vpper Rome Merry strickes him in the head fifteene times.
 Now you are safe, I would the boy were so,
 But wherefore wish I, for he shall not liue,
 For if he doe, I shall not liue my selfe.
 Merry *wiped* [sic, *wipes?*] *his face from blood.*
 Lets see what mony he hath in his purse,
 Masse heres ten groates, heres something for my paine,
 But I must be rewarded better yet. (B4r)

Here the exact figures are prominent; fifteen blows, ten groats. As stated earlier the naming of a specified amount of money is a device often used in city comedies signaling the realism of everyday life.¹⁰ What is interesting here is the number of blows inflicted on poor Beech's head. Is it absolutely necessary in dramatic terms to repeat them 'fifteene times'? Perhaps in the source material the number of wounds on Beech's head was recorded as so many. It must have been the playwright's intention to be exact in the number of blows given. The first quarto edition of the play seems to have been based on the prompt copy actually used in the theatre (when an actor is to give an 'aside', he is sometimes directed to speak '*To the people*'). Then we must assume that the actor is directed to give exactly fifteen blows. The

scene is meant to be performed very realistically; it must have been shocking enough to silence even the rowdy groundlings. Small coins are not easily discernible but the repeated movement of Merry's arm is clearly visible. It is also very probable that Merry's face is actually spattered with blood (i.e. that of a pig or a fowl) while the blows are repeated. He will wipe the blood from his face, probably turning fully towards the audience. The sudden transmutation of a peaceful London household into an arena of bloody slaughter is admittedly impressive. We are made to realize that Yarrington, just like the producers and directors of modern 'splatter movies', is trying to offer sensational horror by means of seemingly authentic details. The present-day audience is accustomed to the way a contemporary horror film unfolds; consequently, it is no surprise for us that the cruel killing of Beech is only the beginning of a series of more gruesome things to come; the expectations of Elizabethan theatre-goers might have been not very different.

Merry is a stupid and clumsy criminal; indeed, he is remarkable for his inability to make plans, his lack of foresight, and even of common sense. He commits murder in his own house; a smart killer would have been more careful in choosing the location. Also Merry has been witnessed by the boy at Beech's shop when he went in person to entice the master out of his house. Due to his remarkable stupidity, Merry is obliged to repeat his crime: Beech's boy must be silenced by any means. In the scene of this second murder, the number of blows is again specified in a comparatively long stage direction:

*When the boy goes into the shoppe Merrie striketh six blowes on his head
& with the seauenth leaves the hammer sticking in his head, the boy
groaning must be heard by a maide who must crye to her maister.
Merrie flieth. (C4r)*

Even with a hammer sticking in his head the boy survives for a few days. The neighbours who have rescued him dared not to pull the hammer out of his head lest he should die by their doing so. In the next scene, the boy is again shown to the audience. He is made to sit on a chair and brought out onto the stage with the hammer still clearly visible in his head. He is alive yet deprived of the power of speech and unable to name the killer (D3v). Since the scene has very little relevance to the unfolding of the plot (unless it is meant to show the hand of Providence, as we will discuss later), the presentation of this sad spectacle is only understandable as another instance of the play's insis-

tent foregrounding of the horrid details of murder. This insistence attains an almost compulsive level as we watch Merry being drawn into an apparently bottomless pit of one evil deed after another.

The body of a victim always poses a difficult problem for the murderer. It must be disposed of as quickly and cleverly as possible. In fact, the writer of a play faces a similar situation when he composes a murder scene. He has to think of expedient means for making the stage clear of dead bodies. Especially the playwrights writing for the Elizabethan and Jacobean open-air theatres such as the Globe, the Swan, the Rose and others where everything is exposed to broad daylight can be seen to employ a variety of ways for clearing the stage of cumbersome corpses. In *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, Merry is foolish enough to commit murder in his own house but even he can predict the consequences of keeping a putrefying corpse for a long time inside his house—which is also a shop open to customers. The expedient Merry hits upon is just like him in its crudity and haphazardness. The murderer makes his sister Rachel help him carry the body downstairs, then orders her to go out and buy a bag:

Enter Merry and Rachel with a bag.

Mer. What hast thou sped? haue you bought the bag?

Rach. I brother, here it is, what is't do?

Mer. To beare hence *Beeches* body in the night.

Rach. You cannot beare so great a waight your selfe,
And 'tis no trusting of another man.

Mer. Yes well enough, as I will order it,
Ile cut him peece-meale, first his head and legs
Will be one burthen, then the mangled rest,
Will be another,

Rach. Oh can you finde in hart to cut and carue,
His stone colde flesh, and rob the greedy graue,
Of his disseuered blood besprinckled lims?

Mer. I marry can I fetch the chopping knife. . . .

Rach. Here is the knife, I cannot stay to see,
This barbarous deed of inhumanitie. *Exit Rachel.*

*Merry begins to cut the body, and bindes the armes behinde his backe with
Beeches garters, leaues out the body, couers the head and legs againe.*

(E2r)

This is probably based on the source material used by Yarrington but the scene is in perfect accord with the play's persistent showing of realistic details meant to shock the audience with its nakedness. We are made to wonder how this scene could be acted on a stage. When Beech's body is brought downstairs, it must have been already

replaced by something like a dummy. Dummies can be surprisingly real as the Kabuki and Bunraku theatres of Japan (and some Western puppet theatres too) will amply testify. This horrendous act of carving up a dead body must have looked sufficiently real even with a homely dummy; as the experience of watching actual puppet performances will show, it is quite possible that the verisimilitude is, if anything, enhanced by not using an elaborately fabricated simulacrum. When realism goes thus far, it is no longer possible for the play to be confined inside the homiletic tradition from which Elizabethan crime drama has developed. After this scene, Truth comes out to utter lamentations about ‘this vnheard of sauadge Massacre’, but for once his purpose is not didactic; he tries to appease the outraged audience. He assures them that ‘this deede is but a playe’ (E2v). It must have been small comfort to the people who has just been made to realize the truly disturbing nature of the actual murder case here reenacted so faithfully before their eyes.

The play’s relentless quest for realistic representation is maintained to the last. In this play, the public execution of the condemned prisoners is simulated on the stage. The scene of hanging begins thus:

Enter Merry and Rachell to execution with Officers with Halberdes, the Hangman with a lather, &c. (K1v)

Here *lather* (*leather* in modern spelling) is an obvious typographical error for *ladder* since the criminal is usually made to go up a ladder on the scaffold.¹¹ The execution scene is usually the moment for the sinner to show repentance and to express hope for salvation in the next world, often adding an admonition to the audience to learn a lesson by his or her example. It is one of the distinguishing characteristics of crime drama derived from the moral interludes of the previous age. Repentant sinners in moral interludes are not always convicted felons but some plays, for example Ulpian Fulwell’s *Like Will to Like* (1568), provide an example of a scaffold speech, the echoes of which can be heard even in *The London Merchant* (1731) by George Lillo, the most famous crime drama of the eighteenth century.¹² *Two Lamentable Tragedies* presents this traditional scaffold speech both for Merry and his sister Rachel. The striking feature of the play that departs from tradition and even from the usual theatrical practice of the day is that the hangings are fully staged.¹³ After a long speech Merry is hurried on by the officer; ‘I pray make hast, the hower is almost past.’ He answers: ‘I am prepar’d, oh God receiue my soule, / Forgiue my sinnes, for they

are numberlesse, / Receiue me God, for now I come to thee.’ Then there follows the stage direction, ‘*Turne of the Lather* [Ladder]: Rachell *shrinketh*’ (K2r). Clearly the ladder is pulled out from under Merry’s feet at this point and his body swings in the air. Rachel naturally flinches at her brother’s death, watching it so closely. Then she is prompted by the officer to go up the ladder herself: ‘Nay shrink not woman, haue a cheerefull h[ar]t’; she replies courageously: ‘I, so I do, and yet this sinfull flesh, / Will be rebellious gainst my willing spirit. / Come let me clime these steps that lead to heaun, / Although they seeme the staires of infamie.’ After a long scaffold speech, she expresses hope for salvation in heaven:

Thus God forgiue my sinnes, receiue my soule,
 And though my dinner be of bitter death,
 I hope my soule shall sup with Iesus Christ,
 And see his presence euerlastingly. *Dyeth.* (K2v)

Then the officer orders the assistants to cut down their bodies and to hang Merry’s again in chains at Mile End and give Rachel’s a proper burial. Again the actors may be replaced by life-size dummies on the stage above or they may actually look as if they were being hanged with some mechanical apparatus which ensures that they are not actually killed.

As the previous scenes of murder and dismemberment have been intended to shock the audience, the execution scene could also be understood as vulgar sensationalism. Yarrington is catering to the low taste of the spectators who seek for blood-curdling horror and tingling excitement. Yet spectacles of horror were a bill of fair not monopolized by crime drama, or even by the theatre of the time. Orthodox tragedies are often filled with senselessly cruel acts. In Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy* (1587), Hieronimo discovers the bloody body of his murdered son hung flauntingly on a tree. Shakespeare can also be quite lavish in offering sensational horror, notably in *Titus Andronicus* (1594), and even in *King Lear* (1605) in which Cornwall at the instigation of Goneril gorges out Gloucester’s eyes (III. vii). In John Ford’s *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* (1632), Giovanni appears on the stage holding a dagger on which the heart of Annabella, his sister, is impaled (IV. vi.). As for purple patches of sensational horror, these plays exceed any crime drama. We must remember also that Elizabethan audiences were accustomed to witnessing *actual* executions of criminals. The famous Tyburn tree was erected in 1571 and, according to Molly

Smith, 6,160 victims were hanged there during Elizabeth's reign (Smith 217). In this age, capital punishment took shockingly cruel forms. Common criminals were hanged and noble victims were beheaded while women who killed their husbands were burned alive (though they were often strangled before the fire actually consumed them), and political prisoners convicted of treason were 'hanged, drawn and quartered'.¹⁴ Mutilated limbs of the victims were displayed at various places in and around London. Entering the city from the Southwark side, a traveler of this age would have been met by the frightful sight of traitors' heads stuck on spikes above the gate of London Bridge.¹⁵ It is evident that any meaningful interpretation of the drama of the time, especially of tragedies, must be made against the backdrop of all these public displays of cruel deaths.¹⁶

However, Yarrington's theatrical presentation of real life is, in a sense, much more appalling than these actual spectacles of cruelty. For, when the scaffold is erected, it has already attained the status of the theatre and the immediate relevance of the victims' fate to the spectators has been lost. Public executions resemble orthodox tragedies in that the protagonists are creatures of the higher sphere, singled out and placed on a privileged, elevated platform. People could turn the spectacle of death into festivities, relying on the safe distance between them and those on the 'stage'. Yarrington's play, however, is firmly grounded in the actualities of the life of the city inhabitants; consequently, its realistic presentation of horrors is on a completely different plane from that of orthodox tragedies or public executions. The persistent presentation of concrete details concerning the disruption of the ordered life of the city engenders profound anxiety in the minds of the citizen spectators. It could be felt that they have been treading the same perilous path between destructive impulses and civilization that Merry has done. Unlike in orthodox tragedies, this sense of insecurity will lead ultimately to the shaking of the very foundations in which crime drama and its ideology were rooted. In spite of the homiletic intention repeatedly made manifest in the speeches of the allegorical figures, the starkness of the realism threatens to overthrow the play itself. An entirely new dramaturgy, a new view of the world, seems to be on the verge of discovery.

engendered in Elizabethan crime drama, it is necessary to reaffirm its medieval heritage. As the studies of domestic tragedies by Henry H. Adams, Ada Lou and Herbert J. Carson, and Viviana Comensoli have shown, crime drama has its origin in medieval cycle plays and Tudor moral interludes. Old plays such as *Nice Wanton, Like Will to Like*, George Wapul's *The Tide Tarrieth No Man* (1576), and *Appius and Virginia* (by R. B. 1564)¹⁷ were essentially sermons by laymen framed in dramatic form. Elizabethan crime plays strongly retain this homiletic aspect. Crude allegorical figures appear in *Two Lamentable Tragedies* and *A Warning for Fair Women*, often acting as narrators of events not dramatized in the play. This is sometimes done at the expense of dramatic situations that would have supplied a more skilled writer with rich material to be exploited. For example, Anne's adultery is presented as an allegorical dumb show in *A Warning for Fair Women*:

The Musicke playing, enters Lust bringing forth Browne and Roger, at one ende mistres Sanders and mistres Drurie at the other, they offering cheerefully to meete and embrace, suddenly riseth vp a great tree betweene them, wherat amazedly they step backe, wherupon Lust bringeth an axe to mistres Sanders, shewing signes, that she should cut it downe, which she refuseth, albeit mistres Drurie offers to helpe her. Then Lust brings the Axe to Browne, and shews the like signes to him as before, wherupon he roughlie and suddenly hewes downe the tree, and then they run together and embrace. (E3v)

This presentation of Anne's adultery and Browne's attempt on her husband's life is so clumsy that it is hard to believe it comes from the pen of the same writer who could produce such life-like pictures as Anne's waiting for her husband, quoted earlier, or the equally realistic court scene. Here we see how strong the homiletic tradition is and how it could work in a way disadvantageous to the play's artistic refinement. We must bear in mind that this homiletic tradition provided the foundations on which the crime drama of the Elizabethan period was constructed.¹⁸ A lot of things in crime drama which sometimes baffle the modern reader can be understood, and should be interpreted, as originating in this tradition. The clumsy device of allegorical figures is one manifestation of the older elements, and the last-minute repentance of the villain is another. Anne Sanders adamantly refuses to admit her guilt at her trial, yet is easily converted to submission and repentance, being persuaded by Mistress Drurie in the condemned cell (K1v). It is simply incredible that Drurie, who has functioned as a brazen bawd

for Browne, should be suddenly transformed into a preacher of morals. Yet this is quite in conformity with the tradition of homiletic drama. The popular theology reflected in the old moral interludes was based on the uncontested premise that the world is controlled by Providence and that everything is given meaning by God, though His ways may often be inscrutable. In reading the crime drama of the period we must always keep this tradition in mind and be careful lest we should be carried away by finding unexpectedly innovative elements in them. Yet Elizabethan crime drama is unsettling and disturbingly ‘modern’ precisely because this fundamental idea, the world governed by Providence, all human affairs as the manifestation of God’s will, seems to be shaken.

The fall of Anne Sanders has been explained to the audience, albeit by means of a crude narrative device, and in *Nice Wanton*, an important precursor of crime drama, the degeneration process of Ismael and Dalila, two pampered children of Xantippe, the foolishly doting mother, is briefly yet sufficiently traced. However, in *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, Merry’s motive for the horrible murder is not credibly presented. The murderer himself seems unable to understand the cause of his deeply felt discontent. In his small shop he soliloquizes thus:

I liue in meane and discontented state,
 But wherefore should I thinke of discontent:
 I am belou’d, I haue a pretty house,
 A louing sister, and a carefull man,
 That doe not thinke their dayes worke well at end,
 Except it bring me in some benefit:
 And well frequented is my little house,
 With many guestes and honest passengers. (A3v)

Yet when Beech, a rich merchant, comes to have a cup of beer in Merry’s shop and talks of his affluence, black malice is suddenly engendered in his breast.

Ah for a tricke to make this *Beeches* trash,
 Forsake his cofer and to rest in mine,
 I marrie sir, how may that tricke be done:
 Marrie with ease and great facilitie,
 I will inuent some new-found stratagem,
 To bring his coyne to my possession;
 What though his death relieue my pouertie,
 Gaine waites on courage, losse on cowardice. (A4v)

The transformation of an ordinary respectable citizen into a vicious

criminal is quite abrupt and imperfectly explained, his soliloquy being so perfunctory (note the awkward aphorism at the end). But again this apparent negligence on the part of the author can be interpreted as deriving from the homiletic tradition. Early Tudor morality plays repeatedly present examples of incorrigibly wicked men and women who are converted to true penitence only at the end of the play. The ideological foundation of these plays dictates that human beings are naturally sinful and wicked; only by means of harsh discipline, continual prayer, and sustained good works could it be possible for men to be saved. Predestination also seems to be accepted in these plays; in *Nice Wanton*, Barnabas is the child of grace, while Ismael and Dalilah have been destined to turn degenerate—one is made to feel—even without their mother's poor education. In a play that has a strong homiletic impulse at its foundations, Merry is to be regarded as a congenitally vile person whose hidden potentials have only been waiting to be triggered. The allegorical figures of Homicide and Avarice tirelessly remind the audience of the workings of the devil that is lurking inside every one of us.

In spite of all this, Merry's crime retains the power to shock even today. This is mainly because he and his deeds have been consistently represented in terms of everyday realism. He is not a figure of allegory but an ordinary citizen, in fact one modeled on a real-life criminal whose recent public execution members of the audience may have actually witnessed. The evil deeds committed by a man next door can be so intimately felt that it stirs deep anxiety in the common people who watch them. In Merry's crime there seems to be laid bare in stark, undecorated terms the destructive force that is lurking under the thin layer of civility, always ready to spring up and disrupt the organized life of the city. It is certain that Yarrington never intended to deviate from the ostensibly homiletic purposes of his play even in its most sensational moments. But his relentless pursuit of realistic details ultimately breaks away from his avowed intentions and results in arousing fundamental skepticism, laying bare the alienation and helplessness of the modern man groaning under the strain of confinement in a dehumanizing urban environment. Of course, this is not presented directly, but it seems undeniable that Elizabethan crime drama departs radically from tradition when in a number of aspects the idea that the world is governed by Providence is shaken.

When the murderer is finally revealed to be Merry, the officers going to arrest him speak incredulously of the apparent contradictions

in his character. We are made to learn that Merry has been a devout Puritan:

Enter Constable, three watchmen with Halberdes.

- Con.* Who would haue thought of all the men aliuē,
That *Thomas Merry* would haue done this deede:
So full of ruth and monstrous wickednesse.
- 1. wat.* Of all the men that liue in London walles,
I would haue thought that *Merry* had bin free.
- 2. wat.* Is this the fruites of Saint-like Puritans,
I neuer like such damn'd hipocrisie.
- 3. wat.* He would not loase a sermon for a pound,
An oath he thought would rend his iawes in twaine,
And idle word did whet Gods vegeance on:
And yet two murthers were not scripulous,
Such close illusions God will bring to light,
And ouerthrowe the workers with his might. (11v)

On the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage, Puritans who were antagonistic to theatres and actors were always presented in a disadvantageous light. Notably their supposed hypocrisy often provides the playwright with materials for satire and comedy. Consequently, it is no surprise that Merry should be presented as just another case of Puritan duplicity. A number of the spectators who had been unfavorably disposed to Puritans might have found this a quite plausible explanation for Merry's crime. Yet in watching the performance of the play, it must have been actually very hard to call Merry a hypocrite. In fact, he has no time to deserve that name before he is transfigured from a harmless shopkeeper into a devilish killer. If all these things (Merry's Puritanism, his sense of discontent that is inexplicable even to himself, and his abrupt downfall) are taken into consideration together, something more disturbing than satire seems to be presented. Merry's sudden transformation exposes the fragility of the foundations of civilized society that is supported by faith in the ubiquitous Providence. The unintentional but implied message of *Two Lamentable Tragedies* seems to be that the idea of the universe ordered by Providence is nothing less than an illusion.

The Third Watch in the passage quoted above speaks of the disclosure of Merry's murderous deed as the work of watchful God. Actually this is not true. Merry has been betrayed to the authorities by his man, Williams, who has known his master's villainy but has been persuaded to remain silent. Williams is tormented by the burden of the terrible secret, torn between his loyalty to the master and his own con-

science. When his friend Cowley, seeing his disordered state of mind and suspecting that he may know something about the murder, strongly advises him to confess it, he cries out, ‘What? shall I then betray my maisters life?’ (H3v). Thus involuntarily, almost unwittingly, he is led to inform against his master. Williams tries to justify his betrayal by making it apparently a deed guided by God’s hand: ‘But what the Lord doth please shall come to light / Cannot be hid by humaine pollicie’ (H4r). Yet this is only a flimsy prevarication, a counsel of despair for him. The truth may have been that Cowley succeeds in eliciting a confession from his friend by suggesting that Williams might incur the severity of the law by concealing the culprit. Indeed, he may well be executed as an accessory to the murder:

Knowst thou the actors of this murtherous deed,
 And wilt conceale it now the deed is done?
 Alas poore man, thou knowest not what thou doost,
 Thou hast incur’d the danger of the lawe,
 And thou mongst them must suffer punishment,
 Vnlesse thou do confesse it presentlie. (H3v)

After the confession, Cowley advises his friend to tell everything to the authorities, so that he may expect clemency. What is here unequivocally made manifest is that in this world, the world of the modern city, it is human law that really matters. The institution of civil society is the only system that is valid and functional here. Williams gives himself up to the authorities not because he is led by God’s will, but because he has been made to recognize the truth of his friend’s words. It is interesting that the primacy of human over divine law is also expressed in a contemporary comedy of city life. In Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), a madman called Trouble-all appears.

Hee is a fellow that is distracted, they say; one *Trouble-all*: hee was an officer in the Court of *Pie-poulders*, here last yeere, and put out on his place by Iustice *Ouerdoo*. . . . Vpon which, he tooke an idle conceipt, and ’s runne mad vpon’t. So that euer since, hee will doe nothing, but by Iustice *Ouerdoo*’s warrant, he will not eate a crust, nor drinke a little, nor make him in his apparell, ready. His wife, Sirreverence, cannot get him make his water, or shift his shirt, without his warrant. (III. i.53-62)

Trouble-all may be a mad man in a world where the older institutions and customs are still current, but he is way ahead of his time in his view of the world. What is regarded by him as the greatest power in this world is the warrant of Justice Adam Overdo, an agent of the system of human laws with a significant first name. Though Overdo is a

butt of satire in the carnival world of Jonson's comedy, his authority in the sober realities of actual London is not expected to be challenged. Exactly the same awareness of the power of worldly institutions lies behind the apparently old-fashioned dramaturgy of Elizabethan crime drama.

This implicit appreciation of the superiority of human law and order gives *Two Lamentable Tragedies* an aspect that is very similar to present-day (not medieval) mystery plays. Items are scattered in the course of the action offering clues to solving the central mystery of the murder of Beech and his boy. It is undeniable that, for the audience who have been made close witnesses of the deed, how the murderer is discovered provides the main interest of the play. Yarrington rather skillfully maintains the suspense. Beech's neighbours, stunned by the cruelty of the two murders, are totally mystified by them. As an organized police force is still unheard-of, they are compelled to do the investigating themselves. The murderer's weapon has remained stuck in the head of the boy. The citizens discover that it has been borrowed from a cutler's in the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the cutler cannot remember who borrowed it from him, but it is now clear the murderer is lurking quite near them. Then the mutilated remains of Beech, who is missing and has been somewhat suspected of attacking his boy, are discovered by a gentleman in the suburbs of London. He finds the bag in which the dismembered body is contained when his dog barks in an extraordinary way and plunges into a ditch. Hearing this tale of the discovery, one of the citizens wonders about the mysterious workings of God's justice: 'Beholde the mightie miracles of God, / That sencelesse things [i.e. animals like the dog] should propagate their sinne' But another citizen admonishes him, pointing to the bag:

2.neigh. Caese we to wonder at Gods wondrous works,
 And let vs labour for to bring to light,
 Those masked fiends that thus dishonor him:
 This sack is new, and loe beholde his marke
 Remaines vpon it, which did sell the bag,
 Amongst the Salters we shall finde it out,
 When, and to whom, this bloody bag was sold. (G2v)

This man, possibly a remote ancestor of Sherlock Holmes, is endowed with a very modern consciousness. He has no interest in the ways of God, though he may ostensibly make concessions to them. It is true God's ways are inscrutable, but they are useless and worthless in the burgeoning capitalist community precisely because they are difficult to

understand in pragmatic human terms. What attracts the 'Second Neighbour' is the physical evidence, the concrete signs imprinted on the real streets of the city, the urban civilization governed not by Providence but by man-made systems of law, commerce and politics. He is well aware that here the theocentric perspective is no longer tenable. The great paradox of the modern age, however, is that this is not necessarily a homocentric world either. Renaissance humanists including major dramatists of the day may explore the potentially infinite universe that has been opened before them. For the common man, merchants and artisans living in the metropolis, the case is almost the reverse. In order to ensure success in business and acquire respectability, he is compelled to suppress discontent that has been engendered by the conflict between his desires and the civilized way of life dictated by the ethics of mercantile society. Also the rapidly expanding urban civilization tends to dehumanize its inhabitants. The world has become too large to be satisfactorily comprehended by the commoners' faith in God; if God is deemed powerless or actually indifferent to human affairs, a new hermeneutics, a way of reading and interpreting man-made signs must be called for. Three centuries will pass before Sherlock Holmes begins his detective work. Yet when we consider the surprisingly modern *Weltanschauung* implied in the behaviour of Elizabethan amateur detectives, we are inevitably reminded of the fact that modern mysteries are born when a similar situation, a shattering of the god-centred universe, seems to have happened. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the basic presuppositions on which the whole enterprise of the English novel, the dominant form of cultural expression since the early eighteenth century, are put in serious doubt. Dickens, Poe and Wilkie Collins are all writers of classic fiction framed by the omniscient mode of narrative. Yet in their works the detectives are already searching for clues to unsolved mysteries in the human world. The implication behind this emergence of modern detective fiction is that the Prime Signifier has disappeared and with that disappearance the links between the signifiers and the signifieds have been lost or become invisible. The narrator who knows everything, omnipotent and omnipresent, is soon to lose its hegemony, giving way to impersonal forms of narration more suited to express the essential formlessness and meaninglessness in the contingency of modern reality.¹⁹ The early appearance of detectives in Yarrington's play derives from a similar situation. It is evidence that this play, and other crime drama such as *A Warning for Fair Women*, and *Arden of*

Faversham, mark a turning-point in cultural history, the beginning of a truly modern consciousness.

The would-be Holmeses, however, fail to realize their potential. They soon discover the salter's shop where the bag was sold—only the day before the discovery of Beech's remains—to a 'young maid'. The man who sold the bag does not know the name of the girl, but he assures the citizens that he can identify her if he meets her. Then a house-to-house search for this maid is conducted by the citizens accompanied by the salter's man. Finally they come to Merry's shop where Rachel is sitting alone. At this critical moment when suspense is at its highest, the discerning power of the citizen detectives is strangely blurred by the disarming innocence of Rachel. They tell her that she has 'too true a face for such a deed' (G3v). Their prejudice is infective; the salter's man when asked to identify her answers, 'No truly gentleman' and exits hurriedly. (Perhaps he recognizes her yet feels pity for one who is clearly only an unwilling accessory to the crime.) Thus the citizens have failed to be detectives in Elizabethan London, though they have come very close, and the play finally misses becoming the first modern mystery play. Yet the fact that such trifling, familiar articles as a hammer and a bag should provide clues to the mystery unmistakably suggests that the play is based on a view of the world which will still be valid three centuries later. Here is precisely where the truly disturbing nature of the play reveals itself. The vulgar sensationalism and hackneyed moralism are transcended by an insistent concern with details of real life, ultimately exposing the frightening condition of the inhabitants of the great city; they are abandoned in a godless world where man-made institutions will have to function as substitutes for Providence. The deceptive peace of this homocentric microcosm is shattered by the outburst of demonic impulses in an ordinary citizen. The clash between the system of civil society and the destructive force of man's primordial desires brings into sharp relief the fundamental condition of chaos, ultimate lack of meaning and order in the world. Thus we are made to feel that what is suggested by Elizabethan crime drama is something that is quite close to the sense of the absurd we often associate with the modernist literature of the last hundred years. Elizabethan crime drama is essentially 'modernist' not only in its presentation of the modern condition but also in its ultimate subversion of the realism it seems to have relentlessly advocated.

4

A number of Elizabethan crime plays are known to be based on actual events. *Arden of Faversham* takes as its subject matter the notorious murder case recorded by Holinshed in his *Chronicles*. Realism, therefore, is expected to be the natural ingredient of the play; actual events of the past will be reproduced on the stage. Yet what is striking in *Arden* is not its expected realism but its surprising and, I suspect, consciously enhanced surrealism; here reality is transcended by something else because sufficient information is often lacking. The insufficiency of the circumstantial details that contributes significantly to the evocation of surrealism in the play is partly caused by the difficulties involved in presenting realistic action relying on the very limited resources of the contemporary stage. On the Elizabethan stage, one could be easily transferred from England to France, from a Roman villa to the Egyptian palace, as in Shakespeare's English and Roman histories, and even from ancient Macedonia to the medieval kingdoms of Denmark and Norway as in *Clyomon and Clamydes* (1570). In romances and historical plays such precipitous changes of location are not considered ridiculous but accepted and evidently relished by the audience who are more than willing to suspend their disbelief for the sake of the entertainment.²⁰ The high-flown speeches of the characters or a narration by a 'Presenter' sometimes accompanied with dumb shows, as in Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (1594), are more than enough to create an illusion of space filled with invisible products of the imagination that will amply compensate for the barrenness of the actual stage. When a contemporary scene is supposed to be represented, however, the dramatist is faced with a special problem; imagination is not required to depict quotidian things involving common people. In a sense, present-day realities are far more difficult to be evoked convincingly than imaginary places removed in space and time. In *Arden of Faversham* the anonymous author must have found himself confronted with a really challenging task as his source material, Holinshed's narrative, demands frequent shifts of location. It is inevitable, consequently, that faithful pursuit of historical representation is often undermined by physical restrictions imposed upon actual dramatic performance. However, the author of *Arden* is obviously a very clever and sophisticated playwright who seems to have consciously appropriated these restrictions to his advantage. While appearing to be tamely adapting his abilities to physical conditions, he may actually be exploiting subtle strategies for presenting his radically

innovative and potentially dangerous view of the early modern world.

Take, for example, Mosby's first appearance on the stage. He is evidently supposed to visit Arden's house when Arden and his friend Franklin are making preparations for their journey to London. There he meets Alice, with whom he has been having an illicit relationship for some time, and proposes a plan for murdering her husband by means of a poisoned painting. It would seem that they are conversing inside the house, but Mosby says abruptly: 'This is the painter's house; I'll call him forth', and the painter Clarke appears answering Mosby's call (i. 243–7). This is quite disconcerting to the reader of the play; we seem to have missed a key stage direction at some point, or a substantial portion of the text would seem to have been lacking. Perhaps the audience watching the play in the theatre may not be much puzzled by this as the two actors must have been seen to be strolling around on the stage, indicating movement from one place to another, while continuing with their dialogue.²¹ We are to understand that Mosby and Alice have gone out into the street, and talking confidentially, arrive at Clarke's house. The impression is, however, that the space around the two evil characters is subtly transformed, their malignant fantasies suddenly taking concrete shape. Mosby has been talking about a painting that will kill those who look upon it; Clarke, he says, 'can temper poison with his oil / That whoso looks upon the work he draws / Shall, with the beams that issue from his sight, / suck venom to his breast and slay himself' (i. 229–34). This is of course pure imagination; actually some poisonous stuff is procured from the painter which Alice tries to make Arden eat by mixing it in his broth. Yet Mosby's fantasy has definitely helped make the scene not a realistic reproduction of their first attempt at murder but something akin to nightmare. This effect is not totally unintentional since a similarly bizarre change of scene is repeated several times in the play—for example, in Arden's lodgings at Aldersgate and at Rainham Down, the places where the third and fourth attempts on his life are made by Black Will and Shakebag, two assassins hired by the conspirators. Readers and audience alike seem to be gradually led into a region where the boundary between reality and unreality has become blurred.

In fact, in this 'realistic' tragedy, dreams appear often to dominate the stage. At Arden's lodgings in Aldersgate, Michael, his servant, has been instructed to leave the door unlocked so that Black Will and Shakebag may kill his master in his bed. Michael is in love with Mosby's sister, Susan, and has been led into complicity with him. Yet

while waiting for the ruffians to come, he is racked by conflicting emotions: loyalty to his master, passion for Susan, and fear of his headstrong mistress; his dread of the two daredevil outlaws especially torments his imagination. The merciless killing of his master at their hands, and even his own murder, come so vividly to mind:

Methinks I see them with their boltered hair,
 Staring and grinning in thy gentle face,
 And in their ruthless hands their daggers drawn,
 Insulting o'er thee with a peck of oaths
 Whilst thou, submissive, pleading for relief,
 Art mangled by their ireful instruments.
 Methinks I hear them ask where Michael is,
 And pitiless Black Will cries 'Stab the slave!
 The peasant will detect the tragedy.'
 The wrinkles in his foul, death-threat'ning face
 Gapes open wide, like graves to swallow men.
 My death to him is but a merriment,
 And he will murder me to make him sport.
 He comes, he comes! Ah, Master Franklin, help!
 Call up neighbours or we are but dead.

(iv. 73-86)

Michael's outcry wakes up Arden and Franklin and the murder attempt is foiled again. Michael explains to them that he 'had a fearful dream', yet here it is not clear whether Michael was actually dreaming or when his excessive terror compelled him to cry out, he feigned a disorder caused by nightmare. After this incident there is a scene in which Arden tells Franklin of a dream he had on the same night. In his dream he thought he fell asleep when he was watching a deer hunting. He woke to find an 'ill-thewed foster' [ill-mannered forester] had trapped him with the net intended for the deer. 'With that he [the forester] blew an evil-sounding horn, / And at the noise another herdman came / With falchion drawn, and bent it at my breast, / Crying aloud, 'Thou art the game we seek.' / With this I waked and trembled every joint, . . .' (vi. 6-20). So Arden was asleep in his sleep, dreaming a dream in his dream. Is he really awake even now? Possibly he is still wandering in the unreal world of a bad dream. Not only Arden and Michael but also some other characters seem trapped in dreams or in dreamlike enchantment. In a rare moment of sobriety and remorse, Mosby and Alice both talk of their passion as caused by bewitchment. Responding to Alice's accusation, 'I was bewitched; woe worth the hapless hour / And all the causes that enchanted me!' (viii.78-9), Mosby retorts, 'I was bewitched—that is no theme of thine!' (viii. 93) . They are con-

trolled by some outside force that drives them to murder and to destruction. They are in a sense made to live in an unreal world of evil. Arden is also under the influence of bewitchment. After the fight with Mosby and the two ruffians in which Arden and Franklin wound the opponents, Franklin is dismayed to see Alice cunningly succeed in persuading her husband to be reconciled to her lover. He soliloquizes: 'He whom the devil drives must go perforce. / Poor gentleman, how soon he is bewitched' (xiii. 151–2). Thus most people in the play are bewitched; the bewitcher and the bewitched are inseparably merged. A character's bewitched state comes perhaps most palpably into relief when Alice is brought before her husband's body:

Arden, sweet husband, what shall I say?
 The more I sound his name the more he bleeds.
 This blood condemns me, and in gushing forth
 Speaks as it falls and asks me why I did it.

(xvi. 3–6)

The corpse of a murdered person is traditionally believed to bleed accusingly when the murderer comes near it. It could be interpreted as another instance of the mysterious workings of Providence. Yet it is not clear whether the body actually bleeds or it is just Alice's imagination. As the stage direction here is silent about the presence of Arden's corpse on the stage, the latter case may be strongly supported. In fact, at this penultimate stage in the play it does not matter any longer whether an action is real or imagined. Reality itself has become bewitched.

In the world of *Arden* some overriding power or superhuman will seems to be working. Realism is constantly undermined by this sense of something that controls human affairs. What distinguishes *Arden of Faversham* from *A Warning for Fair Women* and *Two Lamentable Tragedies* is that this unseen controlling power is definitely not Providence. The anonymous author of the play has decided not to introduce figures of allegory in order to explain or instruct the audience in the unfathomable ways of God. We should take note, however, that the Elizabethan audience must have been ready to read didactic messages in the play's action. The innately evil characters are finally exposed in their villainy and severely punished. Repentance and salvation in the next world are duly expressed by Alice at the end: 'Forgive me, Arden; I repent me now; / . . . Rise up, sweet Arden, and enjoy thy love, / And frown not on me when we meet in heaven . . .' (xvi. 7–10). The one aspect of the play that must have been interpreted by the audi-

ence of the day as indubitable manifestations of God's will is Arden's repeated, miraculous escape from the hand of death. Arden seems to have a charmed life; the two hired assassins, when their attempts have been baffled, have to admit that Arden has 'wondrous holy luck' (ix. 133), that he is 'preserved by miracle' (xiv. 26–7).

Yet, for the modern reader, and possibly for some perspicuous Elizabethan spectators, it is precisely this repeated failure of the villains that ultimately give rise to grave doubts about the will of God; for, after all, He does not save Arden. It is possible to see his death as a demonstration of retributive justice. Arden has been stupid enough to ignore the continual warnings; he has been greedy and ungenerous to Greene and others about the contested plot of ground of which he has taken (quite legal) possession.²² Holinshed carefully presented the real-life Arden's unpleasant character, suggesting strongly that his downfall was caused at least partly by his own failings (Holinshed 110). On the other hand, the Arden in the play is not a character who deserves such a cruel end. Unlike Holinshed's Arden, who connives at his wife's adultery for pecuniary reasons (Holinshed 104), he is just a very ineffectual and credulous husband. As he is such a feeble character, his brutal butchering in the end becomes all the more conspicuous in its cold-blooded senselessness. In fact, the impression given by the repeated attempts on his life is that Arden is a character who has been created and permitted to live in order to be killed; he is not preserved, but reserved for the denouement. As time after time he escapes death, the play becomes more and more unreal, even though the seven murder attempts closely follow Holinshed's historical record. In its deepening sense of failure and frustration the play comes very close to modern absurd drama.

In fact the serious and the ridiculous are strangely yet naturally mixed here. When in London, Black Will waits for Arden at Paul's Walk (the middle aisle of the Cathedral frequented by merchants, actually a kind of shopping mall), hiding himself beside a stall, an apprentice lets down the stall windows and breaks his head (iii. 45–55). The commotion caused by this incident saves Arden's life. This kind of absurd comedy is repeated when the two ruffians are waiting on the river bank for Arden who is going to visit Lord Cheiny's on the Isle of Shippey. They become engulfed by the dense mist which makes them lose their way and Shakebag falls into a ditch. Hearing his cry for help, a ferryman comes to them and while they are conversing with him, Arden goes past them unmolested (xii. 20–51). Natural phenome-

na seem to intervene again after Arden is killed. When the murderers carry his body to the field behind the Abbey, it snows heavily. Susan expresses apprehension about it: 'As we went it snowed all the way, / Which makes me fear our footsteps will be spied' (xiv.357-8). Although Alice assures her that '[t]he snow will cover them again', it had stopped when the murderers were returning. The clear prints of their feet left by this malicious caprice of the weather lead Franklin, who has discovered his friend's body, easily to Arden's own house, the place where the murder was committed. Undoubtedly this surrealistic world is weirdly alive. Even the ground itself seems to bleed when Alice and Susan try to wipe Arden's blood off the floor: 'The more I strive the more the blood appears!' (xiv. 257). But the point is that whatever it is that extends control over human affairs, it is not Providence. It works haphazardly and quite arbitrarily; it is neither benevolent nor malignant. The supernatural will is literally superhuman in that it is perfectly indifferent to man. The indifference is marked by the fate of Bradshaw, a totally innocent man, who nevertheless is made to suffer the severity of the law. A casual statement in the letter from Greene to Mosby incriminates him. This again is based on Holinshed, but no homiletic purpose is served by the death of Bradshaw. It just proves that the world is not governed by a just god but by something coldly indifferent to human justice. The frightening message of the play, the arbitrariness and chaos of the world, is all the more impressively conveyed by the absence of such figures of allegory as appear in *A Warning for Fair Women* or in *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, resulting in a more straightforward evocation of the sense of the absurd. At the end of the play, a modern reader may feel sympathetic to Mosby who is unrepentant to the last. After the confession of his crime, he repeats the same sentence twice: 'But wherefore stay we? Come and bear me hence' (xvi.19); 'But bear me hence, for I have lived too long' (xviii.35). It has become unbearable, one feels, to be placed in a godless universe, to be the sport of meaningless contingency. Death on the scaffold will come almost as a relief, the only way out from this Chinese box world of infinite frustration.

5

The author of *Arden of Faversham* is not known. Here is no place to speculate about the authorship of the play; it would be rather interesting, however, if, as some scholars have maintained, Thomas Kyd wrote it.²³ For *The Spanish Tragedy* seems to reveal the same profound

sense of the absurd as this anonymous crime drama. Though a pamphlet featuring a contemporary murder case, *The Murder of John Brewen* (1592), had formerly been ascribed to Kyd,²⁴ his acknowledged masterpiece is an orthodox tragedy. The characters are all kings, princes, grand seigneurs and highborn ladies; the action concerns war, politics, courtly love and intrigue.²⁵ Yet the play stands apart from other conventional tragedies of the day in respect of its unique structure. The play opens with a dialogue between Revenge, an allegorical character from Hell and Andrea, a Spanish knight who was killed in battle but has been permitted by Pluto and Proserpine to come back to the world as a ghost. Throughout the entire play these two imaginary characters remain on the stage above,²⁶ watching the tragedy of Hieronimo the Knight Marshal of Spain, his son Horatio, and Belimperia, a lady formerly loved by Andrea but now in love with Horatio, unfold below them. Though Revenge says that they will 'serve for Chorus of this tragedy' (I.i.91), in terms of structure he and Andrea are in a position essentially similar to narrators in narrative fiction. Admittedly Andrea is more or less a passive spectator; he is interested in and enthralled by the action of the play just like the people in the pit and the gallery. On the other hand, Revenge has qualities surprisingly close to the omniscient narrator in novels of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Though he does not manipulate the fates of the characters, it is evident that he knows everything that is to happen in the play beforehand. Because of this foreknowledge it is natural that he has little interest in the play itself. He even falls asleep and has to be roused by Andrea: 'Awake, Revenge, for thou art ill-advised / To sleep away what thou art warned to watch!' (III.xv.10–11). This device of passive observers who are actually knowledgeable narrators reflects the essentially modernist outlook of Thomas Kyd. The early date of the play always surprises us, as does that of *Arden*, and we have to be aware that what seem to be remarkably modern elements in it might actually be reflections of an older tradition (for example, the Senecan stichomythia frequently used throughout the play). In spite of this possibility, the text of the play repeatedly presents a perspective which is not pre-modern but may best be described as modernist. Here the world is not under the benevolent watch and care of God; even if there be any presiding eye directed to this world, it is at best that of a powerless spectator like Andrea, or that of a potent but indifferent narrator like Revenge. In the world they watch, the lack of one stable and reliable viewpoint results in blurring the truth of incidents. For example,

the capture of Balthazar, the Portuguese prince, by the Spaniards is narrated no less than five times. First a Spanish general reports it to the king (I.ii.22–84); then Horatio and Lorenzo give different versions of the same story, each claiming Balthazar as his prisoner; and finally Balthazar himself relates the incident (I.ii.152–165); while in Portugal, Villuppo gives a forged eye-witness account to the Viceroy, accusing a fellow courtier, Alexandro, of killing the prince (I.iii.59–71). Among these five different versions, only Villuppo's is manifestly false, as the audience has already seen Balthazar alive, but no one knows which of the other four is nearest the truth. As the same story or *fabula*, to use a formalist term, is repeated in a spectrum of discourses or *sjuzets*, reality becomes more and more elusive.²⁷ All these narrators are, to use Wayne C. Booth's expression, 'unreliable', the fundamental premise that a narrator always speaks truth being utterly shattered. Repetition, the most prominent feature of Kyd's tragedy, is the product of this essentially 'modernist' background.

In *The Spanish Tragedy*, repetitions are discernible at all levels of the text. 'Revenge' is understandably the one word used most frequently; there is an instance where four consecutive lines end with 'revenge' (IV.iv.27–30).²⁸ Other words are also repeated often as the first of several lines in a row; 'Woe to the cause of these constrained wars, / Woe to thy baseness . . . / Woe to thy birth, . . .' (II.vii. 61–3); 'In time the savage bull . . . / In time all haggard hawks . . . / In time small wedges . . .' (II.i.3–6); alliteration and internal rhyme can be seen in such phrases as 'I will consent, conceal' (IV.i.46), 'I may consort my friends in pleasing sort' (IV.v.15). Scenes or tableaux are also repeatedly presented; for example, the 'hangings' of Horatio and Pedringano, and the dumb show which is performed twice in the play (I.iv. III.xv). Subtler devices of repetition that could best be described in terms of narratology, such as foreshadowing or prolepsis, can also be seen;²⁹ the ill-fated love of Horatio and Bel-imperia seems to be already described in capsule in Andrea's first speech (I.i.11–4); Hieronimo's grief at losing his son is anticipated by the anguish of the Viceroy of Portugal at the supposed loss of his son Lorenzo (I.iii. 5–9). All these repetitions contribute to evoking the sense of the absurd in the play. One seems to be trapped in a labyrinth where the straight thread of God's story is forever lost. Innumerable small alleys may be found, all leading to nowhere. Here there is no purpose, no meaning; everything seems to be a pointless recurrence of something that already happened in the past. The sense of endless *déjà vu* drives one

to despair.

This essentially modernist presentation of a godless world goes a step further when, at the end of the play, reader and audience alike are made aware of the ultimate form of repetition suggested in the play. The continual presence of Andrea and Revenge on the stage above has constantly reminded the audience that the play is a fiction. When the controlling power over human affairs is not God, the world presented in a literary work comes to be something removed from the one and only true story written by God; fictions will be let loose, without anchor, over a frighteningly vast contingency. The sense of uprootedness that is characteristic of modernist literature leads inevitably to the distancing of a literary work from itself. The writers of the post-modern age can never be free from the ideas of meta-fiction and meta-drama; he or she is always conscious of his or her work being writing about writing. Kyd's sophisticated use of the device of distancing his work from itself may have resulted in making the play something quite similar to such post-modernist literature. As in John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) the deceptively old-fashioned pseudo-Victorian novel is subverted by a highly conscious manipulation of the plot by the author, so the apparently conservative revenge tragedy of Kyd ends up being removed from itself: the play is self-repetitive, self-reflexive. At its close, Revenge speaks thus:

Then haste we down to meet thy friends and foes:
To place thy friends in ease, the rest in woes.
For here, though death hath end their misery,
I'll there begin their endless tragedy. (IV.v.45-8)

The audience, entrapped by the hypnotizing power of repetition, is here appalled to be made aware that the tragedy will be repeated; there is no end to human misery. One is made to feel that the ultimate message of Elizabethan crime drama is the same. The men and women of the modern world, especially the inhabitants of the city, its epitome, are abandoned and alienated in an absurd, meaningless world. Elizabethan crime drama failed to realize its formidable potentials for creating an artistic representation of this modernist situation (*Arden of Faversham* possibly excepted), unable finally to break free from the fetters of the older homiletic tradition. Yet it is undeniable that they are important precursors of yet unborn vehicles for cultural expression. The endless tragedy of modern man will continue to find its voice in Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserved* (1682), a remarkably orig-

inal absurd tragedy of the Restoration period, the sentimental literature of the eighteenth century, including the novels of Defoe, Richardson and Fielding (the Fielding not of *Tom Jones* but *Amelia*), in Victorian novels and the twentieth century theatre of the absurd.

Notes

¹ This transition of the centre of cultural significance from the country to the city is perhaps best exemplified in Ben Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599). The play begins by presenting country characters; Sordido, a farmer absorbed in weather-forecasting, and Puntarvolo, a knight who lives the life of a Don Quixote courting his own lady every time he comes home from hunting. Then the scene changes to London where the comedy of the city involving fashionable courtiers, ambitious citizens, and unfaithful wives is presented. The play reaches its climax in a scene set in the Counter prison, thus suggesting that confinement is the inevitable fate of the urbanites.

² The term 'domestic' does not correspond to the modern idea of 'private' as opposed to 'public'. See Schutzman (295). When, however, more than a century later, Geroge Lillo talks of 'a tale of private woe' (Prologue 20), the term has already come to designate a space demarcated by middle-class individualism.

³ Dates of plays cited will be given in parentheses, following Harbage, except *The London Merchant*, an eighteenth-century play.

⁴ See for example, *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, and Dekker's *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621). The 'crime' in Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* is adultery. The women in these plays have characteristics in polar opposition to heroines of the patient Griselda type in *Patient Grissil*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *The Fair Maid of Bristow*.

⁵ In quotations from plays, speech prefixes and stage directions will always be in italics, with the exception of characters' names in stage directions. Also indentions will be used strategically for the sake of readability. Otherwise, the original texts from editions used will be reproduced faithfully (long esses are not represented).

⁶ It is interesting to note how the workings of the British criminal court have not changed in their fundamentals over the centuries. Compare the trial of Browne and Anne with the court scene in Agatha Christie's modern crime drama, *Witness for the Prosecution* (1954).

⁷ According to *DNB*, 'Mr. Fleay conjectures that Rob. Yarrington is a fictitious name, and that his play is an amalgamation of the two plays by Haughton, Day & Chettle.'

⁸ According to Chambers, the story is of the Babes in the Wood type. Pertillo's murder may be based on a ballad version of the story (Chambers III 518).

⁹ The names of the characters in the play are, as usual in the printed texts of this period, variously spelled. The most common forms will be used hereafter.

¹⁰ The most effective use of this device can be seen in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607) by Francis Beaumont. Rafe the apprentice, who is made by his master and mistress to perform the part of a knight errant, is often drawn back to banal reality from the romantic adventures when specific, very realistic sums of money are named; for example, at the Bell inn where he is asked to pay twelve shillings for lodging (III.140–78) and even in Cracovia, an imaginary kingdom of romance, where his farewell speech to the daughter of the king enumerates payments of small sums (IV.106–19).

¹¹ See the contemporary woodcut reproduced on the cover of Briggs, Harrison, McInnes & Vincent.

¹² Cuthbert Cutpurse's words in *Like Will to Like*, 'O, all youth take example by me: / Flee from evil company, as from a serpent you would flee; / For I to you all a mirror may be' (E4r, Happé 360) are repeated by Quicksilver in *Eastward Ho* (1605) by Chapman, Jonson and Marston: 'Farewell, dear fellow prentices all, / And be you warnèd by my fall: / Shun usurers, bawds, and dice, and drabs . . .' (V.v.120–4); and by Spendall, the spendthrift apprentice in *Greene's Tu Quoque, or The City Gallant* by Jo. Cooke: 'O what a Slaue was I vnto my Pleasures? / How drown'd in Sinne, and overwhelmd in Lust? / That I could write my repentance to the world, / And force th'impression of it in the hearts / Of you, and acquaintance, I might teach them / By my example, to look home to Thrift, / And not to range abroad to seeke out Ruine' (13r). In *The London Merchant*, George Barnwell, on his way to Newgate prison, addresses the audience thus: '*Be warn'd ye Youths, who see my sad Despair, / Avoid lewd Women, False as they are Fair . . . / by my Example learn to shun my Fate, / (How wretched is the Man who's wise too late?) / Ere Innocence, and Fame, and Life be lost,— / Here purchase Wisdom, cheaply, at my Cost*' (IV.xiii.9–17). See also the parody of this conventional scaffold speech in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (V.320–29).

¹³ In Elizabethan drama it is not often that an execution scene is graphically presented but there are some notable instances. See *A Warning for Fair Women* where George Browne 'leaps off', probably from the stage above into the back entrance (I14)r; and the grotesquely comic hanging of Pedringano in *The Spanish Tragedy* (III.vi).

¹⁴ We can gain some idea of this form of punishment through the recent film *Braveheart* (1995) by Mel Gibson in which the life of the greatest Scottish national hero, William Wallace, who was executed in this way in 1305 is presented. Centuries later, in Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814), a novel about the Jacobite rebellion in 1745, another Scottish rebel, Fergus Mac-Ivor, suffers the same fate.

¹⁵ See Visscher's view of London Bridge, dated 1616, reproduced in Weinreb and Hibbert (468).

¹⁶ Molly Smith summarizes her argument as follows: 'the influence of the scaffold may also account for a general dramatic fascination with the spectacle of death evident throughout the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In fact, the close alliance between theater and public punishment frames the great age of drama in England; after all, the period culminates with the greatest theatrical spectacle of all, the public execution of King Charles I' (Smith 220).

¹⁷ The story is based on a classical legend and is again dramatized by John Webster (1624).

¹⁸ In fact the perseverance of this tradition is so strong that it is revived in the

eighteenth century in sentimental comedies and tragedies, contributing significantly to the decline of English drama.

¹⁹ For the various forms of narration in fiction, see Booth.

²⁰ Of course the preposterousness of romances are often ridiculed or parodied. Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* consistently employs the technique of *reductio ad absurdum* throughout at the expense of such a romantic play as *The Four Prentices of London*.

²¹ For the problems involved in staging the play, see Sturges 49.

²² The social context behind the murder of Arden (marriage, land-owning, and the class system) has been the focus of a number of critical studies on the play. Leanore Lieblin's discussion of *Arden* as well as *A Warning for Fair Women*, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness* gives a useful overview of the genre from this point of view. Catherine Belsey calls attention to the instability of the institution of marriage at the time of the murder and the play (129–148). For the relevance of the changing cultural status of property, and especially land-owning in the period, to the play's action, see Attwell, Sullivan, and White's introduction to the New Mermaid edition of the play.

²³ The debate about authorship is summarized in Chambers IV 3–4, Sturges 20–1. See also Boas lxxxix–xc. For a recent case for including not only *Arden of Faversham* but possibly *The Jew of Malta* also in a Kyd canon, see Thomas Merriam.

²⁴ The pamphlet is included in Frederick S. Boas's edition of Kyd's works 285–293. According to the title page reproduced in Boas's edition, it relates the murder of 'Iohn Brewen, Goldsmith of London, committed by his own wife, through the prouocation of one Iohn Parker, whom she loued: for which fact she was burned, and he hanged in Smithfield, on wednesday, the 28 of Iune, 1592, two yeares after the murder was committed'. The attribution of this pamphlet to Kyd is 'now completely discredited' (White xiii).

²⁵ The protagonist Hieronimo and his son Horatio may be regarded as coming from the 'middling sort'. While admitting that 'the catch-all "middle class"' should be 'treated very tentatively in a pre-industrial context' (557n.), James R. Siemon calls Hieronimo 'that early tragic protagonist of the middling condition and arguably the first of its terrorists' (558).

²⁶ Apparently for practical reasons the actors are not always present on stage throughout the play. They will make usual entrances and exits at convenient points. However, it is assumed that their gaze never leaves the stage.

²⁷ See Gennette and Chatman for explication of the basics of narratology.

²⁸ The idea of revenge itself is repetitive; the killing of the murderer will lead to the killing of the avenger and so on. In a consideration of *The Spanish Tragedy* 'in the light of contemporary debates about the heterogeneous and intertwined fabrics of language, culture, and nation', Carla Mazzio contends that 'Hieronimo's ultimate revenge is a revenge on language, on representation, on what he returns to in the end, "our vulgar tongue"' (213–4).

²⁹ For definitions of these terms, see Rimmon-Kenan and Prince.

Works Cited

Primary Sources (Plays)

- Anonymous. *Clyomon and Clamydes*. Malone Society Reprints, 1913.
- . *The Fair Maid of Bristow*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1912. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- . *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham*. New Mermaids. Ed. Martin White. London: Ernest Benn, 1982.
- . *A Warning for Fair Women*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1912. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- B., R. *Apius and Virginia*. Malone Society Reprints, 1911.
- Beaumont, Francis. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. 1969. Rpt. London: A & C Black, 1986.
- Chapman, George. *Bussy D'Ambois*. Ed. Maurice Evans. New Mermaids. London: Ernest Benn, 1965.
- , Ben Jonson, and John Marston. *Eastward Ho*. Ed. R. W. Van Fossen. Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1979.
- Chettle, Henry, William Haughton, and Thomas Dekker. *Patient Grissil*. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1911. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Cooke, Jo. *Greene's Tu Quoque, or, The City Gallant*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1913, Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Christie, Agatha. *Witness for the Prosecution*. Agatha Christie. *The Mousetrap & Other Plays*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1978. 337–422.
- Dekker, Thomas. *The Witch of Edmonton*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Vol. III. 1958. Rpt: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Ford, John. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Ed. Brian Morris. New Mermaids. 1968. Rpt. London: A & C Black, 1986.
- Fulwell, Ulpian. *Like Will To Like*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1909. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Happé, Peter, ed. *Tudor Interludes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Heywood, Thomas. *The English Traveller. The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*. Vol. 4. 1874. Rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.
- . *First and Second Parts of The Fair Maid of the West. The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*. Vol. 2. 1874. Rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.
- . *The Four Prentices of London. The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*. Vol. 2. 1874. Rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.
- . *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. Ed. Brian Scobie. New Mermaids. London: A & C Black, 1985.
- Jonson, Ben. *Bartholmew Fayre*. Ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. *Ben Jonson*. Vol. VI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- . *Everyman Out of His Humour*. Ed. G. R. Hibbard. New Mermaids. London: Ernest Benn, 1977.
- Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. New Mermaids. Ed. J. R. Mulryne. London: A & C Black, 1989.
- . *The Works of Thomas Kyd*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. 1901. Rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Lillo, George. *The London Merchant: or, The History of George Barnwell*. Ed.

- James L. Steffensen. *The Dramatic Works of George Lillo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Middleton, Thomas. *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. Ed. Alan Brissenden. New Mermaids. London: A & C Black, 1988.
- . *Women Beware Women*. Ed. A. H. Gomme. *Jacobean Tragedies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- , and Thomas Dekker. *The Roaring Girl*. Ed. Elizabeth Cook. Second Edition. New Mermaids. London: A & C Black, 1997.
- Otway, Thomas. *Venice Preserved*. London: 1682.
- Porter, Henry. *The Two Angry Women of Abington*. Malone Society Reprints, 1912.
- Shakespeare, William. *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Sturgess, Keith. Ed. *Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969.
- Wapul, George. *The Tide Tarrieth No Man*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1910. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Webster, John. *The White Devil*. Ed. F. L. Lucas. *The Complete Works of John Webster*. Vol. III. 1927. Rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1966.
- Wickham, Glynne, ed. *English Moral Interludes*. London: Dent, 1976.
- Wilkins, George. *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. Ed. Arthur Brown. Malone Society Reprints, 1964.
- Yarington, Robert. *Two Lamentable Tragedies*. Ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. 1913. Rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Henry Hitch. *English Domestic or, Homiletic Tragedy 1575 to 1642*. 1943. Rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1971.
- Attwell, David. 'Property, Status, and the Subject in a Middle-class Tragedy: *Arden of Faversham*'. *English Literary Renaissance* 21 (1991): 328–348.
- Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Boas, Frederick S. 'Introduction'. *The Works of Thomas Kyd*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. 1901. Rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Briggs, John, Christopher Harrison, Angus McInnes, and David Vincent. *Crime and Punishment in England: An Introductory History*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Carson, Ada Lou and Herbert J. Carson. *Domestic Tragedy in English: Brief Survey*. 2 vols. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1982.
- Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Comensoli, Viviana. 'Household Business': *Domestic Plays of Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin.

- Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Harbage, Alfred. *Annals of English Drama 975–1700*. Rev. S. Schoenbaum. Third Edition. Rev. Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Appendix. *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham*. New Mermaids. Ed. Martin White. London: Ernest Benn, 1982. 104–112.
- Lieblein, Leanoire. 'The Context of Murder in English Domestic Plays, 1590–1610'. *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 23 (1983): 181–196.
- Mazzio, Carla. 'Staging the Vernacular: Language and Nation in Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*'. *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 38 (1998): 207–232.
- Merriam, Thomas. 'Possible Light on a Kyd Canon.' *Notes and Queries* (1995): 340–341.
- Prince, Gerald. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Schlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Schutzman, Julie R. 'Alice Arden's Freedom and the Suspended Moment in *Arden of Faversham*'. *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 289–314.
- Seaver, Paul. S. 'Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*'. *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*. Ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 87–100.
- Sharpe, J. A. *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550–1760*. London: Edward Arnold, 1987.
- Siemon, James R. 'Sporting Kyd'. *English Literary Renaissance* 24 (1994): 553–582.
- Smith, Molly. 'The Theater and the Scaffold: Death as Spectacle in *The Spanish Tragedy*.' *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 32 (1992): 217–232.
- Sullivan, Garrett A. Jr. "'Arden lay murdered in that plot of ground": Surveying, Land, and *Arden of Faversham*'. *ELH* 61 (1994): 231–252.
- Weinreb, Ben and Christopher Hibbert, eds. *The London Encyclopædia*. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- White, Martin. 'Introduction'. *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham*. New Mermaids. Ed. Martin White. London: Ernest Benn, 1982.

The Structuring of Desires in Aphra Behn's Plays: Problems of Prostitution and Gender

Riwako Kaji

I

Arriving on the theatrical scene in 1670 as the first professional English woman playwright, Aphra Behn wrote prolifically.¹ In many of her plays, especially the comedies, she presented attractive female characters as wittily confuting their lovers, forcibly demanding their sexual or social desires, or ingeniously manipulating plots by intrigues. She gave prostitutes or whorish women important parts in the main plots, sometimes as heroines, while such women were usually treated as jesters or supporting players provoking scornful or sexual laughter in Renaissance and Restoration dramas. Recent critics have paid considerable attention to the women in the Restoration theatre, as Jacqueline Pearson put it: 'One of the most striking innovations of the Restoration was the participation of women at all levels of theatrical life, as playwrights, actresses, and theatre managers' (Pearson 25). To analyze Restoration dramas, we should consider the relation between 'representing' and 'represented' women who display influential power, visible or invisible, in the theatre during this period.

Recently, the first professional actresses have mostly been discussed from socio-cultural and gendered viewpoints.² The actress was regarded as a new profession 'open to prostitutes in the seventeenth century, although the wandering entertainer had long been associated with prostitution,' and the stage provided prostitutes not only 'the opportunity to demonstrate their wares before the public,' but also 'a new way of circumventing the law' (Bullough 174). In addition, not a few actresses were given over to infamous practices for money, or supported by patrons for their sexual services. Around 1680, Aphra Behn produced a series of comedies, in which heroines were prostitutes or disguised prostitutes, and she assigned Elizabeth Barry to play the part of the heroines in all these plays. In *The Feign'd Curtizans, or, A*

Nights Intrigue (1679), the comedy dedicated to the King's mistress, Nell Gwyn, Barry played a heroine disguised as a courtesan for the purpose of avoiding paternal pressure to marry. In the following two works, she played the part of prostitutes as heroines in *The Revenge: Or, A Match in Newgate* (1680) and *The Second Part of The Rover* (1681). Prostitutes or mistresses were, of course, one of the distinctive character types of Restoration drama, but, compared with male playwrights, Aphra Behn represented them on the stage in a unique style.

This paper is intended to clarify the structuring of various desires in Aphra Behn's plays where the heroines are presented as prostitutes or feigned courtesans, by examining how prostitutes are represented in the texts, and what alterations we find between the prostitutes in *The Second Part of The Rover* and *The Rover. Or, The Banish'd Cavaliers* (1677). Through these analyses, the influence of the women in Restoration theatre will be examined, considering as well the social and sexual background of Aphra Behn and Elizabeth Barry, who both followed the first theatrical professions for women, relying on male patronage.³

II

On the Restoration stage, adulterous wives, cuckold husbands, rakes and prostitutes are often presented with an emphasis on their sexual looseness. One of the most successful plays with these kinds of character is William Wycherley's *The Country Wife* (1675), which, known as a 'sex comedy,' aroused cynical and sexual laughter (Hume 97). Around the rake, Horner, adulterous wives and cuckold husbands reveal their imprudence or stupidity. Horner deliberately lies about his sexual ability by declaring his impotence, so that he can easily have affairs with married women without being suspected by their husbands. A jealous husband of 'the country wife,' Pinchwife, is mentioned as 'a whoremaster . . . that knew the town so much, and women so well,' and has married so as 'to keep a whore to [him]self' (CW, II. i. 349–50; 431). For Pinchwife, as well as Horner, women in London, whether married or not, are the same as whores who could never qualify to be his wife. On the other hand, as regards the profession of prostitution, Wellman, the libertine of *The Revenge*, insists on its necessity: 'A married man ought to love a Bawdy-house, as English-men love *Flanders*; with war shou'd be maintain'd there, lest it shou'd be brought home to their own doors' (*Revenge*, I. i. 80–82). Filled with

adultery, seduction or prostitution, the plots of Restoration comedies seem to centre upon sexual desires, and we, in these representations, find situations which allow for the coexistence of wife and whore.

One of the reasons for such a tendency is the double-directed sexual desires of men from the upper class; that is, the desire to have a chaste wife who will produce a legitimate son, and, at the same time, the wish to enjoy prostitutes or mistresses for their sexual pleasure. In the late seventeenth century to keep a mistress was considered, in a sense, an example of 'conspicuous consumption' in the upper class. During the reign of Charles II, 'it became almost pro forma for every striving noble to have a mistress in order to maintain his position in society' (Bullough 157). This kind of situation leads to comic, and sometimes distressing, representations of the distinction between wife and whore, as, in Wycherley's *The Gentleman Dancing Master* (1672), when described by the man of quality: 'there's little difference betwixt keeping a wench and marriage; only marriage is a little cheaper; but the other is the more honourable now' (*GDM*, 236. V. i.).

We can also find, on the other hand, female characters who represent this kind of situation as a merging of wife and whore. Adulterous wives in *The Country Wife* reveal the same mode of sexual desire as the male's in an explicit way. Lady Fidget, one of these wives, warns Horner not to 'let other women know that dear secret' about his intrigue, or a rumour of his sexual impotence, since 'my acquaintance are so censorious . . . and detracting that perhaps they'll talk to the prejudice of my honour, though you should not let them know the dear secret' (*CW*, IV. iii. 57–63). Lady Fidget continues to pursue sexual pleasure, though she is also concerned about her 'honour,' which she must preserve as a lady of quality.⁴ In the world of *The Country Wife*, high-bred women, for honour's sake, are not required to be faithful to their husbands but to keep secret their sexual looseness. In the end, Lady Fidget's looseness is exposed to the audience by the implication that Horner catches a sexual disease from her.

Margery Pinchwife, the country wife, has been kept in the country by her husband, because he is fearful of being made a cuckold, and repeats the phrase: 'I know the town' (*CW*, I. i. 426). He tries to keep his 'innocent' country wife away from Horner by having her confined or disguised, but she learns rapidly the way of women in London.⁵ She asks Horner to be her husband, as 'at London here, women leave their first husbands, and go and live with other men as their wives' (*CW*, V. iv. 209–10). In this way, in *The Country Wife*, female desire

for sexual pleasure can be regarded as equal to a male's, or identified with the double-directed sexual desires in men of quality. Female sexual desire is apparently recognized, pursued, and satisfied in the play, but, it causes the disappearance of the chaste wife, which might endanger the male sexuality of the upper class. Male anxiety about a wife's chastity is comically represented in Pinchwife's trying to disguise his wife as a boy—which ironically offers Horner a chance to be intimate with her. Pinchwife suspects that Horner has 'only squeezed my orange, I suppose, and given it me again,' but he has to contain himself with the thought that he 'must have a city patience' (*CW*, III. ii. 523–25). At last Pinchwife sighs: 'Cuckolds, like lovers, should themselves deceive' (*CW*, V. iv. 400), while Horner contracts a sexually transmitted disease. So why do male playwrights in a patriarchal society disclose such male anxieties?

One reason for the presentation of unrestrained female sexuality on the stage might be the changes of the women's positions in the theatre. It cannot be denied that women in the theatre had a profound influence upon the play itself and its performance. Female audiences and patronage was considered to be a primary factor in dramatic achievement.⁶ Aphra Behn, in fact, made her theatrical debut with the Duke's Company which at that time was led by Lady Davenant (Howe 26). Lady Davenant also introduced Elizabeth Barry to the theatre (Pearson 32). Actresses were, though sometimes classified with prostitutes, gradually recognized as a socially acceptable profession—which, as the story of Nell Gwyn showed, could be 'the quickest way to a royal bed, or the title of duchess for a commoner' (Bullough 174). Therefore, representations of female sexuality or their various desires in comedies—which could be threatening to male sexuality—might serve as flattery to the female audience, or as concern for actresses and prostitutes. Or it might be an entertainment for the male audience to see and hear sexual scenes performed by actresses.

Consequently, in Restoration comedies, the voice of female characters, especially those who claim their social rights or sexual liberties, has become more prevalent. Many Restoration heroines, in order to fulfill their desires, manipulate plots through disguises or intrigues. For example, the heroine of *The Gentleman Dancing Master* is a plot manipulator who uses her fiancé to find her lover, catch his attention, and have occasions to see him by outwitting her father and fiancé himself—so as to marry the man of her choice. Fidelia, in Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer* (1676), uses disguise to achieve her desire—in that

she follows her lover as a page and finally marries him. Women disguised so as to fulfill their desires have been a staple of comedies, as presented in a number of Shakespeare's plays. However, the scenes in which Restoration heroines played by women wear a male costume produce sexual titillation on the stage,⁷ as exemplified by the scene where Fidelity, while pretending to be a page, is in danger of being raped. The heroines in comedies, who manipulate plots through cross-dressing or intrigues achieve their marriages as they first wished—but with the addition of newly sexualized and gendered representations in the Restoration theatre.

III

So far, we have mainly discussed male dramatists' representations of desire in Restoration comedies, but now I will turn to analyzing the characteristics of the first female dramatist. Aphra Behn's *The Feign'd Curtizans* offers an example of a heroine whose disguise and intrigue enable her to express her desire. Cornelia, a heroine acted by Elizabeth Barry, urges her sister Marcella, who wishes to avoid a forced marriage, to run away from home with Cornelia and go to Rome disguised as prostitutes. The following conversation takes place between Marcella, who is reluctant to feign being a courtesan, and Cornelia who is trying to persuade Marcella into her intrigue:

MARCELLA I wou'd fain perswade my self to be of thy minde, —but the World, *Cornelia*—

CORNELIA Hang the malicious World—

MARCELLA And there's such charms in wealth and Honour too!

CORNELIA None half so powerfull as Love, in my opinion, life, Sister thou art beautifull, and hast a Fortune too, which before I wou'd lay out upon so shamefull a purchase as such a Bedfellow for life as *Octavio*; I wou'd turn errant keeping Curtizan, and buy my better fortune.

MARCELLA That word too startles me.

...

CORNELIA . . . a little impertinent Honour, we may chance to lose 'tis true, but our right down honesty, I perceive you are resolv'd we shall maintain through all the dangers of Love and Gallantry . . .

(*The Feign'd Curtizans*, II. i. 56–74)

Cornelia forcibly reproaches Marcella's care for 'the World,' or 'wealth and Honour.' Women of quality in comedies usually manage to maintain their 'wealth and Honour,' by which heroines are ironically tormented, who wish to refuse marriage forced upon them by pater-

nal figures for pecuniary reasons. Cornelia denounces Marcella's care by comparing marriage to a curious bargain, for it is 'so shamefull a purchase' that Marcella who 'hast a Fortune' is to marry a fiancé whom she does not love at all. Bargain, as a metaphor for marriage, is conventional, whether in Renaissance or Restoration dramas, and a woman with a fortune is usually described as a commodity. A courtesan in *The Rover*, for instance, states that a man is 'guilty of the same Mercenary Crime' as are prostitutes (*Rover*, II. i. 357), in that his marriage is motivated by a lady's fortune. Thus it seems generally accepted that it is as mercenary for a man to marry a woman for money as for a woman to offer her body for money.⁸ Cornelia, however, refers to a woman with a fortune as not 'an object' but 'a subject' in the bargain, though actually she lacks voice in the patriarchal marriage system. In this sense, a virgin who is designed to be a chaste wife commits 'the same Mercenary Crime' as do men of quality and prostitutes.

Cornelia, in persuading Marcella to avoid a forced marriage, implies the similarity between the state of virgins and that of prostitutes, by despising 'impertinent Honour' and laying stress on 'right down honesty.' Telling Marcella to be a feigned courtesan for this purpose, Cornelia expresses her idea of the prostitute's profession in her declaration that 'I wou'd turn errant keeping Curtizan, and buy my better Fortune.' Keeping a courtesan is a phrase used by a man who keeps a mistress, but this phrase, 'errant keeping Curtizan,' is given an unusual meaning by Cornelia. She will herself be an errant courtesan who marries, or even keeps, her lover. However, Cornelia's 'courtesan,' implying a prostitute who actually sells her body, eventually signifies a woman who has a fortune of her own. For her, there is no reason to say honourable wives are in a better state for women than honest mistresses, since obedient daughters and prostitutes, at all events, belong to the mercenary world.

Cornelia's viewpoint on honesty can be understood as a severe criticism of the honour or appearance that forces women to obey the rules which define the concept 'honourable' within a patriarchal society. The idea that honour is nonsense is frequently mentioned by heroines such as Cornelia, and its absurdity is shown by supporting female characters such as Lady Fidget. Willmore, the hero of *The Rover*, displays his loathing for women's honour, calling it 'that Foppery' (*Rover*, IV. i. 446). As he has 'layn with a Woman of Quality, who has all the while been railing at Whores' (*Rover*, IV. i. 261–62), he understands women's falseness under the veil of 'honour' as well as Horner

does. In Restoration comedies, the word 'honour' is used variously from sexual and social viewpoints as follows: the force that binds virgin daughters to the patriarchal system; the veil for indiscriminate sexual behaviour as pursued by adulterous wives; the plausible reason for men of quality to keep mistresses; the instrument which enables rake heroes to have affairs with unfaithful wives.

Honour, in any case, is closely associated with sexuality, especially women's, which indicates that, in the Restoration theatre, female sexuality, with the introduction of actresses, could become more appreciated as a social issue than before. Of course, players were generally considered in association with sexuality, since they, male or female, were not unfamiliar with whoring from the beginning. Not only Restoration actresses but also actors were subject to sexual advances, as Charles Hart, one of the greatest actors in this period, was kept by aristocratic ladies (Howe 35). Similarly, it was not unusual for actresses to be kept by male patrons, or closely connected with theatre personnel, not only for financial reasons but for the fulfillment of theatrical ambition. Among these actresses, some could win popularity as players, while being disdained as whores, and a few could gain great social power, as the stories of Elizabeth Barry or Nell Gwyn suggest. Female sexuality both on and off the stage was a matter of concern and interest, as the sexual activities of actresses' were frequently censured, while those of actors caused little public comments.⁹ Indeed, prostitutes, formerly objects in the sexual market, now, as actresses, came to acquire a power in society, what is called 'honourable' status, via their sexuality. Therefore, it is no wonder female sexuality is represented with complicated nuances on the stage, or that it is often associated with questions of 'honour.'

Prostitution in comedies is often called 'honourable' by both men who love or keep whores and virgins who are distressed by the patriarchal marriage system. Aphra Behn sometimes describes prostitutes as tragic heroines like discarded loves. So what is 'honour' to Behn's prostitutes? Angelica, a famous courtesan in *The Rover*, who 'never lov'd before, tho oft a Mistress' falls in love with the inconstant lover, Willmore (*Rover*, II. i. 380). She gives him her 'Virgin heart' and five hundred crowns that her 'Youth has earn'd from Sin' in return for his vow to love her, instead of demanding her price—one thousand crowns a month (*Rover*, IV. i. 230–34). She expresses her rage and sorrow at Willmore who has trampled down her 'Virgin heart' and attempted to marry a young virgin of quality with Angelica's money:

—But when Love held the Mirror, the undeceiving Glass
 Reflected all the weakness of my Soul, and made me know
 My richest treasure being lost, my Honour,
 All the remaining spoil cou'd not be worth
 The Conqueror's Care or Value.
 —Oh how I fell like a long worship'd Idol,
 Discovering all the Cheat.
 Wou'd not the Incense and rich Sacrifice,
 Which blind Devotion offer'd at my Altars,
 Have fall'n to thee?
 Why wou'dst thou then destroy my fancy'd pow'r.

(*The Rover*, V. i. 268–78)

Angelica has been living in luxury as if she were of noble birth, by receiving pecuniary aid or rich presents from her customers at the expense of her 'Honour,' her virginity. In exchange for her virginity, she gains power as 'a long worship'd Idol,' which gives her such pride as to demand an extravagant price for her body.¹⁰ Her power, however, is disclosed to be a 'fancy'd pow'r,' which is readily destroyed by Willmore, and Angelica herself understands well that 'Honour,' which seems to have given her the power to be rich, involves her 'richest treasure being lost' forever. Angelica, though leading a lady-like life, is a prostitute, that is, a figure designed not to value chastity but to satisfy male sexual desire under the structure where male sexuality is divided. Her desire to love and be loved by a single man must also be possessed by virgins who will be virtuous wives. Tormented for her sexual role in the social system, Angelica is driven away into obscurity, or darkness in a metaphorical sense, at the close.¹¹

As we have seen, 'honour' signifies various meanings concerned with female sexuality. William Wycherley's usage of 'honour' mainly indicates appearance, as Lady Fidget and Horner value or abuse it for their love affairs, and it acts as a man's reason for keeping a wench. On the other hand, Aphra Behn's 'honour' is diversified: Cornelia considers 'honour' as that which causes a woman of fortune to commit a mercenary crime; Willmore censures it as women's falseness; Angelica laments her loss of physical 'honour' or virginity, but, instead, asserts her inner one or 'Virgin Heart.' With the appearance of Behn in the theatre, female sexuality, as well as the meanings of 'honour,' were complicated; that is, its definition cannot be drawn clearly. Nor can the female categories, such as ladies or prostitutes,

wives or mistresses.

IV

As we have seen, in the Restoration theatre, female sexuality is intricately represented by the actresses, in the figures of lady-like prostitutes or prostitute-like ladies. The pursuit of sexual activities, which causes a confusion of female status in the theatrical space, is performed in a situation where persons are disguised by masks or costumes, or in darkness which veils persons' identities. Darkness was natural to the theatrical order in the Restoration period, before the era of gas or electric lamps. Neither the lights from above or the sides, nor the footlights, the most effective lights, offered enough illumination to throw light on the centre of the stage, much less the box or gallery (Picard 215–16).

The settings or plots in which darkness has an effect are easily produced from the structure of the buildings. This real obscurity is linked with fictional darkness in which a person acting on the stage can not be clearly identified—which functions well as a stage effect. Aphra Behn often uses mistaken identification caused by disguises, masks, and darkness. For example, in *The Feign'd Curtizans*, misrecognition and confusion of persons in the dark happen incessantly, as its subtitle, *A Nights Intrigue* suggests. Heroines take advantage of confusions from darkness as well as disguises and masks in order to fulfill their wishes. The mask functions as a disguise for a woman and sometimes for a man as an instrument for veiling his imprudence: 'whatever Extravagances we commit in These Faces, our own may not be oblig'd to answer 'em' (*Rover*, II. i. 3–4). Often, in comedies, such as *The Rovers* or *The Feign'd Curtizans*, we find scenes where persons are reluctant to be discovered when lights are brought in, or by losing their masks. However, male sexual activities, whether in disguise or not, are not usually censured on the stage—where men's double-directed desires are performed. On the contrary, sexual desire expressed in a woman's behaviour, especially that of a lady heroine, threatens not only the desire itself but also the agent of the desire, unless she is veiled by a mask, a disguise, or by darkness. When expressing female desire, women should be anonymous personae in disguise.

Female desire, concerned with virginity and chastity, must be secured and controlled by the patriarchal system, and many of the heroines or wives are confined by their fathers or husbands. Women

of quality, designed to occupy the position of a chaste wife, need to be anonymous personae when they wish to pursue their own desires in violation of this system. Cornelia risks her own honour and her sister's by running away from home and arranging for them to disguise themselves as courtesans so as to fulfill their wishes. In response to her sister's fear of failure, Cornelia answers that 'if all these if's and or's come to pass, we have no more to do than advance in this same glorious Profession,' with 'a thousand Satisfactions' rather than lead 'a dull virtuous Life,' as the wife in a loveless match (*FC*, II. i. 88–90). Her statement seems to be a radical one, but it is in the subjunctive mood that Cornelia insists that women with the personae of prostitutes could obtain, physically and mentally, pleasures and satisfactions. For Cornelia, to be a feigned courtesan indicates that she has adopted the temporary persona of a prostitute, which, like darkness or a mask, can be utilized in order to confuse identification. She does not mean that women can pursue their desires physically and mentally with transparent personae, but that anonymous personae offer women chances, for a while, to try their fortune. Cornelia, by good fortune, will be wedded to her lover, as a conventional comic heroine, with her chastity preserved. In the process of her intrigue, she has been recognized as a courtesan by her lover, so, she must 'promise to be the most Mistriss-like wife' at the end (*FC*, V. i. 708–9). Cornelia, as a wife, will use the persona of mistress as occasion requires.

Most of the comic heroines put on anonymous personae, at some stage, in following not the paternal order but their own wishes. Prostitutes, on the other hand, cannot be said to acquire anonymous personae, when they are not identified in the dark while expressing and pursuing their sexual desires as lady heroines do. Their evident personae were obtained at first via their virginity, which have given them a means to live, sometimes fashionably or luxuriously, like Behn's lady-like prostitutes, who have acquired a large fortune through their professional lives. But their personae, which certify that their bodies are the social device for supporting the structure of male sexuality, also make them confused, as Angelica in love insists on her 'Virgin heart' instead of her virgin body. Prostitutes in *The Rovers* are both involved in an amorous triangle, but represented differently in their means for pursuing both profession and love. While Angelica offers her body, heart, and money for Willmore's love, La Nuche refuses to deal with him following the manner of prostitutes. Angelica is discarded by Willmore who chooses to marry a girl with a fortune;

on the other hand, La Nuche, as it were, wins in the love triangle. Until the end of the love struggle, La Nuche is tormented like Angelica, because she loves Willmore in her inmost feelings, though she always refuses him:

LA NUCHE . . . I 'gainst Nature studying thy dull precepts; and to be base and infamously rich, have barter'd all the joys of human Life—oh give me Love! I will be poor and Love!

PETRONELLA She's lost—but hear me—

LA NUCHE I won't, from Childhood thou hast trained me up in cunning, read Lectures to me of the use of Man, but kept me from the knowledge of the right; taught me to jilt, to flatter and deceive, and hard it was to learn th'ungrateful Lessons: but oh how soon plain Nature taught me Love! and show'd me all the cheat of thy false Tenets—no—give me Love with any other Curse.

(The Second Part of the Rover, IV. i. 356–65)

In suffering anguish caused by her love for Willmore, La Nuche curses the education for prostitution that she has been given, which offers a remarkable contrast with Angelica's curse on Willmore's unfaithfulness to her 'Virgin heart.' La Nuche, though she expresses an aversion to her trade, understands and practices her profession much better than Angelica who yields up her body, heart and even money to Willmore. La Nuche almost falls into a similar condition to Angelica's, in that she wishes 'I will be poor and Love,' at which her bawd, Petronella, remarks: 'She's lost.' However, La Nuche's confusion, on this occasion, is resolved by Petronella, who think 'Love! forbid it Heaven' (*Rover*, 2, IV. i. 351), for love will not maintain them. Persuaded by her teacher, La Nuche returns to her profession, with the words, 'I will be rul'd—I will be wise, be rich . . . and I'll submit to Interest' (*Rover*, 2, IV. i. 388–91). This might be the effect of her education given from childhood to prepare her as an accomplished professional in a mercenary world, where there is no means to live for a person who wishes 'to be poor and Love.' Her education has offered her a means of living, but, simultaneously, made her a device for satisfying male sexual pleasure. 'Nature' is referred to twice as the opponent of education and the profession that La Nuche has practiced, or, further, as the opponent of the social structure itself, which allows double-directed male sexual desires.

At the ending of this comedy, La Nuche can fulfill her wish 'to be poor and Love,' by giving up pursuing money as a courtesan and receiving Willmore's love and desire. This final victory of love is quite different from a conventional comic ending, in that La Nuche

will not be a wife or a prostitute but 'live and starve by turns as fortune pleases' with Willmore (*Rover*, 2, V. i. 504). This conclusion for La Nuche and Willmore may, in a sense, threaten the structure of male sexual desire or the social system. Closely tied by love and desire, their choice is apparently considered a happy ending, but a woman who is neither a wife nor a prostitute cannot be socially recognized.¹² In short, La Nuche does not obtain an acceptable persona physically and mentally, even in her final triumph. What this reveals is that women cannot have nor gain their sexual desires with transparent personae in a society where two kinds of sexual desire are pursued. The structure of these desires contradictorily offers to La Nuche and Willmore necessities, pleasures and sufferings. The denouement for La Nuche and Willmore may be a threat to the male, and it is not ideal for the female. The love that 'plain Nature taught' La Nuche can be regarded as a question posed to this structuring of desires. This might be the point where sexuality intersects with nature and society or culture, but La Nuche offers a large darkness in the theatre, as her name can be identified with the Spanish word 'noche,' meaning 'night' in English.

V

Aphra Behn's representations of the prostitute heroine, La Nuche, showed the possibility and limitation of pursuing female sexual desire under the social system which regulates the sexualities of both sexes. Though the content of the play exposes its limit, the performance of La Nuche by Elizabeth Barry complexly colours the dramatic heroine, carried by the image of the actress. Barry was known as a mistress of the Earl of Rochester who had a great influence in the theatre. He gave her the training to be a successful actress, however, 'as Rochester's care for her acting changed into love,' he begged her to leave the stage. In due course, she had a child by him, but their relationship broke up 'with jealousy on both sides' (Todd 193). Barry, though she had a child, had no intention of abandoning her work, by which she achieved popularity and received insults. When the 'women's wages were significantly lower than the man's' in the theatre (Howe 27), it was no wonder that an actress who found an aristocratic patron to keep her retired from the stage, as Nell Gwyn did. In this respect, it was unusual for Barry to pursue her career as a professional actress. Barry's image, concerned with her profession and love affairs,

could be identified with La Nuچه's. The fact cannot be missed that the theatrical space itself offers such multiple or ambiguous images as La Nuچه involved in the reality and the dramatic plot. Theatres, as well as parks and festival spaces, were the place where men and women looked for each other or whores picked out their customers (Bullough 173). In this space, the distinction between prostitutes and women of fashion came to be blurred, when prostitutes played ladies, or ladies played prostitutes by pursuing sexual pleasure as performed on the stage, with masks on.

Like Elizabeth Barry, Aphra Behn was a woman who pursued her profession, enjoying and simultaneously suffering from her author's vocation, receiving insults as a prostitute.¹³ In the Restoration theatre, we have seen that female sexuality or social status cannot be definitely distinguished. Aphra Behn, in the prologue to her debut, utilizes the unclear distinction of women:

The Poetess too, they say, has spyes abroad,
Which have dispos'd themselves in every road,
I'th'upper Box, Pit, Galleries, every face
You find disguis'd, in a black Velvet-Case.
My life on't, is her Spy on purpose sent,
To hold you in a wanton Compliment;
That so you may not censure what she's writ,
Which done, they'le face you down 'twas full of wit.

(*The Forc'd Marriage*, Prologue 27–34)

Aphra Behn implies the link between herself and prostitutes, by describing them as 'her Spy' 'dispos'd' everywhere in the theatre, even in the upper box. They all put on 'a black Velvet-Case,' that is, a mask, the sign of a prostitute. However, it came to be fashionable for female theatre-goers to wear or hold an oval mask (Picard 216), and under the dim lights, the distinction of the female, whether ladies or prostitutes, became obscured or confused, as happened on the stage. In the darkness of the theatre where identifications were hard to make, a female playwright, actresses, prostitutes and ladies confusingly coexisted. In such a theatrical situation of ambiguous female personae, Aphra Behn developed various dramatic plots by producing different images of prostitutes on the stage, overlapping them with the actresses or, on occasion, the playwright herself. The actresses' performances drew not only sensual laughter from their images of prostitutes but also serious sympathy for honest or positive attitudes in their sexual and social lives. It is in this specific space where reality and

fictionality were crossing that Behn tried to express experimentally the possibilities of female sexuality under the sexual structure which allows the men of quality to practice double-directed desires. From her attempts, the possibilities and impossibilities for women of pursuing their sexual desires in the Restoration period can appear. However, what we cannot dismiss is that *La Nuche's* night, covering the whole space of the theatre, poses questions to the dominant social ideology that categorizes female positions, and poses them also to male anxiety itself.

Notes

* This article is a revised version of the paper read at the 68th General Meeting of the English Literary Society of Japan at Risho University on May 26, 1996.

¹ *The Forc'd Marriage*, acted in 1670, is recognized as Aphra Behn's first play. The life of Aphra Behn, however, has been so poorly recorded that her image has been constructed from her works, with numerous contradictions in her sexual, political, or religious positions. Regarded as a playwright, poetess, novelist, political propagandist, translator and even as a spy, she has recently aroused feminist interest. Janet Todd edited the complete works of Aphra Behn and wrote her biography, entitled *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn*.

² Elizabeth Howe, examining the first English actresses in the forms and contents of Restoration dramas, refers to 'feminist' comedy and 'sexist' tragedy, in which 'the sexuality of the actress was exploited' (173–76). They were usually represented as 'object of desire,' given sexual rhetoric and performance in comedies, or rape scenes in tragedies (37–55).

³ Elizabeth Barry was evidently regarded as a mistress of the Earl of Rochester, and 'in December 1677, Barry bore Rochester a child' (Janet Todd 193). On the other hand, Aphra Behn's sexual life is almost unknown. Catherine Gallagher in her *Nobody's Story* analyzes Aphra Behn's metaphor of the prostitute. Gallagher describes how Behn makes use of slander from male opponents that she is actually a 'whore,' and how she attracts the audience in the theatre who want to see a 'real whore' in public. I am much indebted to this analysis, but my concern is subtly different from hers. I would like to elucidate how far Behn's strategy works, that is, how it is restricted to the socio-cultural context of the Restoration period, through examining the relation between male and female desires represented in the texts.

⁴ The word 'honour' is used frequently and most variously in the comedies of this period; it means, for example, chastity, virginity, courtesy, ornament, and good name, as *OED* records. *OED* also indicate its allegiance to some conventional standard of conduct. According to the conventional standard of conduct observed, or, in a sense, enjoyed by the persons of the upper class in the late sev-

enteenth century, 'honour' should not necessarily imply sexual control. On the sexual standard in the upper classes, see Bullough 157–87.

⁵ Margery was acted by Elizabeth Boutell who was famous for her 'ability to portray innocence and purity,' owing to her childish appearance, and also infamous for her sexual looseness (Howe 57; 75). The relations between the dramatic character and the actress playing it could let the audience recognize reality and enjoy the performance, which might lead to the theatrical success of the play.

⁶ Roberts, by analyzing the female audience and patronage in the Restoration theatre, shows that women's fashionable concerns, for better or worse, arouse theatrical interest in producing plays, especially, comedies. See Roberts 127–65. The playwrights ought to be sensitive to the tastes of the audience in order to keep their plays running, since they 'were paid the receipts (above the house charges) for the third day's performance of their plays' (Catherine Gallagher 10).

⁷ Cross-dressing boy actors in the Renaissance were a target of censure by the Puritans for fear of homosexual eroticism being aroused in the theatres. In the Restoration theatre, the actresses' wearing men's clothes amounted to a sexual device for 'outlining the actress's hips, buttocks and legs, usually concealed by a skirt' (Howe 56).

⁸ In *The Ladies Dictionary*, published in 1694 for the women of quality, 'prostitutes' are assaulted because 'they will for good Victuals, or for a very small piece of Money, prostitute their Bodies, and . . . they are dexterous in picking of pockets' (421). They are attacked as 'mercenary whores,' rather than 'wantons.'

⁹ The actress was an object of male sexual desire on and off the stage, as she 'displayed herself on the public stage,' and she was watched dressing behind the scenes 'for regulations against backstage visitors were ineffectual' (Howe 32–33).

¹⁰ Anita Pacheco, in analyzing a rape culture in *The Rover* where a virgin and a courtesan are treated equally as whores, regards Angelica's exalted price as a recreation of the 'physical unattainability of the chaste Petrarchan lady' for the purpose of 'compensating for her loss of chastity' (335–36).

¹¹ Aphra Behn presents another image of prostitutes in *The Revenge*. Corina is a woman, who was corrupted by Wellman and has been a faithful mistress to him. On learning of his betrayal, her passionate love makes her wish his death before he marries a young virgin of quality. Her plots are foiled in the end, but Wellman is reconciled with her and marries her off as his sister to a gentleman. Corina, at last, becomes an actual lady and wife. However, in the process of the play, Corina is represented not as a courtesan but as a discarded love, who is distressed by her lover or almost raped by a trickster.

¹² *The Ladies Dictionary* divides women into four categories according to sexual criterion: virgins, wives, and widows, on the one hand, who are expected to stay in the private or domestic space; prostitutes, on the other hand, who are usually seen in public. Prostitutes, identified with 'wantons,' include common whores and private mistresses (466). Unless women have the title of virgins, wives, or widows, they are soon labeled as prostitutes. However, what separates wives from private mistresses, that is, prostitutes, is a 'lawful' and 'solemn Contract' (350). In this distinction, no sexual factor is suggested.

¹³ In addition to Aphra Behn's metaphor of the prostitute, Marta Straznicky mentions another identification with actresses, in that 'all three [female dramatists, prostitutes and actresses] perform public roles and trade in pleasure' (711), in the

analysis of the limitations of the female writer as a professional in public and as an amateur in private.

Bibliography

- Behn, Aphra. *The Works of Aphra Behn*. Ed. Janet Todd. 7 vols. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992–96.
- Bullough, Vern, and Bonnie Bullough. *Women and Prostitution: A Social History*. New York: Prometheus Books, 1987.
- Carlson, Susan. *Women and Comedy: Rewriting the British Theatrical Tradition*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991.
- Chernaik, Warren. *Sexual Freedom in Restoration Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Copeland, Nancy. ‘“Once a whore and ever?” Whore and Virgin in *The Rover* and its Antecedents.’ *Restoration* 16. 1 (1992):20–27.
- Duffy, Maureen. *The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn 1640–89*. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel*. New York: Vintage Books, 1984.
- Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace 1670–1820*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.
- Gill, Pat. *Interpreting Ladies: Women, Wit, and Morality in the Restoration Comedy of Manners*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1994.
- Holland, Peter. *The Ornament of Action: Text and Performance in Restoration Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Howe, Elizabeth. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Hutner, Heidi, ed. *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993.
- Ladies Dictionary, The. Being a General Entertainment For the Fair Sex*. London, 1694.
- Pacheco, Anita. ‘Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*.’ *ELH* 65 (1998):323–45.
- Paglia, Camille. *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1988.
- Pearson, Jacqueline. *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women & Women Dramatists 1642-1737*. New York: St. Martin's, 1988.
- Picard, Liza. *Restoration London: From Poverty to Pets, from Medicine to Magic, from Slang to Sex, from Wallpaper to Women's Rights*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Roberts, David. *The Ladies: Female Patronage of Restoration Drama, 1660–1700*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.
- Straznicky, Marta. ‘Restoration Women Playwrights and the Limits of Professionalism.’ *ELH* 64 (1997):703–26.
- Todd, Janet. *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn*. New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1996.
- Wycherley, William. *The Complete Plays of William Wycherley*. Ed. W. C. Ward. London: Unwin, 1888.

- . *The Country Wife*. Ed. John Dixon Hunt. London: A & C Black
- . *The Plain Dealer*. Ed. James L. Smith. London: Ernest Benn Limited.

Women's Reading and Creation in *Northanger Abbey*

Megumi Sato

Jane Austen describes a literary space considerably restricted in place and class. As she herself puts it in a letter, '3 or 4 Families in a Country Village is the very thing to work on.'¹ It has been noted, however, that she was not unaware of the social changes and movements in her day and delicately depicted them in her works.² She lived during the Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution, and the Napoleonic Wars, when the power of the middle class greatly altered the social situation, especially of women. Wealth contributed to the rise of a female reading public, along with the flood of sentimental and Gothic novels and the emergence of circulating libraries. Richard D. Altick remarks that the library was 'destined shortly to complete the triangle whose other legs were the expanded middle-class audience and the new fascination of the novel.'³ From a moralistic viewpoint, however, they were thought of as degrading social morals and having a bad influence on young girls' minds. Austen also deals with such problems concerning women and reading in her works.

Although posthumously published together with *Persuasion* in 1817, *Northanger Abbey* is generally regarded as Austen's earliest major work and linked to the *Juvenilia* because of its burlesque of popular novels. This work is often said to be a fiction of fictions. Of all her novels, it is most concerned with the problems of women and reading. The story describes how an inexperienced heroine is absorbed in popular Gothic romances, confuses the real with fiction, but finally awakens to the difference. Unlike those romances, the novel displays no world of unusual illusions. As early as 1815, Sir Walter Scott recognized in his review that, in place of the splendid scenes of an imaginary world of the old romance, Austen presents ordinary walks of life in an innovative style.⁴ In a recent study, James Thompson also argues

for Austen's position in literary history as that of a great innovator; her work marks the transition from eighteenth- to nineteenth-century fiction, in terms of the comparison between political economy and the novel.⁵ More distinctly, Austen depicts the social situation in the middle class during the period: its unfixed, mobile state and the resulting economic friction. In this essay I would like to analyse the problems concerning women and reading in *Northanger Abbey*, focusing upon the conversation exchanged among characters in each of its locations, and finally to demonstrate the manifold construction of fiction and the issues involving women and creation revealed through the act of reading.

I

Northanger Abbey has often been analyzed as Austen's defence and criticism of novels, partly because characters display their own tastes for reading, partly because the narrator defends novels and introduces a young lady's shame at novel-reading. The heroine, Catherine Morland, is presented in the playful mockery of the opening lines as an anti-type of the standard central figure in sentimental and Gothic novels:

No one who had ever seen Catherine Morland in her infancy, would have supposed her born to be an heroine. Her situation in life, the character of her father and mother, her own person and disposition, were all equally against her. . . . She had a thin awkward figure, a sallow skin without colour, dark lank hair, and strong features;—so much for her person;—and not less unpropitious for heroism seemed her mind.⁶

Upon such a girl, according to the narrator, reading had a great influence in training her as a heroine. From fifteen to seventeen, Catherine 'read all such works as heroines must read to supply their memories with those quotations which are so serviceable and so soothing in the vicissitudes of their eventful lives'(3). The works listed read like an anthology of poetry—from Pope, Gray, Thompson, and Shakespeare, some of them misquoted. This could suggest the insufficiency of her education; yet 'Something must and will happen to throw a hero in her way'(5), and it is the Allens' invitation to Bath that provides the opportunity for her to reach 'the true heroic height'(4). There she is influenced by Gothic novel-reading and comes to equate the real with what she has read. From these descriptions, Catherine's story might seem to be merely Austen's criticism of contemporary morals. Barbara

M. Benedict, though, points out that Austen criticizes not only contemporary novels but also literary collections and series.⁷ When these descriptions are more minutely examined in connection with other characteristics of the context, however, some new aspects in this work will become clear beyond the problems concerning Austen's criticism of the contemporary literary vogue for novels and anthologies, namely, women's reading and creativity.

It has been generally thought that there are two main scenes in *Northanger Abbey*: Bath in the first half, and Northanger; and that a great gulf lies between them. The analyses seem to have concentrated rather more on the episodes in Northanger, than those in Bath. More surprisingly, there is little consideration of those scenes set in Fullerton and Woodston. The volume of critical study is small in proportion to the length of the descriptions, yet I think that these places are also intended to have their decisive significance. Fullerton is Catherine's home village; Woodston is her hero Henry Tilney's parish and will become her home after their marriage. Although only five chapters take place there, the first two and the last three, Fullerton presents itself as the frame for this work, where the story begins and ends.

Catherine lives with her family in the parsonage of the fictional village of Fullerton in Wiltshire. At the opening, the various characters of its inhabitants are introduced with an emphasis on their plainness. In contrast with the implications of the names, 'fuller-ton,' 'mor-land,' 'all-en,' the village appears to represent an infertility, as Terry Castle indicates, one fraught with negative words in the descriptions.⁸ There Catherine has been confronted with no representative patriarchal figure: her father, who has no direct speech, seems to be largely absent through the work and leaves only a faint impression on us; Mr. Allen, the chief landowner, cannot be a literal father because he has no children and no heir. Furthermore, this world represents itself as one of wordlessness and silence, where the residents exchange little conversation. Catherine, therefore, must leave such a world as 'a picture of intellectual poverty'(59) to gain some experience as a heroine. In the worlds of Bath and Northanger, a naive and socially inexperienced young girl learns to know the social through enjoying conversation with other characters and meeting with a tyrannical father, General Tilney.

There is a striking contrast concerning the heroine's discourse throughout the work: her inquiries during the repetitive conversation in Bath, and her muteness at the last. The urban society of expendi-

ture overflows with products of novelty for which people have a passion, and under the improved systems of publication and transportation ideas or thoughts flood the market as commodities. There Catherine is caught within the circulation of conversation. Away from that boisterous place, she next gets down to some detective-like work in search of something strange at Northanger, but she is also caught within the desire structures of a man of economic sense, who has a modern taste for new goods and an urgency for intelligence. Confined in commercialization, finally she falls silent, yet I think it is this silence itself which Jane Austen invests with significance in *Northanger Abbey*. Angus Fletcher comments on some related features of silence and thought in the mid to late eighteenth century, exemplifying them from Gray, Sterne, Goethe, and Mozart; he then infers that silence plays a remarkable part in the growth of pre-Romantic attitudes to the saleability of thought, and that the Romantic authors aspire towards 'the voice of thought.'⁹ I shall examine the meaning of silence in the story of a woman's reading and inventing fictions through imagination, but first contextualize in detail Catherine's features and attempts at conversation or perception.

II

Catherine is invited to visit Bath by the Allens, where they will go for Mr. Allen's gouty constitution. In the late eighteenth century Bath was still one of the most famous and popular resorts, with a hot spring whose waters were thought to be able to cure patients suffering from various diseases including gout and infertility. In addition, circulating libraries were well known at that time, and there were ten bookstores with libraries by the end of the century, one of which had more than five hundred monthly subscribers.¹⁰ The life in Bath supplied many amusements for the visitors who were crowded there from all walks of life. Catherine is absorbed in reading popular Gothic novels, and becomes acquainted with the Thorpes, a newly-rising lawyer's family, and the Tilneys, a family of great property and means. This urban space is a crucible for widely various layers of the middle classes, one where they enjoy the society of amusement and consumption, and negotiate for love and marriage sustained by a sense of family economics.

The Allens are Catherine's guardians in Bath, and are thus *in loco parentis*, but, in fact, they take no responsibility for her. Mrs. Allen

does not fill the role of chaperone and devotes herself only to clothing. She cannot introduce Catherine to any acquaintances, nor any subjects of conversation, other than concerning garments, until they meet with Mrs. Thorpe. When they go to the Upper Rooms, all she can do is to repeat to Catherine, 'I wish you could dance, my dear, —I wish you could get a partner' (8). The following conversation is most remarkable:

'How uncomfortable it is,' whispered Catherine, 'not to have a single acquaintance here!'

'Yes, my dear,' replied Mrs. Allen, with perfect serenity, 'it is very uncomfortable indeed.'

'What shall we do? . . .'

' . . . I wish we had a large acquaintance here.'

'I wish we had *any*;— it would be somebody to go to.'

'Very true, my dear; and if we knew anybody we would join them directly. . . .'

'Had not we better go away as it is?—Here are no tea things for us, you see.'

'No more there are, indeed. —How very provoking! But I think we had better sit still, for one gets so tumbled in such a crowd! How is my head, my dear?—Somebody gave me a push that has hurt it I am afraid.'

'No, indeed, it looks very nice.—But, dear Mrs Allen, are you sure there is nobody you know in all this multitude of people? I think you *must* know somebody.'

'I don't upon my word—I wish I did. I wish I had a large acquaintance here with all my heart. . . .'

(9-10)

Thus they do not exchange conversation but circulate the subject unproductively without any new information useful to readers and any motive to develop the plot, for we have been already informed of this fact by the narrator. Therefore, Catherine has to learn to converse with others without any chaperone or mediator. Park Honan states that Bath becomes 'a place of social talk in which Catherine learns . . . the very difficulty of intuiting human character in a society in which men and women shield themselves with words.'¹¹

Catherine comes to have social intercourse through the association with the Thorpes and the Tilneys; but it is soon shown that other conversations between characters there also lack genuine interchange and development. The narrator informs us of an exchange between Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Thorpe, who has 'one great advantage as a talker, over Mrs. Allen, in a family of children' (17):

[S]he [Mrs. Allen] spent the chief of it by the side of Mrs. Thorpe, in what

they called conversation, but in which there was scarcely ever any exchange of opinion, and not often any resemblance of subject, for Mrs. Thorpe talked chiefly of her children, and Mrs. Allen of her gowns. (21)

Between Catherine and Isabella Thorpe, there is an important long conversation about Gothic novel-reading, which, according to the narrator, is given 'as a specimen of their very warm attachment, and of the delicacy, discretion, originality of thought, and literary taste which marked the reasonableness of that attachment' (22-23). Yet it soon turns out that Isabella's knowledge is superficial and relies on her friend, a Miss Andrews, and that her mind is really captivated by men. She is merely borrowing another's opinion about the subject and in turn supplies it to Catherine, as if she borrowed the horrid novels from a circulating library and the books were then borrowed by another's hands. John Thorpe is interested in only his gig and horses, and brags about them importunately.

On the other hand, Eleanor and Henry Tilney differ from these other characters in their conversation with Catherine: Eleanor's role as a useful responder and Henry's as a confident instructor. Irene Collins notes how the people Austen admires in her novels can all speak effectively, and that the ability to communicate openly and easily is important in the circumstances of life, while shyness, embarrassment and reserve are exiled from conversations between the admired characters who have true feelings for others.¹² Catherine enjoys a true companionship with the Tilneys in open and friendly conversation, but the relationship between them is firmly fixed: the questioner and the answerer, the instructor and the instructed. These one-sided conversations cannot allow them perfectly to be saved from the characteristics of repetition and circulation, lacking exchange, for Catherine's knowledge and information depend not on her own perception but on her acceptance of others' views.

Repetitiousness and unproductiveness, as has been stated above, characterize the conversations between characters in Bath. They repeat the same subjects, parrot the other's words, circulate other's opinions, and reiterate questions or instructions. There Catherine comes to be involved within such social conversations, and misjudges the true natures of the people through conversing with them. Marilyn Butler notes that it is never the heroine herself but only the reader who is enlightened by the conversations in Bath.¹³ As for Catherine, it is her questions that are distinctive in her speech. She uses them as a means for gaining what she desires to know. This is clear from

Henry's indication in his conversation with her, when Isabella, who is engaged to her brother James Morland, flirts with his brother Captain Tilney:

After a short pause, Catherine resumed with 'Then you do not believe Isabella so very much attached to my brother?'

'I can have no opinion on that subject.'

'But what can your brother mean? If he knows her engagement, what can he mean by his behaviour?'

'You are a very close questioner.'

'Am I?—I only ask what I want to be told.'

'But do you only ask what I can be expected to tell?'

'Yes, I think so; for you must know your brother's heart.'

'My brother's heart . . . I assure you I can only guess at.'

'Well?'

'Well!—Nay, if it is to be guess-work, let us all guess for ourselves. To be guided by second-hand conjecture is pitiful. . . .' (119)

Catherine's knowledge of the environment and other people's feelings is reliant not on her own recognitions but entirely on others' opinions. Her cognitive world in Bath has been organized at second hand: she manages to gain and judge information about the objects of her curiosity through the medium of questions in conversation, as well as by projecting what she has read upon the outside world. Her consciousness is wholly absorbed in reading and quoting the texts of popular Gothic novels and the speeches of others. Catherine's situation is said to be that of a passive knower in the urban space of circulation and consumption, and she cannot create her own perception about the true circumstance and others' feelings, or talk with her own language without borrowing others', as if her self were involved and consumed as an object within the circulation.¹⁴ When Catherine enters the next stage at Northanger, however, some differences arise in her situation as a reader and understander, which I shall consider in the following section.

III

While Catherine's questions characterize her speech in the repetitious conversations of Bath, she comes to attempt self-perception through her own examination, or rather imagination into circumstances at Northanger — for she has been cautioned by Henry against second-hand conjecture. The thrilling words 'Northanger Abbey' lead her fancy to the highest point, and she expects the place to be an illusionary world of the supernatural and unusual just as in Gothic novels. On

the way to Northanger, there is a crucial conversation between her and Henry in his curricle, where he invents and teasingly tells a burlesque Gothic tale: an isolated gloomy chamber, an ancient housekeeper, a secret subterranean communication, hidden sheets of manuscript, and an extinguished lamp. It could be thought to be the counterpart of Catherine's follies at Northanger Abbey, as Butler indicates:

The memory of Henry's intelligent detachment in this conversation lingers as an unspoken commentary on Catherine's series of interior monologues at Northanger—while she searches her room, or lies terror-stricken in bed, or concocts wild fantasies concerning the General and the death of Mrs. Tilney.¹⁵

It is recollected as a mockery of her silliness, but it has a similar effect on her as the texts from her novel-reading in Bath. His story enables her imagination to provide a direct occasion for her practice of reading fictional events in the Abbey. She fancies that there must be something strange, but eventually finds nothing but the modern world ruled by the General's rational and efficient philosophy of economics. Yet her mistaken consciousness still continues to devote itself to reading text-like fictions in life, so her thought-process is described as consisting of a series of false perceptions. Debra Malina analyzes how the absent mother of the Tilneys seems to Catherine to demand interpretation and to be read as a text, and that she takes on that title herself in marrying into the family after she has invested much in the detective work she undertakes.¹⁶

Catherine has been captured within a fictional world created by her own imagination and cannot perceive the real rightly. Thus her situation as a reader and knower in Northanger can be said to reflect the moralistic criticism of the novel's harmful effects on a young woman in those days, but Austen's true intention here does not seem simply to depict this, because Austen herself is writing a novel of manners. What Austen throws into sharp relief is the issue of women and creativity closely connected with that of women's reading. Though Catherine reads Gothic novels literally and relies on others' conjectures through the conversation in Bath, in Northanger she attempts a practical reading of the world as a text—with her own detective research. In other words, her attempt could be thought to be Catherine's creation of fiction by first-hand's perception or interpretation of the text-like world. The heroine's state may be regarded as a doubling of the author herself who is a woman reader and creator of

fiction.

Despite the rise of female readers and writers, women's acts of creating fiction had been invested with a more vicious image than had reading fiction in the patriarchal society and literary world of the period. The image of women writers who put their own created texts into circulation was thought to be analogous to that of professional women who sold their own bodies and were consumed by male desire. In his conversation with Catherine about the style of letter-writing, Henry describes the faults of female composition: 'A general deficiency of subject, a total inattention to stops, and a very frequent ignorance of grammar' (13). When Catherine's creative acts and her fiction are disclosed to Henry, therefore, he severely instructs her about how horrid is the image her fancy has created and what a mistake her act of inventing fiction in the real has been:

'If I understand you rightly, you had formed a surmise of such horror as I have hardly words to—Dear Miss Morland, consider the dreadful nature of the suspicions you have entertained. What have you been judging from? Remember the country and the age in which we live. Remember that we are English, that we are Christians. Consult your own understanding, your own sense of the probable, your own observation of what is passing around you—Does our education prepare us for such atrocities? Do our laws connive at them? Could they be perpetrated without being known, in a country like this . . . where roads and newspapers lay every thing open? Dearest Miss Morland, what ideas have you been admitting?'
(159)

The repetition of these unanswerable questions makes her wake completely from 'The visions of romance' (159). So she runs off shedding tears of shame. His instruction brings to her the sudden recognition of a reality away from her fiction, and it forms a censure of Catherine as a reader, knower, and creator. She is apparently released from her confinement within fiction—created by the influence of what she has read in Bath and the practice of reading in Northanger—at the price of sacrificing her subjectivity, but another fictional world has already been set up for her: that of General Tilney.

What the General represents has been thought to link with the contemporary social and political conditions. His tyrannical behaviour has been related politically to the shadow of the French Revolution and the riots in England during the 1790's.¹⁷ Northanger Abbey is a place ruled by 'parental tyranny' (205), and no other work by Austen has a father of such strong patriarchal power. His estate is a manifestation of

his passion for novelty quite different from what Catherine has expected from her reading. His taste for novel commodities, as Tony Tanner notices, has often been associated with 'a symptom of the new consumer urge of the age and the crass material instinct for competitive emulation it spawned.'¹⁸ Moreover, his enormous enclosed kitchen garden with hot-houses producing one hundred pine fruits a year shows another of his aspects as a producer.¹⁹ The General is absorbed in the pursuit of his family's economic stability and further rise, so he earnestly reads pamphlets to sense such dangerous movements in the society as may result in the loss of property; he makes his sons engage in the professions, and attempts to have one marry an heiress in order to reinforce the family's economic position. Thus Catherine becomes 'the peculiar object of the General's curiosity, and his own speculations' (199), when he believes John Thorpe's false information that she is an heiress.

Thanks to this false information Catherine is captured as an object to fulfill the General's desire, and so he brings her into Northanger to be Henry's partner. She is, as it were, involved unawares and confined within the fiction created by male desire—originally John's and subsequently the General's. Now she becomes not a subject but an object of reading and creating fiction. When the fiction implanted in the General's mind is dispelled because the original author enlightens him about its fictionality, Catherine may be released from the fiction of male desire, but at the same time she must be dismissed from Northanger. He casts her off severely, entrapped by John's further fiction which conflicts with his economic outlook: that the Morlands are a very poor family, 'a forward, bragging, scheming race' (201), and that there is a young man who will inherit the Allens' estate. Following Henry's bitter criticism, Catherine is now exposed to the General's authority and silenced, left without speech. Ironically, it is his second fiction, not about herself but about her home village, that contributes to her finally being able to marry his son.

Fullerton, a world of silence and stillness at the opening, is at the close infringed upon by the conversation of meaningless repetition and circulation similar to the Bath society of consumption. The only obstacle to Catherine's marriage is the General's consent, which is finally given partly because he is informed that John's second fiction is also untrue, partly because Eleanor marries a man of fortune, and is consequently able to satisfy his economic requirements. But the stronger cause may be his private intelligence:

[B]y no means without its effect was the private intelligence, which he was at some pains to procure, that the Fullerton estate, being entirely at the disposal of its present proprietor, was consequently open to every greedy speculation. (205)

This estate becomes so unstable that the General may usurp and enclose it within his dictatorial economic power. Mrs. Morland repeats to the Allens only what she hears from her daughter, and for Mrs. Allen, her husband's 'wonder, his conjectures, and his explanations, became in succession her's' (193). Catherine's silence contrasts remarkably with their conversation, and she can only take refuge from a world in danger of being usurped by the General through moving to Woodston as his daughter-in-law—a place nevertheless enclosed within his power.

This story appears to be ending in the victory of the General's economic outlook, but deploying its manifold fictional structures, as we have seen above, the true and final object of Austen's irony is not Catherine's attempts to read and create fiction affected by the harmful influence of the novel, nor Catherine herself speechlessly confined within the General's authority, but the General himself who is misled by information and invents fictions to fulfill his desire. It is not Catherine but the General that will be condemned to silence, because of the absence of his heir Captain Tilney, of the removals of Henry and Eleanor through marriage, and of Catherine's taking up the title of Mrs. Tilney which has been the symbol of maternity at Northanger. The lack of maternity and the absence of children suggest the emptiness and instability of that world. What is truly hidden there is not the supernatural horror which Catherine's curiosity had sought, but the General's anxiety about such social and economic mobility as may subvert his status.

By presenting problems of economic instability and conflict in the middle-class, by doubling the story both as Catherine's and as the General's reading and creation of fiction. Jane Austen tries to justify women's historical positions as reader, knower, and creator in the contemporary society of a patriarchy.²⁰ Still, it could not be said that Catherine's attempt is fully presented as a complete one, for she is silently yielded to the General's dictatorship. The incompleteness in *Northanger Abbey*, or rather its significance, should be clear when we take account of how these issues develop in Austen's last complete

novel—where we can see how she as a woman writer manages to resolve them.

Persuasion is also closely concerned with reading, but it narrates a story of men's absorption in books, not women's. They are indebted to books for consolation: Sir Walter Eliot to the Baronetage; Captain Wentworth to the Navy List; Captain Benwick to Romantic poetry. Behind it, however, there is another story of a woman's reading. In a study of the epistemologies of feeling, Pinch discusses the connection between women as readers and women as knowers of feeling, pointing out the temporal structure of Anne's story as an isomorphism between the doubling of first and second courtships, and the doubling of Anne's and readers' experiences. For the heroine, the repeated romance of courtship functions bookishly, so she is to the second one what a reader is to a book.²¹ Robyn R. Warhol analyzes Anne's act of looking as a text-like perception, and notes that the feminine look, 'a silent but a very powerful dialogue,' is contrasted with the limited masculine language in its capacity to know another's desire.²² Thus in *Persuasion*, Austen makes much of silent female reading and recognition, in contrast with a deficient male verbalization. It could be thought that she creates women's voices against men's ones of socio-political power by means of this silent space. Therefore, when we think of the significance of Catherine's speechlessness, when the story of Anne is seen to be a counterpart to that of Catherine, then might be more clearly revealed Catherine's or rather Austen's untold fiction—the possibility and validity of women's creation.

Catherine's condition enclosed within her own fiction and the General's, as it were, could be thought to reflect that of Austen herself: her reading-experience and her early creative activity as a woman writer seeking a release from the influence of what she has read. She was a member of such a family as 'are great Novel-readers & not ashamed of being so,' and she could read freely not only in the rectory library which contained five hundred or so volumes, but from a circulating library—although novels and the libraries were still criticized for fear of degrading the social morals.²³ Her circumstances of reading had much influence upon her writing, and she started to write inspired by what she had read. *Northanger Abbey* as well as the *Juvenilia* reminds us particularly of the works of contemporary woman writers, popular sentimental and Gothic romances. She was absorbed in reading them and was greatly affected, at the same time being discontented and criticizing them ironically; her early works present this mixture of

reactions with their characteristic imitation and burlesque. In this work we can read the loci of Austen's seeking to create 'a new circumstance in romance' (198) as a writer, free from the shadow of those earlier romances, from the criticism against women's creative activity in a patriarchal society. Finally, the import of Catherine's silence may correspond with the literary tendency toward 'the voice of thought' in the writing of this period.

Notes

¹ Jane Austen, *Jane Austen's Letters*, ed. Deirdre Le Faye, 3rd. ed. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) 275. In the letter to James Stanier Clarke, a doctor of the Prince Regent, she also modestly but unhesitatingly declined his suggestion that she should write a historical romance.

² In the 1970s some critics published influential books historically contextualizing her novels. See Alistair M. Duckworth, *The Improvement of the Estate* (1971; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994); Marilyn Butler, *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas* (1975; Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); Warren Roberts, *Jane Austen and the French Revolution* (1979; London: Athlone, 1995).

³ Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900* (1975; Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983) 61. For the general historical contexts, see Altick esp. chap.2; also Roy Porter, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (1982; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990) chap.6.

⁴ Walter Scott's unsigned review of Emma in *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage* vol.1. ed. B.C. Southam (1968; London: Routledge, 1995) 58-69.

⁵ James Thompson, 'Conclusion: Austen and the Novel' in *Models of Value: Eighteenth-Century Political Economy and the Novel* (Durham: Duke UP, 1996) 185-98.

⁶ Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, and Sanditon*, ed. John Davie (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990) 1. All the following quotations are from this edition.

⁷ Barbara M. Benedict, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1996) 211-21.

⁸ Terry Castle's introduction to the Oxford edition by John Davie, vii-xxvi. Castle discusses the resounding negatives throughout this novel, and points out that Northanger is itself a site of negation via the implication of its very name.

⁹ Angus Fletcher, 'Silence and the Voice of Thought,' *Colors of the Mind: Conjectures on Thinking in Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991) 189-211.

¹⁰ For the historical condition of Bath in the period, see R. S. Neale, *Bath 1680-1850: A Social History or a Valley of Pleasure, yet a Sink of Iniquity* (London: Routledge, 1981). For circulating libraries in the town, see 24-25.

¹¹ Park Honan, *Jane Austen: Her Life* (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1987) 140. He also recognises 'Her real education begins when she senses the need to judge other people accurately behind the mask of their words' (139).

¹² Irene Collins, *Jane Austen and the Clergy* (London: Hambledon, 1994) 154-55.

¹³ Butler, 173-76.

¹⁴ For a study of women as readers and knowers in Austen's novels, see Adela Pinch's discussion in 'Lost in a Book: Jane Austen's *Persuasion*,' *Strange Fits of Passion: Epistemologies of Emotion, Hume to Austen* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996) 137-63.

¹⁵ Butler, 175.

¹⁶ Debra Malina, 'Rereading the Patriarchal Text: *The Female Quixote*, *Northanger Abbey*, and the Trace of the Absent Mother,' *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 8 (1996): 285.

¹⁷ Duckworth, 96-98.

¹⁸ Tony Tanner, *Jane Austen* (1986; London: Macmillan, 1993) 65. Tanner also discusses how the General is a typical product of the exponential increase of consumer products in the Industrial Revolution, and that his chivalric, military title conceals a most unheroic, monomaniacal, greedy dehumanised consumer-acquisitor.

¹⁹ See David Spring, 'Interpreters of Jane Austen's Social World,' *Jane Austen: New Perspectives*, ed. Janet Todd (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983) 64; also Shinobu Minma, 'General Tilney and Tyranny: *Northanger Abbey*,' *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 8 (1996): 503-18.

²⁰ See Jane Spencer, *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (New York: Blackwell, 1986) 192-94. Spencer states that women's fiction has always been concerned with their historically oppressed position: Gothic fiction claims it explicitly, while the domestic novel explores it implicitly.

²¹ Pinch, 160.

²² Robyn R. Warhol, 'The Look, the Body, and the Heroine: A Feminist-Narratological Reading of *Persuasion*,' *Novel* 26 (1992) 5-19.

²³ Austen, *Letters*, 26. For biographical facts about Austen's education and reading, see David Cecil, *A Portrait of Jane Austen* (London: Constable, 1978) 45-51; also Honan, part 1.

Matters of Fact and Questions of Value

Peter Robinson

Arthur C. Danto has described how he ‘could not read further’ when a friend begins a novel with some people ‘driving *up* Fifth Avenue, a southbound only street’. This unnamed friend is then on the receiving end of so fierce a conclusion that his real existence is put in doubt: ‘a man whose grip on reality is that weak is not necessarily to be trusted with the more delicate psychic facts to which we expect a novelist to be true.’ Continuing to read requires for Danto the existence of a trusting relationship. Having dispensed with his seemingly untrustworthy friend (‘untrustworthy friend’ being something of a contradiction in terms), Danto turns to the ‘worse case’ of a story by Cynthia Ozick in which Michelangelo’s *Rondanini Pietà* is placed in Milan’s Castello Sforzesco during the Fascist era, though until 1953 it was in the possession of the San Sèverino family in Rome.¹ There are opportunities for *Schadenfreude* in sprees of error detection. Defending Keats’s ‘On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer’, Helen Vendler remarks that ‘poetry is often careless of learning’,² and Shakespeare’s *A Winter’s Tale* does give the landlocked Bohemia a sea coast; but Seamus Heaney’s ‘Chekhov on Sakhalin’, which notes how ‘That far north, Siberia was south’,³ does not imply (as Vendler elsewhere writes) that ‘the penal colony on the faraway island of Sakhalin’ is ‘off the east coast of Russia below Japan.’⁴ Does this impugn the Harvard professor’s ‘grip on reality’? I can understand how the poet Ed Dorn could, in an interview, have imagined that Wittgenstein’s complexly questioning late work is called *On Uncertainty*, but should Danto himself, a professional philosopher, be trusted with delicate distinctions when he does away with the two phases of the same writer’s oeuvre, and muddles him up with Gottlob Frege, by combining the titles of his 1922 and 1953 books as *Logical Investigations*?⁵ Perhaps that anonymous novelist friend with the weak grip on reality who made a slip about the traffic flow on Fifth Avenue was so delicately adjusting the psychic materials of his novel that he overlooked the one-way street signs. Potentially fatal when driving a car, does such a mistake mortal-

ly injure a novel? In his early twenties, W. H. Auden wrote feelingly of ‘goodness wasted at peripheral fault’,⁶ and, given that everyone makes mistakes, what is to be done with art’s hapless errors?

1

The word ‘fact’ used to mean something that has been done.⁷ In contemporary Italian this is still punningly evident in that ‘fatto’ is the noun meaning ‘fact’ and the past participle of the verb ‘fare’, ‘to make’ or ‘to do’, whose sense is thus ‘made’ or ‘done’. John Searle notes: ‘this word is derived from Latin “*factum*,” which is the neuter past participle of the verb “*facere*,” meaning “to do” or “to make”, and hence, ‘to mix three languages, one can say that the *factum* is the *thing done*, or the *fait accompli*.’⁸ One such thing done would be a work of art, as Auden’s lines tendentiously asserted:

Art is not life and cannot be
A midwife to society,
For art is a *fait accompli*.⁹

That the English word ‘fact’ has a history in making and doing can be detected in some uses. It doesn’t sound right to announce that ‘A tree is a fact’. In those statements beloved of philosophers, it’s not the tree that is the fact, it’s the existence of the tree. Facts are ‘states of affairs’ and not things, objects, and the like. If it is ‘that the tree exists’ which is the fact, then some minimal verbal life has been attributed to it by its existing. This appears a single instance of what is happening in all language use: ‘we impose intentionality on entities that are not intrinsically intentional.’¹⁰ The attribution of verbal action is a form of anthropomorphism, an assimilation of the tree into human meaning, for this verbal action is not intrinsic to or distinctive of organic objects only; the same applied verbal action, for example, would be required in stating the bare fact about the existence of earth, air, fire, or water. That the statement of the existence of things requires the attribution of verbal life does not mean that without this verbal attribution they cease to exist.

In his searching essay ‘Literature and the Matter of Fact’, Christopher Ricks acknowledges that poets find themselves within webs of conflicting responsibilities, obliged to choose among them:

Poets have themselves differed as to where their responsibilities lie. They have had to choose, and we as readers and critics may be obliged to

choose too. Does the natural world, for instance, need to be respected in and for itself before it can be asked to furnish the energies of art? Poetry may be capable of being as culpably exploitative as anything else, and its right to be respected may be in proportion to its willingness to respect all which is not poetry or art.¹¹

Ricks then exemplifies ‘culpably exploitative’ by citing a work by the poet who later published a collection called *Responsibilities* (1914):

An early poem by Yeats, ‘The Indian to His Love’ (1886), has the line, ‘The peahens dance on a smooth lawn.’ It was objected that peahens do not dance. Yeats turned not to natural history but to literature, insisting that peahens ‘dance throughout the whole of Indian poetry....As to the poultry yards, with them I have no concern.’ But no amount of high and mighty scorn will undo the fact that a high price is paid by a poetry which invokes poultry and at the same time declares that it has no concern with the poultry yards.¹²

In 1886 the poem was called ‘An Indian Song’. What has stung Ricks, or provided him with the opportunity to push home a high and mighty point of his own, is not so much Yeats’s factual error (if it is one), but his Symbolist poet’s apparent disdain for the living that our servants are obliged to do for us in the process of putting a boiled egg on our breakfast table, with all its accidents and incoherences, in the world that is ‘not poetry or art’. Here, the young Yeats is caught being ‘silly’, though not ‘like us’, the choosing readers; and the critic is punishing him ‘under a foreign code of conscience.’¹³

But do any birds exactly ‘dance’? An owl dances with a pussycat ‘by the light of the moon’¹⁴ in Edward Lear’s poem, but, then, there wouldn’t be anything nonsensical about it if owls and cats did regularly take turns around the dance floor together. Even dancing bears and monkeys must, strictly, only be mockeries of people dancing, hence the supposed entertainment. In Yeats’s poem—

The island dreams under the dawn
And the great boughs drop tranquillity;
The peahens dance on a smooth lawn,
A parrot sways upon a tree,
Raging at his own image in the enamelled sea.¹⁵

Notice that islands don’t ‘dream’; boughs can drop leaves, but not ‘tranquillity’; a parrot can sway but can only be ‘Raging at his own image’ under interpretation; and the sea, while possibly shining in the sun, will not thus be literally ‘enamelled’. Yeats’s verb ‘dance’, like other actions in the stanza, is a metaphor characterizing to his perhaps

not empirically strenuous satisfaction some paces or flutterings that the birds may be imagined to be doing on the mown grass.

The issue of whether peahens dance or not may be a pedantic one since no birds dance, unless ornithologists also deploy the same metaphor (or, in the case of the peahen, significantly don't). Yeats's seemingly once modish disdain for the poultry yard could also be a way of forcefully asking the objector to consider what the word 'dance' contributes to the poem, because that's where it functions, and his resort to Indian literature (since he is loosely imitating it) doesn't appear so shamelessly self-serving a move in the search for justification. Peter McDonald has drawn attention to Ricks's scanting certain facts in his dealings here with Yeats: 'The quoted retort comes from Yeats at the age of twenty-three (itself a fact of some possible relevance, given the weight being attached to his remark), in a letter to John O'Leary written in the wake of a blood-thirsty review'.¹⁶ The young poet is taking a tough line in defence of his fledgling reputation and project: 'The wild peahen dances or all Indian poets lie...If my style is new it will get plenty more such for many a long day. Even Tennyson was charged with obscurity.'¹⁷

Ricks overlooks a distinction of Yeats's here between the 'wild peahen' dancing in Indian poetry, and the 'poultry yard'—where you may find *tame* peahens. The poultry yard is thus, Yeats believes, strictly irrelevant. He may be putting on a lofty air, but he is backing it with a relevant distinction of his own. Nor is there any disrespect for the then Poet Laureate in Yeats's reference to him. McDonald convincingly defends the young poet by contextualizing the 'poultry yard' aside in his literary life: 'the tone is one of deference to authorities greater than that of the periodical press' or 'Part of the letter's winning quality resides in its boastfulness, and in the temerity of the young Yeats mentioning himself and the (still living) Tennyson in the same breath.' McDonald reminds us in a footnote that, since peahens do dance in the poems of the fifth century Sanskrit poet Kalidasa, for example, Ricks's quarrel must be with the Indian poets as well as Yeats.

What helpfully prompts McDonald is Ricks's own argumentative playing fast and loose with matters of fact: 'But the fact of peahens' behaviour and the fact of this "high price" are not obviously facts of the same order, and Ricks's rhetorical sleight of hand itself misses (or bypasses) the facts both of what Yeats said and the context of his saying it.'¹⁸ As far as peahens' behaviour is concerned, the only relevant fact might be one adduced from an ornithological account. That too

would be a description, but one probably less metaphorically coloured than Yeats's verb 'dance'. The 'high price' is not a fact of a different order; it's a critical judgement and thus an assertion backed by a network of stated and implied values. Here the only description of a fact would be: Ricks asserts in his essay that a high price is paid by poets who turn away from such sources of knowledge as poultry yards. McDonald's essay indicates, if there were need, that the assertion itself does not command universal assent.

Ricks goes on to compare Yeats's attitude, as he understands it, with Tennyson's preferring not to print a 'lovely early poem of his, "Anacaona"', because its details might be 'confuted by some Midshipman'. If this was his only reason for wanting to suppress the poem, it would be admirable enough of the Laureate, but when Ricks goes on to judge both *poets* on their attitude to fact and authority, he is writing *ad hominem* and beyond the confines of facts (of any order):

There is perhaps no greater distinction within poets than that between those who believe that a poem can be confuted by a midshipman and those who demand a collusive jury of their peers. Tennyson's seems to me far the more honourable position—and to have made for the greater poetry.¹⁹

By the time Ricks reaches 'honourable' and 'greater', he is away from 'fact' and in the critic's other natural element: 'value'. However, assent does not follow readily to the proposition that Tennyson wrote greater poetry than Yeats because the former had a supposedly respectful attitude to the superior knowledge of '*some* Midshipman' (my italics) while the latter just appeared to scorn poultry yards. Ricks's 'greater poetry' claim also requires an institutional context for its acknowledgement and evaluation: one that might have to be trans-historical and trans-cultural, a higher academy of Parnassus. Perhaps the critic is appealing to a jury of *his* peers? It is likely that the English Poet Laureate's poetry will not be counted greater with everyone in those times and places where Irish green is worn.

'There is perhaps no greater distinction', writes the critic. But does Ricks only 'perhaps' believe this? Did Tennyson's attitude make for the greater poetry? Could an *attitude* ever do that? He asserts that the poets 'have had to choose, and we as readers and critics may be obliged to choose too.' In what sense 'obliged'? Elsewhere he quotes Auden's 'if you had to choose between the serious study and the amusing gossip, say, between Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and John Aubrey's Scandal and Credulities, wouldn't you choose the

latter?’ then Ricks firmly adds: ‘Fortunately, in the real world, as against the world of bluff broadcasting, we do not have to choose between Clarendon and Aubrey.’²⁰ In that same real world, as against the world of literary critical polemics, it is possible to admire and read Tennyson, Yeats, and many others, and for different reasons. Indeed, a person who had not read and seen the values in both would not count as seriously involved with poetry in English.

One of Yeats’s last poems, dated 13 January 1939, less than two weeks before his death, ends by imagining men changed so that they ‘had the throats of birds.’²¹ In ‘Yeats’s Epitaph’, a review of his *Last Poems and Plays*, Louis MacNeice returned to the issue of what kind of creature the poet was: ‘anyone can praise a bird of paradise’, he said of reviewers who thought Yeats a safe bet ‘because he was an exotic’, but ‘you have to have some knowledge before you go buying Rhode Island reds.’²² In pursuit of his distinction, Ricks is reiterating the conceptual struggle between the realist conscience of a high Victorian and the aesthetic conscience of a late one. McDonald is defending a twenty-three year old who has received a bad review against a professor who alights on the example, and aligns it with an implied evaluation of Yeats and his poetry, to grind an axe. What type of fowl is the poet? And whose code of conscience is to apply in the case of the dancing peahen?

2

Ricks’s engaged and engaging essay examines at length and in detail the question: ‘Are works of literature affected if the facts they proffer as facts are not facts and demonstrably so?’²³ His position is that works of literature are always damaged by factual error, but the extent of the damage and how fatal it may be to the work are matters of critical appreciation: ‘The principle is obdurate, though the application of it will always ask tact and a recognition of how complicated and elusive a literary understanding can be.’²⁴ Ricks touches the heart of the matter and has his heart in the right place regarding the matter of fact in literature; there are, nevertheless, three problems with his account: (1) It moves between brief accounts of factual error and broad critical censure without addressing in any detail why and how and whether the latter can follow from the former. (2) Its many examples of mistakes lump together facts of different types, such as: that peahens don’t dance; that there were no £1 notes before 1797; that you can’t start a

fire with lenses to correct myopia.²⁵ While the second and third facts, being ones of history and physics, are types of hard one, the peahen case turns out to be anything but open and shut. (3) The representational behaviour with which the essay is morally concerned ranges from an oversight about a detail to a consciously promulgated deception: Ricks describes Keats as having ‘notoriously stationed’ Cortez on that peak in Darien; he also finds it ‘appalling’ that a biographer can ‘brush aside the question of whether Capa’s most famous photograph, the falling soldier in the Spanish civil war, was faked, staged, or not.’²⁶ I appreciate his outrage in the latter case, but there is nothing notorious about Keats’s mistake, however familiar an example, and it offends against reason and ethics to suppose that if Capa’s photograph was faked its historical deception has any similarity with the 21-year-old English poet’s unintended confusion of conquistadores.

Again, Ricks is not arguing that factual accuracy is the be-all and end-all of literary value:

Fidelity to fact, or accuracy, I should propose, is always a virtue, but it is not necessarily the ground of all virtues; elegance and energy are virtues too. So I am not proposing accuracy as a necessary, let alone a sufficient, condition of literary worth. Nor am I maintaining that a deft inaccuracy may not manage to bring about other valuable effects, to some degree compensatory. But I judge that it will always be critically relevant to consider accuracy and inaccuracy, and that if you decide in advance that inaccuracy is inherently irrelevant or immaterial or trivial, you strike at the roots not only of interpretation but of imaginative creation.

Ricks’s target is made clear: textualists who believe that language and literature cannot by definition make any reference to anything beyond themselves, and that literary texts have no relation to purported fact. Though I wholeheartedly support his opposing this mistaken notion and those who have proclaimed it, such valuable intentions do not make his case any less difficult to present: ‘Fidelity to fact, or accuracy . . . is always a virtue’: this sounds fine, but it doesn’t follow from it that accuracy has to be in relation to fact. Is Ricks concerned with ‘fidelity’ and ‘accuracy’, or must it be ‘fidelity to fact’? He certainly seems to be arguing for more than just ‘accuracy’ as one method among many for achieving plausibility. Alastair Fowler has noted that the critic ‘surrenders the strategic virtuality of literature’ and that ‘Without qualification, Rick’s principle leaves little room for’ a writer ‘to lie like the truth’.²⁷

His essay takes its stand against the grain of a non-factual writing understood to be in the cultural ascendant: 'in our time, fiction and fictivity have aggrandized themselves not only in art but in discourse generally.'²⁸ Richard Rorty's essay 'Is There a Problem about Fictional Discourse?' concludes by gesturing towards the case for an ironic understanding of the 'fact-fiction' divide: 'In a culture in which the notion of "hard fact"—the Parmenidean notion of compulsion to truth by reality—had less of a place, the whole genre of "modernist" writing would make no sense' and he amplifies this a little later:

What is most distinctively modern in modern literature depends for its effect upon straight men, and especially upon philosophers who defend 'common-sense realism' against idealists, pragmatists, structuralists, and all others who impugn the distinction between scientist and poet.²⁹

Rorty has paid tribute to strong poets that are supposed to make things happen by changing a culture's conversational vocabulary, and he has his own way with words: 'straight men'. The truths of philosophical enquiry and literary practice are to be understood as the equivalent of a comedy duo's stand-up and knock-down routines. It is difficult not to see this vaguely sketched mention of the 'distinctively modern' as nothing more than a means for having it both ways. Furthermore, modern writers who have their cake and eat it too with the borders of common sense are taking advantage of, and thus confirming, an accuracy rule—by breaking it.

Ricks takes offence when critics play along with the game of having it both ways by altering the rules of engagement:

But what critics keep doing is changing the terms so as to exculpate. When a work is acutely consonant with the facts which it adduces, it is praised for fidelity; when it lapses from its claims, the idea of *infidelity* is held to be farcically solemn and inadmissible. This is not criticism but public relations.³⁰

In 1856, an anonymous reviewer (possibly Walter Bagehot) observed that Daniel Defoe's 'proper novels' are 'pure fictions; any elements of fact which may be included in them being, as it were, entirely dissolved and incorporated in a homogeneous work of imagination.'³¹ A little under a century and a half ago, this critic saw Defoe's facts 'entirely dissolved and incorporated' so as to grant the writer a stake in the history of the novel, to credit him as an artist at all. Making a case for the consideration of a writer as an artist, as the 1856 review indicates, may involve just such a mixture of criticism and public rela-

tions, for it requires an altering of the way the work is viewed in order to allow its entry into a genre that promises a more serious consideration. Despite such ordinary impurities of strategy in the literary trade, Ricks is short with critics and scholars who offer special pleading to defend this or that famous work: ‘There are occasions when the cost of protecting a particular poem is too high because it amounts to the selling short of poetry.’³²

3

Ricks’s plea is for judgements of literature that ‘relate it directly to “the transactions of the world”’—the great phrase (à propos of Shakespeare) is Dr Johnson’s, and it asks to be supplemented by Wittgenstein’s understanding that “the world is everything that is the case”.³³ However, his supplementary citation serves to underline the first of his problems listed above: is there any sustainable relation between matters of fact, ‘everything that is the case’, and questions of value such as how we evaluate the effects of a factual error? Wittgenstein’s remark is the opening one in the *Tractatus*; it is part of an account of the picture theory by which elementary propositions can logically picture ‘everything that is the case’. Wittgenstein’s early work finds no place in what ‘is the case’ for aesthetics and ethics.³⁴ These are, in the terms of the *Tractatus*, inexpressible. This is the thrust of: ‘(Ethics and aesthetics are one.)’ It is a remark growing out of the equal value of propositions principle, and the following, which would also present problems for Ricks’s essay: ‘In the world everything is as it is and happens as it does happen. *In* it there is no value—and if there were, it would be of no value.’³⁵ It is not necessary to accept the mystical dimension of Wittgenstein’s statement to appreciate its family resemblance to Hume’s prefiguring of the fact-value distinction and Moore’s naturalistic fallacy.³⁶

Wittgenstein appears to have remained convinced by this distinction even when beginning to abandon the picture theory. In 1929 he noted that ‘You cannot lead people to the good; you can only lead them to some place or other; the good lies outside the space of facts.’³⁷ About the same time, in his ‘Lecture on Ethics’, he holds firm to this view of the matter:

If for instance in our world book we read the description of a murder with all its details physical and psychological, the mere description of these facts will contain nothing which we could call an *ethical* proposition. The

murder will be on exactly the same level as any other event, for instance the falling of a stone. Certainly the reading of this description might cause us pain and rage or any other emotion, or we might read about the pain and rage caused by the murder in other people when they heard of it, but there will be facts, facts, and facts but no Ethics.³⁸

Wittgenstein himself seems bewitched by words, here, for he needs to use the shrieking word 'murder' to bring in the challenging idea that the facts of the world do not contain or entail the ethical value. Yet the word 'murder' shrieks exactly because it brings in the ethical. Wittgenstein wants the notional murder to be like the falling of a stone: a person struck another over the head with a blunt instrument, blows which resulted in the death of the person struck. But a murder occurs when someone in her or his right mind commits such acts with the intention of killing the other person, and is found by a court of law to have perpetrated the said act. By this stage, ethics is painted all over the picture and the word 'murder' is in place. These sorts of distinction have required philosophers to develop theories of different types and levels of fact, distinguishing, for example, between 'brute' and 'institutional' facts.³⁹

Auden's revision of his phrase 'the necessary murder' in 'Spain' to 'the fact of murder' in 'Spain 1937' suggests that what he had in mind was such intentional killing and its acknowledged consequences by active supporters of the Spanish Republic: 'Today . . . The conscious acceptance of guilt in . . . murder'.⁴⁰ Auden was drawn to the word, perhaps, because his verse is about the price of commitment to the morally and intellectually alert: 'increase in the chances of death', 'guilt . . . in murder', and 'expending of powers' on the 'ephemeral' and the 'boring'.⁴¹ Orwell was doubtless right in detecting something amiss.⁴² Even the word 'murder' raises a problem, for soldiers defending an elected government and insurrectionaries from any quarter are equally not expected to think of themselves as committing murders in the line of duty. From the *ad hoc* authorities' point of view, for instance, Garcia Lorca was summarily executed for opposition to their régime, not murdered. They are indulging in what to them is a contextually justified killing. Auden's word 'murder' keeps the normal circumstances, and higher moral dimensions in view. But 'the fact of murder'? In the terms of Wittgenstein's lecture, even this phrase may be in difficulties. If the fact is on the level with the falling of a stone, then it is not a murder, but a death resulting from events which appear to be man-made. If it is a murder, then the 'fact' has to be construed

not as a brute fact, but as a secondary level fact, something whose facticity depends upon human institutions of judgment and value.

Ricks writes ‘Fidelity to fact, or accuracy, I should propose, is always a virtue’. The fact that in a work of art the facts are correct can’t be a value *in itself*—but only with the addition of some such human framework, the evaluative premise, for example, that factual correctness is a good in art. It doesn’t make sense to say that in this poem the factually-accurate facts are a virtue; only people and their behaviour can display virtue, which is why Ricks writes of ‘Fidelity to fact’, since being faithful is a quality of human activity. His argument begins to seem less fundamentally concerned with the facts in themselves, as with the valuing of writers’ and, more urgently, critics’ attitudes to ‘the matter of fact’. Ricks can’t argue for the value of fact in art as such, and certainly he doesn’t, conceding that ‘I am not proposing accuracy as a necessary, let alone a sufficient, condition of literary worth.’

He also remarks that ‘I should myself be grateful for a disinterested theoretical—better still, philosophical—exploration of the whole business.’⁴³ David Hume sceptically identified what came to be theorized as the fact/value distinction:

In every system of morality, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remark’d, that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs; when of a sudden I am surpriz’d to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, *is* and *is not*, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an *ought*, or an *ought not*. This change is imperceptible; but is, however, of the last consequence. For as this *ought*, or *ought not*, expresses some new relation or affirmation, ’tis necessary that it shou’d be observ’d and explain’d; and at the same time that a reason should be given, for what seems altogether inconceivable, how this new relation can be a deduction from others, which are entirely different from it. But as authors do not commonly use this precaution, I shall presume to recommend it to the readers; and am persuaded, that this small attention wou’d subvert all the vulgar systems of morality, and let us see, that the distinction of vice and virtue is not founded merely on the relations of objects, nor is perceiv’d by reason.⁴⁴

For Hume ‘relations of objects’ (facts) are familiarly observed contiguous arrangements, and have no inherent causal links. Furthermore, ‘perceiv’d by reason’ doesn’t mean associated by habits of thinking, but strictly logically deduced. Is Hume really ‘surpriz’d to find’ his authors sidling tacitly from accounts of how they take the world to be,

to how we should behave? I doubt it. This passage does two things: (1) it throws cold water on ‘the vulgar systems of morality’ which bully you into understanding that you must behave in such and such a way because the world is how it is and is thus because ordained to be so by higher authorities who receive their power from a creator, and (2) it recognizes with a genial irony that writers on morality cannot avoid linking their prescriptions to their descriptions, so that if they cannot do it by means of observation or reasoning, where can such imagined, and humanly needed, links find support?

Hume’s account of this issue in relation to vices and virtues answers the question thus: ‘Tis not, therefore, reason, which is the guide of life, but custom.’⁴⁵ Before we jump to the conclusion that this makes Hume a necessarily conservative writer,⁴⁶ note that custom not only can be, but is in a continuous process of conservation and change, wrought by all the members of a society, not merely by the acts of its rulers. Hume’s insight served to free empirical research and ethical enquiry from the taboo restraints of hegemonic religions and ideologies, contributing towards equality and social justice by advancing the force of evidence and demonstration against canting assertion, moral bullying, and the interests of caste and honour codes. Nor did Hume quite invent the fact/value distinction; he foreshadowed it with his expressions of ironic surprise and doubt. He doesn’t even say that there is a total division between fact and value. What he asserts is that ‘vulgar systems of morality’ are falsely founded upon the assumption that the ‘distinction of vice and virtue’ (values) which they promote can either be observed in ‘relations of objects’ (facts), or can be derived by reasoning from them. This does not assume or imply that there can be no relations between fact and value of any kind. Hume may, however, be implying that in non-vulgar systems of morality relations between fact and value, based on a true appreciation of their interdependence for us, can be identified and promulgated.

Facts are not the same as descriptions: the mountain I happen to be able to see from my window has snow on it whether the fact is described or not. The description can be made in any human language you choose; the fact remains the same. Indeed, that the sentence can count as a description depends upon the independence of the fact from it. Description contains or implies value: we describe things for a purpose; that’s how and why we come to give prominence to some phenomena and not to others in any description. The giving of prominence is a sign that values are being stated or implied. The facts that

are given prominence need to exist independently of the descriptions for description to be understood to have taken place: descriptions are not value-free; some, though by no means all, facts are. Prescription requires description to set the scene in which it is intended to function: this is clear in the case of a doctor's 'prescriptions', and seems evident in other instances too. Some facts require no values, descriptions, or prescriptions for their existence; values cannot exist without prescriptions, descriptions, and facts.

Numerous philosophers over the last few decades have offered theories which significantly qualify this long-standing philosophical difficulty. In 1964, John Searle proposed a counter-example to Hume's thesis that an 'ought' cannot be derived from an 'is':

Consider the following series of statements:

(1) Jones uttered the words 'I hereby promise to pay you, Smith, five dollars.'

(2) Jones promised to pay Smith five dollars.

(3) Jones placed himself under (undertook) an obligation to pay Smith five dollars.

(4) Jones is under an obligation to pay Smith five dollars.

(5) Jones ought to pay Smith five dollars.

I shall argue concerning this list that the relation between any statement and its successor, while not in every case one of 'entailment', is nonetheless not just a contingent relation; and the additional statements necessary to make the relationship one of entailment do not need to involve any evaluative statements, moral principles, or anything of the sort.⁴⁷

The reader may have spotted what looks at first to be a sleight of hand on Searle's part. His initial fact from which he will derive a value, is the report of what J. L. Austin called a performative utterance, in this case 'making a promise': 'Jones uttered the words "I hereby promise to pay you, Smith, five dollars."' This being the case, the value (promises ought to be kept) is already there in the fact ('Jones uttered the words . . .'). What if the fact were in the form: a person opened her or his mouth and made noises in the direction of another person? Crucial to Searle's ability to derive the value is his understanding the noises that the man makes as 'a promise'; it is from this premise that the 'ought' derives. In his consideration of such an objection, Searle elsewhere calls events like the making of promises 'institutional facts': 'They are indeed facts; but their existence, unlike the existence of brute facts, presupposes the existence of certain human institutions.'⁴⁸ The complex stage-setting by which two people can make noises with their mouths and gestures with their bodies that constitute a promise

between them, and an undertaking as regards future behaviour, point towards the interrelated institutions necessarily involved.

In 1981 Alasdair Macintyre also cited a counter-example to the alleged fact/value principle: ‘from the premise “He is a sea-captain”, the conclusion may be validly inferred that “He ought to do what a sea-captain ought to do”.’⁴⁹ The problem with this is that ‘He is a sea-captain’ doesn’t refer to a brute fact (like the fact of snow on the mountain), but an institutional fact. Being a sea-captain requires the passing of exams and such like which leads to a recognized body granting the official institutional status-function of captain (from which, at sea, derives the authority to, for example, declare suitably paired persons married). The value is already attributed to the fact (a mature homo sapiens), and not validly inferred from it. However, this hardly damages Macintyre’s point, because a vast number of facts are not brute but social or institutional facts whose existence depends upon the ascription of function and therefore of value. These social and institutional facts are sustained through time not least by our communal support for them (custom), and they can be overthrown or abandoned (as in the case of mutiny on the *Bounty*). However, ‘She, or he, is a poet’ implies the existence of no such official institutional status and authority.

Stuart Hampshire, indicating the role of familiarity and memory in the appreciation of art, offered a further counter instance from *bel canto*, in 1989:

If I hear someone singing ‘Caro nome’ and she is half-way through the aria, I can infer what notes she ought to have sung before and what notes she ought to sing next. If both these inferences fail and neither ‘ought’ statement is true, either it was not ‘Caro nome’ that I heard, or it was a very bad version of ‘Caro nome’.⁵⁰

Once again, and with special relevance to the present discussion of poetry, Gilda’s aria in *Rigoletto* is by no means a brute fact, only having existence and force through the co-presence of a large number of human institutions, practices, conventions, customs, habits, traditions, and the like. The evaluation is already in the fact. With brute facts like the snow on the mountain, uses of ‘ought’ in descriptions can only be predictive (‘It’s December: the mountain ought to have snow on it by now’); no obligation is, or can sensibly be, attributed to the mountain or the weather. Hampshire doesn’t push the inherent evaluation in institutional facts as far as it can go. Which text of *Hamlet* shall we stage, and how much or little can we afford to cut? Beyond the, in

practice, flexibly-applied ‘ought’ involved in a performed artwork’s being recognizably what it is supposed to be, there is the further question snagged on his account of whether this recognizable *Hamlet* is a good one in the specific performance. Yet this evaluation, added on to the one of identification, is still part of the fact (the specific performance), because this is the fact of a human activity which requires attributive evaluation as part of its institutional status: you can have good, bad, and indifferent stagings of *Hamlet* (all facts) but you can’t have value-free ones. If the composite of Piave’s words, Verdi’s music, and Callas’s voice, ‘Caro nome’, may be considered an institutional fact, so, for example, may Auden’s elegy ‘In Memory of W. B. Yeats’.

4

Is something in a poem’s aesthetic wholeness damaged by a factual error? Such wholeness cannot be grasped merely by appreciating the work’s internal cohesiveness: Ricks specifically rules out this convenient formalist simplification. The wholeness, including its relations to the world in which it was made, is weakened by the flaw; yet this weakening will only appear to happen if the work has already achieved sufficient distinctness for value to be attributed to it through attention. Errors of fact or consistency may prevent a work from achieving such distinctness, but when, over centuries, ‘the bosom returns an echo’, the finding of errors can leave it untouched, however much I acknowledge the claim of value in factual accuracy.

Keats’s well-known slip, putting the word ‘Cortez’ into his sonnet ‘On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer’ has been treated as a *faux pas* in an ambitious poetic career. Andrew Motion detects a series of tell-tale strategic errors in a sonnet the young poet wrote ‘remarkably fast’:

Its title suggests that Keats felt he had come late to high culture (it is ‘On First Looking’). It draws attention to the fact that he could not read Homer in the original Greek. It mistakes Balboa (whom Robertson rightly credits as the discoverer of the Pacific) for Cortez, and so undermines its air of learning.

For the moment, let’s leave aside the fact that Balbóa didn’t discover the Pacific, but was the first European to set eyes on a vast expanse of water which came to have that name for English speakers. ‘Much have I travelled in the realms of gold’ does not need to convince by appending a bibliography. It’s a metaphor for a 21-year-old’s interest in clas-

sic poetry whose implications readers grant so as to take the force of his sonnet's early turn ('Yet did I never . . .') and ramifying sestet: 'Then felt I like . . .' Motion concludes his paragraph by asserting that this 'is a poem written by an outsider who wants to be an insider'. Just over two years after composing the sonnet, Keats wrote to brother George and his wife: 'I think I shall be among the English Poets after my death'; Motion makes such boldly uncertain and unworldly expectations the equivalent of wanting from poetry another 'mere matter of the moment'⁵¹ in some improved social status.

Yet the 'urgent and exhalted'⁵² impetus which produced the poem could indicate that Keats was not much motivated by such smart moves as would prompt him to check his historical references, or cover his lack of a classical education, when completing the poem quickly enough for a messenger to deliver it to the house where the borrowed copy of Chapman's Homer had been shown to him the previous evening by Cowden Clarke. Keats's friend would thus become the sonnet's first reader over a 10 o'clock breakfast. How can the poem his friend read and liked so much both frankly declare its author's lack of schooling in 'high' culture and have an 'air' of learning? Keats's mistake does not 'undermine' (to borrow Motion's cliché that muddles up ground and clouds) the poem's 'air of learning', not only because to be reasonably, though not invulnerably, well-informed is not the same as having learning, but also because 'On First Looking into Chapman's Homer' puts on no academic airs. That scholars have identified Keats's sources may be their claim to be learned, but this same material is the poet's enthusiastic book-worming. Motion is pleased to italicize 'First', as if this were a give-away, but 'Looking into' tells us that the writer of the sonnet has read little of the book he is here inspired by.

Nor does the inadvertence about explorers appear to have weakened his poem's aesthetic wholeness:

Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
 When a new planet swims into his ken;
 Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
 He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
 Looked at each other with a wild surmise—
 Silent, upon a peak in Darien.⁵³

Ricks, it is true, rejects both the Norton editors' and Donald Davie's defences of Keats: 'Far from the New World's being there only "incidentally",' he writes, 'I find that the awe-inspiring amplitude of the

poem, its sheer reach, is dependent upon its holding so assuredly in relation the great spaces of three human endeavours'.⁵⁴ The flaw is there; it can't be explained away, or minimized by saying that historical accuracy is not required of a psychologically expressive simile. The invocation of the New World is at the heart of the poem's imaginative structure: its octave evokes Ulysses sailing back from the Trojan war via various islands in the Old World; its sestet reaches out beyond the Pillars of Hercules and that same sailor's drowning in, for instance, Dante's *Divine Comedy*, to the new lands beyond the Atlantic 'discovered' by Columbus. That Keats puts the conqueror of Mexico into his sonnet underlines the poetic ambition implicit in the sestet's expressive simile: Keats feels like someone who is going to hold some lands of his own in fealty to Apollo. Curious in Ricks's rejection of what he calls those specious defences is his warming to the imaginative amplitude of the sonnet (something Motion does too). Is he writing thus just to imply that this is what he would have felt about the poem if Keats had written 'Or like Balbóa when with eagle eyes', which would reconcile the claims of scansion and fact, as Tennyson had said history requires? He would have felt this, but now, unfortunately, he has to accept that the amplitude is marred by the mistake? Ricks doesn't come out plainly and say Keats's poem is faulty, and therefore less valuable. He simply insists that we can't turn a blind eye to the mistake.

Should we observe a distinction between cases like Keats's where an oversight has occurred, apparently without the poet's ever realizing it, and cases where the writer makes a compositional, or retrospective, compromise with the facts? I think we should, just as we should distinguish them both from cases of calculated deception, such as Capa's Spanish war photograph may have been. Keats has made a real mistake: that's to say, a recognizable near-miss. Eric Griffiths⁵⁵ brings this out in relation to Wittgenstein's philosophy when he exploits an acknowledged pseudo-distinction of his own between 'mistake' and 'error': the former is stipulated to indicate statements which, while incorrect, pay tribute to correctness by being unwitting, by being intelligible near-misses (Cortez for Balbóa), and by being accepted as mistakes by the perpetrator, thus corrigible. By conveniently articulated contrast, 'error' signifies the stubborn sticking to one's perverse and mistaken belief, such as that it *was* Cortez, whatever anyone else says to the contrary. To my knowledge, during his life no one pointed out to Keats his mistake, so Griffiths's distinction doesn't clear up the ques-

tion whether Keats would have preferred the original reading against all advice. However, I can at least suspect that he would have wanted to change it, because his line attempts a statement about the explorer who really did first clap eyes on an ocean that came to be known in English as the Pacific. If, in a moment of mania, Keats had put 'Or like stout Falstaff' we would be puzzled, and the sonnet ruined; but 'Cortez' now means the unintended equivalent of 'stout what's-his-name', the man who first reported to the Western world his seeing of a large ocean to be called the Pacific. What should a critic's attitude be to an honest mistake? If the stance adopted is too unforgiving, it will reflect badly not on the poem, but on the unforgiver.

Ricks asks: 'Does it matter that a poem by Elizabeth Bishop apparently supposes that there is ordinarily such a thing as an eighty-watt bulb about the house?'⁵⁶ He has taken his example from a review by Anthony Hecht published in the *TLS* on 26 August 1977. The poem with the error, 'Faustina, or Rock Roses', appears in the 1955 collection *A Cold Spring*. Bishop lived for just over two years after the review and is known to have hand-written other revisions into people's copies of her books. Yet the 'eighty' has not been changed. Is this a case of, in Griffiths's sense, stubborn, incorrigible error? Bishop has said that 'Marianne Moore's greatest influence on me was a thirst for accuracy'. Her interviewer reported that for 'Crusoe in England' the poet 'had a friend visit a goat farm to find out how goats open their eyes'. Bishop was not scorning the farmyard and getting a servant to do her living for her; she suffered from allergic reactions triggered by animal fur. Her interviewer went on:

But she doesn't carry factual accuracy to pedantic extremes. 'In the Waiting Room' describes a *National Geographic* magazine she read in a dentist's office in 1918, the February issue. 'Out of curiosity I looked it up, and it turned out that I had combined the March and February issues, but I didn't change the poem. It was right the way it was. . .'⁵⁷

This scrupulous poet could bring herself to accept that the poem can be right, even if the fact is wrong. Is Bishop thus perpetrating a further 'error' in Griffiths's persecutory sense? I think not: the poet acknowledges the claim of fact, admits that an unwitting (and therefore honest) mistake has been made, but decides that, on balance, more would be lost than gained by bringing her poem (one, after all, of memory) into line with how it must actually have been. I take this to be thoughtfully responsible literary behaviour when confronted with an irresolvable

conflict of responsibilities.

Why doesn't Ricks make an editorial intervention in Keats's sonnet and clear away the fault? He is a scrupulous textual scholar, one whose work is devoted to the preservation of texts as authorially or historically sanctioned, mistakes or errors and all. Here the scholar confronts an irresolvable conflict of responsibilities, founded on the oeuvre's *fait accompli*. Bishop, if confronted by her misremembering from more than a quarter of a century before, is presented with three options: throw the poem away; change it to fit the facts; accept the claims of faulty memory and compositional achievement over those of strict historical accuracy. Where the scholar-editor-critic is required not to choose but to live with the intellectual conflict in registering the damage of an error and preserving the text in which it occurs, the poet can not. She has to take one of the three options, the best of a bad lot.

Yet is it so bad? What creative decision is not a compromise between conflicting claims? What work of art is not the result of such decisions in compromised circumstances? It is unlikely that we would come to admire a work of art that could claim to be absolutely perfect, even supposing we could imagine it, since the thing would then seem to have gone beyond the world in which we need art to work for us. Perhaps it is even possible that, as with a beauty spot, a flaw can enhance the value in a work of art. Is this what has happened with 'On First Looking into Chapman's Homer'? Or is it, as in a surviving marriage, a case of 'for all your faults, I love you still'? Ricks's account of the Keats sonnet warmly summarizes the kind of pleasures that reading it gives, even when I know who should really be there on that mountain top; and the excitements of literary discovery and poetic ambition are no less felicitously associated with star-gazing, world exploration and, thanks to the factual slip, conquest. Critics such as Donald Davie who offer mitigation for the error are not necessarily defending a favourite sonnet against a pedantic smear; they may be unsuccessfully attempting to account for how the error does not weaken their enjoyment and sense of the poem's worth. Nor would it be candid to assume that this failure can always be put down to the moral and aesthetic depravity of the critics in question. We may appear to be no further than Hume's account of an inevitable variety in acceptable tastes: 'One has a strong sensibility to blemishes, and is extremely studious of correctness: Another has a more lively feeling of beauties, and pardons twenty absurdities and defects for one elevated or pathetic stroke.'⁵⁸

5

However, I think we are not, for this argument is about what contextualized reasons can apply and what consequences result in the evaluation of any specific literary blemish regarding the matter of fact. Such matters of fact can be of no significance in works which fail to achieve even minimal value as art, works too trivial in form and style to warrant attention in and for themselves. Thus a further problem with fact in the appreciation and evaluation of art is that as a discriminating tool at what might be called the admission stage of art's entering the world, the matter of fact is both too fine and too crude a comb, while when considering works that have been accepted over centuries, apparently crucial questions of factual accuracy may seem to have been left behind. This is perhaps to suggest that where works of art are concerned, a reader's desire to keep unsullied something that gives pleasure and instruction may well overlook a generally binding concern for fidelity to fact. Just as a divorce does not annul marriage as such, the imaginative tolerance of a specific mistake or error does not threaten the principle of value in accuracy.

The issue is still more vexed if factual accuracy is considered not as an aesthetic value, but as an ethical one. 'The facts in this imaginative writing are accurate' cannot begin to mean 'It is a good piece of art' without the addition of 'In good art, facts which purport to be facts ought to be accurate'. However, understanding that literary texts are institutional facts points to how the additional premises find their way into the creative and critical process. This example also highlights Ricks's sensible concession that factual accuracy could never be sufficient grounds for the attribution of literary value. Leaving aside the counter-examples which suggest that no such requirement seems actually to be operating in the process by which some pieces of imaginative writing are regarded as good art, a further question then follows: what is it that supports the 'ought' in the literary critic's added premise?

Hume's more general answer was: 'Tis not, therefore, reason, which is the guide of life, but custom.'⁵⁹ What could this word 'custom' mean in relation to the critic's plea that 'it will always be critically relevant to consider accuracy and inaccuracy'? Ricks supports his case by 'advocating a return to a contractual model in literary understanding' and defends this return by remarking that 'I have never seen

a cogent refutation, as against a scorning, of the contractual model, valuably one among several.⁶⁰ Hume argued against the existence of an original contract in the governing of societies,⁶¹ and the philosopher's appeal to 'custom' doesn't match neatly against Ricks's 'contractual model'. Joanna Hodge has argued that in understanding music 'a conception of habit should be mobilized to displace this notion of a picture holding us captive. It might be less inhibiting to think in terms of habits, formed and breakable'; then she adds in a note: 'This could involve an appeal to David Hume on habit and association as a supplement to Wittgenstein on thinking about aesthetics'.⁶² The 'contract' is not then some notional agreement tacitly signed in advance by the writer and reader, but a set of guiding, unwritten terms extrapolated over a period of time which forms a body of expectations and undertakings that are worked out separately in practice and in each case. In this, it resembles the risky processes and trusting expectations involved in making, keeping, or breaking promises.

To see poems as institutional facts of this informal kind helps with the problems of literary value. All such value is attributed value, but the attributions occur and have occurred at some four levels, one of which is, and another may be, of such long-standing that the assigned values are so embedded as to appear intrinsic. The base level, and the one at which the value seems most like what is called intrinsic value, is the poetic medium, the natural language itself. No language user can utter words without also calling up networks of value. The poet is no exception, so the medium brings values with it into the poem, and part of poetic technique is in the acuteness with which such values are recognized and managed. When the poem is believed finished and offered in whatever way for publication, the poet implicitly makes a value claim based upon the work done and a recognition, by the writer, of value in what has been produced. This claim is brought into contact with another level of value assignment whereby editors, readers, critics and the like make overt or implied claims for the value of the same poem. If the work has achieved cultural survival over a long period, this process will have been repeated in ways that establish a heritage of evaluation, a heritage which may also give the poem an appearance, but only through cultural habit, of an intrinsic value. 'Some of the *attributed* value', as Frank Kermode has noted, 'sticks to the object' and 'We behave in the ordinary way as if things were capable of being precious in themselves, though we may admit, on reflection, that opinion, which involves self-esteem, governs all valuations.' Kermode

then underlines the role played by the whole culture: 'We will further allow that it cannot be merely one's own private opinion that does so; for that opinion will be affected by tacit or explicit agreements within our particular community.'⁶³

The importance of evaluation by an individual reader is not lessened by the last of these, for two reasons: (1) the institutional fact of a poem has to be sustained by repeated cultural use and if this stops the poem goes into possibly permanent hibernation; and (2) the other levels of value assignment can influence, but not override, the individual reader's response. Thus, if a serious listener fails to 'agree with us' that the music which Schoenberg composed after *Verklärte Nacht* also counts as *music* then this would not necessarily 'mean that the listener could not learn the music history of the twentieth century'.⁶⁴ Wittgenstein's remarks about certainty with regard to brute facts cannot be stretched in this fashion to include the cultural histories of institutional facts. What if this listener were just about to produce an aesthetic revolution in twenty-first century music which made Schoenberg's compositions a barely comprehensible dead-end curiosity? The above account cannot explain how Donne's neglected verse, with its once unacceptable metrics, came to play such a part in stylistic developments for poetry in English during Schoenberg's century, nor could it account for how the poetry of James Russell Lowell has played so little. The history of nineteenth-century American poetry is now principally about Emily Dickinson and Walt Whitman; during most of their century it was not. Nor can these reflections be set aside by insisting that the point is not about changing values with regard to works which are nevertheless assumed to be works of that type (music, that's to say, not noise), for the cultural argument is frequently about what is to count as music, or as poetry. Schoenberg's later work is probably safe from total marginalization by great revolutions of taste, but you never know. There has to be dynamic interplay between the different levels of value-assignment for a culture and its history to develop and this interplay may be no respecter of solid-looking achievements.

Facts, and our assuming their independent existence, are necessary for such evaluation at any level. They are also necessary for aesthetic ordering, since they contribute crucially to the surroundings in which any act of aesthetic intervention must take place or be visible as an intervention. Both of these assertions are supported by the necessity of independently existing facts for our taking part in any form of lan-

guage use. Ricks's essay supports the conviction that plausibility, fairness to reality, and fidelity (not only to fact) are qualities that have customarily been deployed in the making and receiving of art, and that, as custom, these value-bearing concepts have been developed through innumerable exchanges over many centuries. Factual accuracy is one aspect of these aesthetico-ethical values. Thus, it may be regarded as crucial in some works, less so in others, but never necessarily and never in itself. Despite the problems with his heterogeneous examples and under-described criteria, the main thrust of Ricks's argument is in this sense wholly justified, justified in so far as his essay is itself an example of custom in action. It is a valuable contribution to the conflictual culture of negotiation and evolution concerning how literary art is to be made and received.

Notes

¹ Arthur C. Danto, *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art* (New York, 1986), 174-5. In *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), his irrepressibly comic study of indiscernibly different artworks and mere things, Danto describes himself and a companion 'admiring Breugel's *Landscape with the Fall of Icarus*, in Antwerp.' (p. 115) The painting with this title referred to in W. H. Auden's 'Musée des Beaux Arts' is in the Musée des Beaux Arts, Brussels.

² Helen Vendler, 'Inspiration, Accident, Genius', *LRB* (16 Oct 1997), 10.

³ Seamus Heaney, *Station Island* (1984), 18.

⁴ Helen Vendler, *The Music of What Happens: Poems, Poets, Critics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), 129. North on maps being conventionally up, Sakhalin is *above* Japan.

⁵ Danto, *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art*, 183. See Ed Dorn, *Interviews* (San Francisco, Cal., 1978).

⁶ W. H. Auden, 'Since you are going to begin today', *The English Auden: Poems, Essays and Dramatic Writings 1927-1939* ed. E. Mendelson (1977), 45.

⁷ *OED*, senses 1a-c.

⁸ John R. Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality* (New York, 1995), 210.

⁹ W. H. Auden, 'New Year Letter', *Collected Poems* ed. E. Mendelson (New York, 1991), 201.

¹⁰ Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality*, 99.

¹¹ Christopher Ricks, 'Literature and the Matter of Fact', *Essays in Appreciation* (Oxford, 1996), 304.

¹² *Ibid.*, citing A. Norman Jeffares, *A Commentary on the Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* (1968), 8-9.

¹³ W. H. Auden, 'In Memory of W. B. Yeats', *The English Auden*, 242.

¹⁴ Edward Lear, *A Book of Nonsense* (1992), 71.

¹⁵ W. B. Yeats, *The Collected Poems*, 2nd edn., ed. R. J. Finneran (1991), 14. I quote the received text which was in place by *Poems* (1895), where it appears (dated 1886) under the revised title and with the variant 'the dim enameled sea'. For the 1886 text, see *The Variorum Edition of the Poems* ed. P. Allt and R. K. Alspach (1971), 77.

¹⁶ Peter McDonald, 'Yeats and Remorse', Chatterton Lecture on Poetry, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 94 (1997), 203.

¹⁷ *The Collected Letters of W. B. Yeats: Vol. 1 1865-1895*, eds. J. Kelly and E. Domville (Oxford, 1986), 138.

¹⁸ McDonald, 'Yeats and Remorse', 204 (twice), 203.

¹⁹ Ricks, 304, 305 (twice).

²⁰ Ricks, 'The Wit and Weight of Clarendon', *Essays in Appreciation*, 51. He cites 'In Defence of Gossip', W. H. Auden, *Prose, and Travel Books in Verse and Prose, Vol. 1, 1926-1938* ed. E. Mendelson (Princeton, NJ., 1997), 425.

²¹ Yeats, *Collected Poems*, 332.

²² Louis MacNeice, *Selected Literary Criticism* ed. A Heuser (Oxford, 1987), 116.

²³ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 283.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 299.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 304-6.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 295.

²⁷ Alastair Fowler, 'Glintingly the Word', *TLS* no. 4887, 29 Nov 1996, 7.

²⁸ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 298.

²⁹ Richard Rorty, *Consequences of Pragmatism: Essays 1972-1980* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1982), 136.

³⁰ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 287.

³¹ *Defoe: The Critical Heritage* ed. P. Rogers (1972), 125. Rogers suggests Bagehot as its author on p. 21.

³² Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 286.

³³ *Ibid.* 284.

³⁴ For a summary of this mysticism, see Hans-Johann Glock, *A Wittgenstein Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996), 31-2.

³⁵ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. C. K. Ogden (1922), 6.421, 6.4, and 6.41.

³⁶ What Wittgenstein does not mean by 'Ethics and aesthetics are one' is the implication in Fredrick Raphael's 'Despite what Wittgenstein. . . said to the contrary, aesthetics and ethics have no necessary equivalence or symmetry; there can, after all, be "good" right-wing literature', Fredrick Raphael, 'In the Case of Julius v. Mr Eliot', *PN Review* 110, 22, 6 (1996), 37. The equivalence or symmetry of particular ethical and aesthetic judgements is not the issue; he is saying that these ways of talking are both entirely ruled out of truth-proposition status. For an account of affinities between these two among the many fields whereof 'we must be silent', see B. R. Tilghman, *Wittgenstein, Ethics and Aesthetics: The View from Eternity* (1991), ch. 2.

³⁷ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value: A Selection from the Posthumous Remains*, ed. G. H. Von Wright with H. Nymann, rev. ed. of text A. Pichler, trans. P. Winch (Oxford, 1998), 5e.

³⁸ *The Wittgenstein Reader* ed. A. Kenny (Oxford, 1994), 291.

³⁹ See G. E. M. Anscombe, 'On Brute Facts', *Analysis* 18, no. 3 (1958).

⁴⁰ *English Auden*, 212.

⁴¹ Empson believed so; see 'Another Time', *Argufying: Essays on Literature and Culture* ed. J. Haffenden (1987), 374n.

⁴² George Orwell, *Inside the Whale* (1940), 169. For further recent comment on this issue, see Zachary Leader, *Revision and Romantic Authorship* (Oxford, 1986), 13n.

⁴³ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 283 (twice).

⁴⁴ David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* ed. L. A. Selby-Bigge, 2nd edn. ed. P. H. Nidditch (Oxford, 1978), 469.

⁴⁵ Hume, *Treatise*, 652.

⁴⁶ The fact/value distinction has been taken to be an ideological tool of bourgeois culture, an alienation device. See Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford, 1990), 410-11.

⁴⁷ John R. Searle, 'How to Derive an "Ought" from an "Is"', *Philosophical Review* (1964), 101.

⁴⁸ John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, 1969), 51.

⁴⁹ Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1984), 57. The counter-example is attributed to A. N. Prior.

⁵⁰ Stuart Hampshire, *Innocence and Experience* (1989), 96.

⁵¹ John Keats, Letter to George and Georgina Keats, 14 or 15 Oct 1818, *Letters* ed. S. Colvin (1935), 171. Leader discusses Keats's practical need for 'immediate recognition' in *Revision*, 262ff.

⁵² Andrew Motion, *Keats* (1997), 109, 112 (twice), 109. I repeat criticisms of Motion reading Keats's sonnet made more forcefully by Helen Vendler in 'Inspiration, Accident, Genius', 10.

⁵³ John Keats, *The Complete Poems* ed. J. Barnard (Harmondsworth, 1988), 72.

⁵⁴ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 286, referring to the *Norton Anthology of English Poetry* and Donald Davie, 'Pound and the Perfect Lady', *LRB*, (23 May 1985).

⁵⁵ Eric Griffiths, 'Wittgenstein and the comedy of errors', *English Comedy* ed. M. Corder, P. Holland, and J. Kerrigan (Cambridge, 1994), 298-9.

⁵⁶ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 285.

⁵⁷ *Conversations with Elizabeth Bishop*, ed. G. Monteiro (Jackson, Miss., 1996), 73.

⁵⁸ David Hume, 'Of the Standard of Taste', *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. E. F. Miller (Indianapolis, Ind., 1987), 244.

⁵⁹ Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 652.

⁶⁰ Ricks, 'Matter of Fact', 286.

⁶¹ Hume, 'Of the Original Contract', *Essays*, 465-87.

⁶² Joanna Hodge, 'Aesthetic Decomposition: Music, Identity, and Time', *The Interpretation of Music: Philosophical Essays*, ed. M. Krausz (Oxford, 1993), 249.

⁶³ Frank Kermode, *Value in Literature* (Tokyo, 1990), 17, 21 (twice). See also Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

⁶⁴ G. L. Hagberg, *Art as Language: Wittgenstein, Meaning, and Aesthetic Theory* (Ithaca, NY., 1995), 157.

解体する身体

『密偵』における観相学的語りとその解体

*

伊藤 正範

ジョゼフ・コンラッド (Joseph Conrad) の『密偵』(*The Secret Agent*, 1907)の人物描写について論じる際、観相学 (physiognomy) を看過することはできない。ヴィクトリア朝後期のイギリス社会において隆盛を極めた観相学は、人間の身体的特徴、特に顔を子細に判読することで犯罪者などの類型化を試みる、当時の純然たる科学だった。『密偵』の語りは、しばしば観相学的手法を用いて登場人物の身体を典型的に描写していく。ところが他方で、そうした身体の「判読」ができなくなる瞬間、すなわち観相学の枠内で人間の身体を捉えることができなくなる瞬間が、この小説にはある。語りが大きく依拠する観相学が、テキスト内で破綻をきたしてしまうのだ。本稿では、『密偵』が観相学の言説と「判読できない身体」とを同時に内包することで、いかなる語りの仕組みを築いているかに着目してみる。

この小説において、観相学を包括する一つの大きなディスコースがアイロニカルに扱われていることは、これまでの研究でも論じられてきた。¹だがこうした語りの特殊性を議論の中心軸に据えると、観相学が単なるアイロニーの対象にとどまらず、テキストの構造の根幹に位置し、解体されることによって、語りという形式が負う限界を巧みに取り外していることが見えてくるであろう。

I

この小説の中心的エピソードとなっているのは、密偵ヴァーロック氏 (Mr. Verloc) がロシア大使館から命じられたグリニッジ天文台爆破の陰謀である。その企みは爆弾の暴発によって失敗に終わり、現場には自爆して

木っ端みじんになった人間の死体が残される。² この自爆した人物、ステイーヴィー (Stevie) はヴァーロック氏の妻ウィニー (Winnie) の実弟であり、生まれつきの知能障害を持つために、ヴァーロック夫妻の保護下に暮らす少年であった。彼は、義理の兄であるヴァーロック氏に純真な崇敬を寄せていたのだが、そこに目を付けたヴァーロック氏によって計画に利用され、結局、爆弾を運ぶ途中で誤って爆死してしまったのだ。

このステイーヴィーは、実は意外な一面を持っている。彼の繊細すぎる感受性は、社会的弱者が被る不利益を目の当たりにして耐えることができないのだ。彼は、貧困にあえぐ御者とその御者に鞭打たれる馬を見て、強者が弱者を虐げることで成り立つ階層社会に激しい怒りを覚える。

“Poor brute, poor people!” was all [Stevie] could repeat. It did not seem forcible enough, and he came to a stop with an angry splutter: “Shame!” Stevie was no master of phrases, and perhaps for that very reason his thoughts lacked clearness and precision. But he felt with greater completeness and some profundity. That little word contained all his sense of indignation and horror at one sort of wretchedness having to feed upon the anguish of the other—at the poor cabman beating the poor horse in the name, as it were, of his poor kids at home. And Stevie knew what it was to be beaten. He knew it from experience. It was a bad world. Bad! Bad!

(171)

自らの感情を表現する言葉に乏しいステイーヴィーに代わって、彼の内面に潜む「完全さ」や「深遠さ」を描き出すのは語りである。そこには、単なる「狂人」として括ることの決してできない、彼の鋭い洞察力、そして豊かな感受性が浮かび上がってくる。

ところが、まさにそうした描写の直後、語りは自らの叙述を覆してしまう。御者と馬を救う「妙案」に思い至ったステイーヴィーの顔は、内面描写とは正反対のベクトルをもって描き出される。

“Police,” [Stevie] suggested, confidently.

“The police aren’t for that,” observed Mrs. Verloc, cursorily, hurrying on her way.

Stevie’s face lengthened considerably. He was thinking. The more intense his thinking, the slacker was the droop of his lower jaw. And it was with an aspect of hopeless vacancy that he gave up his intellectual enterprise. (172)

怒りの真剣さとは裏腹にだらしく変形していくステイーヴィーの顔は、明白なアイロニーをもって提示される。しまりなく垂れ下がった顎の描写は、いくら「考え」ようとしても及ばない彼の精神薄弱者としての姿を如実に浮かび上がらせてしまうのだ。ステイーヴィーの外見描写をする語りは、内面描写が伝えようとした彼の人物像を全く異なったものへと書き換えてしまうのである。

II

こうした外見描写の背後には、ある強力な社会的言説が潜んでいる。それが冒頭で触れた観相学である。この観相学を熱烈に信奉する登場人物、アナーキストのオシボン (Ossipon) は、スティーヴィーが一心不乱に無数の円を描き続けるのを見てこう言う。

“Very good. Very characteristic, perfectly typical.”

“What’s very good?” grunted, inquiringly, Mr. Verloc. . . .

“Typical of this form of degeneracy—these drawings, I mean.”

“You would call that lad a degenerate, would you?” mumbled Mr. Verloc. (46)

ヴァーロック氏に対するオシボンの答えはこうである。

“That’s what he may be called scientifically. Very good type, too, altogether, of that sort of degenerate. It’s enough to glance at the lobes of his ears. If you read Lombroso——” (46-47)

オシボンは、スティーヴィーの耳たぶを一瞥して、「退廃」(‘degeneracy’) という語を口にする。その主張の根拠としてオシボンが名前を言いかけたチェーザレ・ロンブローゾ (Cesare Lombroso, 1835-1909) は、1876年にイタリアで出版した著書『犯罪者』(*L'uomo delinquente*)において、観相学を用いて犯罪者を見分けることができると主張した人物である。彼はその英語版の序文で、ある山賊の頭蓋骨が著作のきっかけをもたらしたことを、特徴的な語彙を用いて述べている。

At the sight of that skull, I seemed to see all of a sudden, lighted up as a vast plain under a flaming sky, the problem of the nature of the criminal—an atavistic being who reproduces in his person the ferocious instincts of primitive humanity and the inferior animals. Thus were explained anatomically the enormous jaws, high cheek-bones, prominent superciliary arches, solitary lines in the palms, extreme size of the orbits, handle-shaped or sessile ears found in criminals, savages, and apes. . . .

(Lombroso xiv-xv)

ロンブローゾの叙述において目立つのが、人間の顔の様々な部位の羅列と、それらを形容する語句である。彼は人々の顎、頬骨、額、眉、眼窩、耳などの形態の統計をとり、多くの犯罪者の顔に「先祖返り」(‘atavism’) と呼ばれる変形があることを、科学的に証明しようとしたのだ。ロンブローゾが発展させた犯罪人類学において、先祖返りは「退廃」の徴候と見なされ、犯罪者としての先天的、遺伝的な資質を示していると考えられた。観相学の対象となったのは、犯罪者だけではない。アナーキスト、狂人、アルコール中毒者、癲癇患者、果ては下層階級の人々までもが「退廃者」

として分類され、やがて都市の拡大が進むと、彼らの存在は大衆社会に「文化的退廃」をもたらすものとして広く危険視されるようになったのである。

ヴィクトリア朝後期からエドワード朝にかけてのイギリス社会もまた、「退廃」に対して神経をとがらせていた。ロンブローゾの退廃論は、初めのうちこそ、根強く残るリベラリズム思想の中で、個人の自由意志を蔑ろにする決定論であると反発を受けた。³ だが、1880年代における組織的な社会主義運動の出現、デモや暴動の増加は中産階級の不安を煽り、都市の混乱に対する彼らの危機感は否応なしに高まっていった。そのような状況下で、下層階級や貧民を「先天的に劣った人種」として類型化する観相学の決定論は好都合だったのである。

観相学そのものの起源はより古く、18世紀後半のヨハン・カスパー・ラヴァーター (Johann Kaspar Lavater) にまで遡る。百年経ってなお観相学がこうした脚光を浴びた背景には、19世紀後半に絶大な影響力を振るった社会ダーウィン主義があった。社会ダーウィン主義は、エリート階級が生存競争において生物学的に優越性を持っているという信仰を招き、その後よりラディカルな優生学思想を生み出していく。優生学者達は、下層階級などの「退廃者」の出生率が中流・上流のそれを上回ることによる「人種の退化」を危惧し、結果的に、強力な階級差別意識を正当化していった。⁴

『密偵』におけるオシボンの人物像は、ロンブローゾの観相学への盲目的な信仰によって大きく特色づけられている。登場人物達の「退廃」の徴候は、彼によって次々と暴き出されていく。スティーヴィーの耳の変形も、オシボンの「科学」の目を逃れることはできなかったのだ。だが、この小説においてこうした観相学的視点を持つのはオシボンだけではない。それは前述した御者のエピソードの場面を見れば明らかであろう。語りまでもが、心情に即した内面描写の一方で、しばしば同様の言説を用いて登場人物の外見を描写するのである。⁵

III

語りによるスティーヴィーの描写は、その対象が内面であるか外見であるかによって著しい対照を見せる。スティーヴィーの下顎の観相学的描写は、内面描写が示す彼の深みをたちまちにして消し去り、代わりに「退廃者」であるという逃れようのない事実を浮かび上がらせるのだ。ヤーコブ・レーテ (Jakob Lothe) は、この小説の語りの特徴のひとつとして、作者

的語り手が登場人物に課すアイロニーの度合いが絶えず変動することを挙げている(226-62)。このことは、スティーヴィーの外見描写と内面描写の相違に当てはめてみてもよくわかる。語り手は、彼の心情を酌み量ったその直後というのに、痛烈なアイロニーを彼に浴びせかけるのだ。スティーヴィーは、この繰り返しによってもたらされるアンビヴァレントな人物像からついに抜け出せないかに見える。

だが、語りのアイロニーが観相学に裏打ちされているのだとすれば、その観相学の働かなくなる瞬間に、まさに他ならぬアイロニーの消失を見て取れるのではないか。爆弾によって粉々に吹き飛ばされたスティーヴィーの体は、「名前のない断片の山」(‘a heap of nameless fragments’, 87)と化す。断片化した彼の死体には、「退廃」の痕跡はおろか、一個の人間の身体が表出しようの意味づけは何も読みとることができない。鋭い観察眼を誇るヒート警部(Chief Inspector Heat)ですら、現場から拾い集められた肉片が「身元不明」であるという事実にも悩まされる。

The echo of the words “Person unknown” repeating itself in his inner consciousness bothered the Chief Inspector considerably. He would have liked to trace this affair back to its mysterious origin for his own information. He was professionally curious. Before the public he would have liked to vindicate the efficiency of his department by establishing the identity of that man. He was a loyal servant. That, however, appeared impossible. The first term of the problem was unreadable—lacked all suggestion but that of atrocious cruelty. (89)

粉碎されて「判読不能」となった身体は、そこに意味づけを求めようとする試みを拒絶する。観相学は身体表象の「判読」を要とする科学であった。その観相学が働く余地は、ここには見あたらないのである。

こうして、スティーヴィーの身体の解体とともに、観相学をもって語ることのできないものが小説中に出現する。「退廃者」の身体を吹き飛ばすことで、テキストは自らの語りの対象を消し去るのだ。断片化した身体を眼前にして、観相学的語りは沈黙せざるを得ない。それはテキストが自らの語りに対して仕掛けた解体ではないか。そして、スティーヴィーの人物描写に付きまどっていた語りのアイロニーは、この瞬間に引き剥がされる。「持てる者」が「持たざる者」を搾取する現実に憤る彼の純粹無垢な人物像は、「持てる者」の言説が穿たれることで、ついに精神薄弱という枷を外されるのである。

この意味において、スティーヴィーはヴァーロック氏の計画遂行に決して失敗したわけではない。なぜなら、大使館が命じたグリニッジ天文台爆破の計画は、そもそも爆弾によってブルジョワジーの「神聖なる崇拜物」

(‘sacrosanct fetish’, 31) である天文学を破壊しようというものだったからである。スティーヴィーはその完遂にこそ失敗するのだが、結果的に自らの身体を破壊することによって、もう一つの中産階級の科学、観相学を解体しているのだ。スティーヴィーの持つ爆弾が吹き飛ばしたものと、紛れもない中産階級の巨大なディスコースだったのである。

IV

とはいえ、スティーヴィーの身体の解体には、当然のごとく死という大きな代償が伴う。⁶ さらに「判読不能」なほどバラバラになったはずの死体からは、皮肉にも彼の身元を示す決定的な証拠が見つかってしまう。ヒート警部が肉片の中からつまみ上げた布きれは、奇行を起こして警察に保護されたスティーヴィーが住所すら忘れてしまうことから、ウィニーがコートに縫いつけておいた迷子札だったのだ。彼は命を失ってなお、精神薄弱者という「退廃」に付きまとうアイロニーから逃れることができないのか。

だが物語の後半、観相学は再び、しかもより明確に動揺させられることになる。ヴァーロック氏の従順な妻であったウィニーは、スティーヴィーの死を知ると突如として変貌し、彼女から最愛の弟を奪ったヴァーロック氏を、ためらいもなくナイフで突き刺す。裏切った夫に強い憎しみを抱きつつ、彼女はついに彼から、そしてスティーヴィーを養うための望まない結婚生活から、解放されたと考えるのだ。そのようなウィニーの顔には、ある変化が生じる。

As if the homeless soul of Stevie had flown for shelter straight to the breast of his sister, guardian, and protector, the resemblance of her face with that of her brother grew at every step, even to the droop of the lower lip, even to the slight divergence of the eyes. (262)

ウィニーの顔のさまざまな部位は、スティーヴィーの「退廃」の顔と、驚くほど似通ってくる。彼女の狂気の表情は、弟と同様、観相学的な語彙をもって描き出されるのである。⁷

しかしながら、ここでの観相学的描写に再びアイロニカルな効果を見いだすことは難しい。というのは、ウィニーの顔は観相学の枠組みでは捉えきれないものを有しているからである。

Anybody could have noted the subtle change on her features, in the stare of her eyes, giving her a new and startling expression; an expression seldom observed by competent persons under the conditions of leisure and security demanded for thorough analysis, but whose meaning could not be mistaken at a glance. (260-61)

「暇と安全さという条件下で観察する人々」というのは、明らかにロンブローゾのような観相学者に対するあてこすりであろう。そこには、机上の理論家的存在が想起させるある種の安穩さ、気楽さが風刺されているように見える。ウィニーの顔は、そうした観相学者の眼差しに明確な「退廃者」としての意味を呈しつつも、同時に彼らにとっての未知の側面を抱えているのだ。

そのことがより明白となるのが、その後のオシボンとの出奔の場面である。オシボンは、彼女の顔の異変に気づく。

[Ossipon] was scientific, and he gazed scientifically at that woman, the sister of a degenerate, a degenerate herself—of a murdering type. He gazed at her, and invoked Lombroso, as an Italian peasant recommends himself to his favourite saint. He gazed scientifically. He gazed at her cheeks, at her nose, at her eyes, at her ears. . . . Bad! . . . Fatal! Mrs. Verloc's pale lips parting, slightly relaxed under his passionately attentive gaze, he gazed also at her teeth. . . . Not a doubt remained . . . a murdering type. . . . If Comrade Ossipon did not recommend his terrified soul to Lombroso, it was only because on scientific grounds he could not believe that he carried about him such a thing as a soul. But he had in him the scientific spirit, which moved him to testify on the platform of a railway station in nervous, jerky phrases.

“He was an extraordinary lad, that brother of yours. Most interesting to study. A perfect type in a way. Perfect!”

He spoke scientifically in his secret fear. (297)

ロンブローゾを信奉するオシボンは、「科学的な」目をもってウィニーの狂気の顔を観察する。だがその一方で、彼は未だかつて経験したことのない スティーヴィーの顔を面白半分に観察したときには感じ得なかった

恐怖を感じずにはいられない。その恐怖は、観相学という「科学」の枠からはみ出し、オシボンのロンブローゾへの信仰心を苛むのである。

オシボンはウィニーを捨て去るものの、結局、彼女の狂気に見いだした恐怖をその後もずっと拭い去ることができない。彼は、ウィニーらしき女性の自殺を報じる新聞の一節に執拗に悩まされることになる。

They ran thus: “*An impenetrable mystery seems destined to hang for ever over this act of madness or despair.*”

Such were the end words of an item of news headed: “Suicide of Lady Passenger from a cross-Channel Boat.” Comrade Ossipon was familiar with the beauties of its journalistic style. “*An impenetrable mystery seems destined to hang for ever. . . .*” He knew every word by heart. “*An impenetrable mystery. . . .*” And the robust anarchist, hanging his head on his breast, fell into a long reverie.

He was menaced by this thing in the very sources of his existence. . . . He was becoming scientifically afraid of insanity lying in wait for him amongst these lines. “*To hang for ever over.*” It was an obsession, a torture. (307)

ウィニーが残していった「見通すことのできない謎」は、彼女の死後も「科学者」オシポンを恐怖させる。それは、彼が信仰する観相学の枠組みの中では表出することのできない「謎」なのだ。オシポンの恐怖に同調した語りは、ウィニーをアイロニカルに描くことはない。むしろこの場面にアイロニーがあるとすれば、それは観相学に偏執したオシポンに対してであろう。こうして、ウィニーの「狂気と絶望」は、再び語りすることができないものとして観相学の前に立ちはだかり、動揺をもたらす。しかもウィニーは死してなお、観相学者オシポンを脅かし続ける。スティーヴィーとは異なり、死が彼女から観相学を穿つ力を奪い去ることはないのだ。

V

だが、ウィニーも結局は命を落とすことに変わりない。観相学を揺るがす登場人物は、おしなべて死というもう一つのアイロニーを免れることができないのだろうか。しかし、プロフェッサー (Professor) とあだ名されるアナーキストの存在は、そうした疑念を払拭してくれる。彼もまた異様な外見を持ち、それはオシポンの目を通してこう語られる。

[The Professor's] flat, large ears departed widely from the sides of his skull, which looked frail enough for Ossipon to crush between thumb and forefinger; the dome of the forehead seemed to rest on the rim of the spectacles; the flat cheeks, of a greasy, unhealthy complexion, were merely smudged by the miserable poverty of a thin dark whisker. The lamentable inferiority of the whole physique was made ludicrous by the supremely self-confident bearing of the individual. (62)

プロフェッサーの顔の各部位を列挙していく手法とその語彙は、まさにロンブローゾのものである。アナーキスト 他ならぬロンブローゾの犯罪学の対象であったものであるプロフェッサーは、「退廃」の典型的徴候を抱えているのだ。著しく変形したプロフェッサーの顔は、スティーヴィーの顔と同様、アイロニカルに描写されてしまう。

しかし語りは、群衆の中で際立つプロフェッサーの「発育不全の背丈」(‘stunted stature’, 80) や、彼の社会的成功を妨げた貧弱な外見、父親の「傾斜した額」(‘sloping forehead’, 80) などに触れながらも、再びそのアイロニーの度合いを変動させる。

Lost in the crowd, miserable and undersized, he meditated confidently on his power, keeping his hand in the left pocket of his trousers, grasping lightly the india-rubber ball, the supreme guarantee of his sinister freedom. . . . (81)

プロフェッサーの身体的劣等性に触れているにもかかわらず、語りが彼の「自らの力に対して自信をもった」様子を描き出す姿勢にアイロニーは見

られない。

その理由を探る手がかりとなるのは、彼の手に握られている「ゴムのボール」、すなわち爆弾の起爆スイッチである。彼は自らが作った爆弾を肌身離さず持ち歩き、警察の手にかかるうという瞬間に自爆しようと考えているのだ。だが彼の自信が、そうした警察に対する示威行為だけから来ているとは考えにくい。というのは、その後続く場面で明かされる彼の最大の不安の原因とは、「無数の群衆」(‘immense multitude’, 81), 「大勢の人間」(‘mass of mankind’, 81-82) だからである。彼の身体の奇形が際立って現れるのが、しばしば群衆に紛れた彼の描写においてであることを忘れてはならない。その身体こそが、警察以上に彼のアナーキストとしての存在を脅かしてはいるのではないか。

バーバラ・アーネット・メルキオーリ (Barbara Arnett Melchiori) は、コンラッドが『密偵』においてアナーキズムを喜劇的に提示していると指摘しつつ、アナーキスト自身の身体的な奇形がその喜劇性をさらに強めていると論じる (74-75)。確かに、ミケーリス (Michaelis) の「巨大な腹と、膨らんで青白く半ば透き通った頬」や、カール・ユント (Karl Yundt) の「歯のない口」、「禿頭」、「弱々しく垂れ下がる山羊髭」、「光のない目」、そしてオシボンの「黄色い縮れ毛」、「そばかすのある赤ら顔」、「平べったい鼻と突き出した口」(41-44) は、彼らの人物像を滑稽なものとして演出する。『密偵』におけるアナーキスト達の身体的特徴は、確実に彼らから破壊者としての脅威を剥ぎ取ってしまうのだ。⁸ プロフェッサーにおいても、それは例外ではない。ロンドンの群衆 都市の大衆社会こそ「文化的退廃」が最も危惧された場所である に紛れた彼の姿は、自らの惨めな「退廃」の様相をさらけ出してしまうのである。

しかしながら、その群衆のただ中で彼は爆弾のスイッチを握る。仮に爆弾が爆発したとしたら、それによって破壊されるのは、周囲の建物や人々のみならず、紛れもない彼の身体であろう。ここで思い起こされるのが、スティーヴィーの自爆である。奇妙にも、爆弾を抱えるのはまたしても「退廃者」なのだ。プロフェッサーという人物は、スティーヴィーと同様、観相学のアイロニーを吹き飛ばす術を手中にしているのだろうか。小説の終末部、プロフェッサーがロンドンの街を歩く場面を見てみよう。

And the incorruptible Professor walked, too, averting his eyes from the odious multitude of mankind. He had no future. He disdained it. He was a force. His thoughts caressed the images of ruin and destruction. He walked frail, insignificant, shabby, miserable—and terrible in the simplicity of his idea calling madness and

despair to the regeneration of the world. Nobody looked at him. He passed on unsuspected and deadly, like a pest in the street full of men. (311)

再び群衆に紛れ、語りが「弱々しく、取るに足りず、みすぼらしく惨めな」と描写するプロフェッサーは、にもかかわらず、強烈な死と破壊のイメージに結びつけられる。そこにあるのは、彼の力に対する無条件の肯定に他ならない。

もちろん彼は実際に自爆してみせるわけではない。だが彼の身につける爆弾は、一つの可能性として常に過去、つまりスティーヴィーの自爆を想起させる。さらに、強い力を発し続ける彼の信条「狂気と絶望」こそ、ウィニーがもたらした恐怖を集約するものとして反復されてきた語句であり、プロフェッサーと彼女の結節点を成すものなのだ。このように彼の力の背後にはスティーヴィー、そしてウィニーが潜む。だからこそ起爆スイッチを握りしめるという行為は、社会の負の価値として彼を貶めるイデオロギーを破壊するほどの力を彼にもたらすのではないか。結果として、プロフェッサーの身体に課せられるアイロニーが持続することはない。こうして、彼は無力な「退廃者」としてではなく、恐怖の象徴としてのアナキストであり続けることができる。スティーヴィー、ウィニーによって揺るがされてきた観相学的語りは、最後の、そして致命的な打撃を受けるのだ。

プロフェッサーが観相学に与える動揺は、スティーヴィー、ウィニーの比ではない。死というアイロニーを逃れられなかった彼らとは対照的に、プロフェッサーは爆弾を抱えたまま恐怖の存在として生き続けていくからである。そう考えると、プロフェッサーが抱く「再生」(‘regeneration’)の野望にも大きな意味が見えてくる。「再生」とは本来、社会ダーウィン主義、特に優生学によって用いられた言葉で、「退廃」した人種を生物学的に減らすことによる「優れた人種の再生、復興」を意味した。ところが、プロフェッサーは、人類の「進歩」(‘progress’)について考える際、自分自身が生き残ることに強い望みを抱いている(303-4)。自らこそが「退廃者」であるにもかかわらず、である。彼の「再生」は、明らかに社会ダーウィン主義的なコンテクストからかけ離れているのだ。むしろ、それは対極にあるともとれる。爆弾を抱えるプロフェッサーの存在は、観相学を否定し、さらには社会ダーウィン主義の「再生」とは全く異なる、独自の「再生」の道すなわち、「退廃者」であるはずの自らの生き残りの可能性を提示するのである。

観相学の言説は、都市の拡大に伴う犯罪やテロリズムの増加を背景に、

世紀末の小説の世界で台頭した。⁹ 『密偵』もまた、確かにそうした流れを汲む小説であろう。登場する精神薄弱者、殺人者、アナーキストは、例に洩れず典型的な身体の奇形を抱え、「退廃者」としてのアイロニカルな類型のもとに描写される。しかし、『密偵』における「退廃者」は観相学の枠組みでは語りきることができない。彼らの存在は観相学的語りの絶対性に綻びを作り、その綻びの上にメッセージを築き上げようとする。語ることでできない顔や身体にこそ、観相学という科学言説を揺るがす力が託されているのである。そこには、小説の言語の新たな可能性を模索するコンラッドの姿を見いだすこともできよう。彼の創造した独自のフィクションの形態は、ヴィクトリア朝後期の社会を席巻する退廃論と明らかに共振しつつも、「退廃者」達が「退廃者」の烙印を峻拒して生き得る可能性を垣間見させてくれるのである。

注

* 本稿は日本英文学会第70回大会（1998年5月、於京都大学）における口頭発表の原稿を加筆修正したものである。

¹ この大きなディスコース、すなわちロンブローゾの退廃論については後述する。コンラッドが作中で退廃論を懐疑的に扱っていることを論じる批評については、Hunter 214-16, Greenslade 114-19, Berthoud, ‘Secret Agent’ 117, Berthoud, *Joseph Conrad* 152-59 等が挙げられる。

² 原型となった1894年2月15日のグリニッジ天文台爆破事件は、やはり犯人の自爆によって失敗に終わっている。犯人の男性 (Martial Bourdin) は精神薄弱で、ステイーヴィーとの身体的な類似も指摘されている。Baines 330, Tennant xix 参照。

³ ロンブローゾの退廃論とリベラリズム的な自由意志との対立については、Pick 176-203, 及び Hunter 182-83 参照。

⁴ こうした優生学思想が活性化したのは20世紀初頭で、その主導的立場にあったのがカール・ピアソン (Karl Pearson, 1857-1936) である。優生学 (eugenics) という語が一般的に浸透したのもその頃であるが、この言葉が初めて世に出されたのは、約20年前、フランシス・ゴールトン (Francis Galton, 1822-1911) によってであった。『密偵』が出版された1907年には、ゴールトンを名誉会長とした優生学教育協会 (Eugenics Education Society) が設立されている。Greenslade 196-99, Kevles 3-69 参照。社会ダーウィン主義については Bowler 57-79 参照。

⁵ 『密偵』におけるロンブローゾの退廃論の影響は無視できないほど大きいのであるが、コンラッドとこうした当時の科学言説との接点は明らかではない。ただし、それに関する推論はいくつかなされている。アラン・ハンター (Allan Hunter) は、『密偵』の登場人物の描写の細部がロンブローゾの論を様々な形で反映していることを指摘している。『犯罪者』の英語版 (*Criminal Man*) が出版されたのは1911年であるが、ハンターは、仏語版 (*L'Homme criminel*, 1895), 簡約版 (*Criminal*

Anthropology, 1897) , もしくはロンブローゾに依拠して書かれたハヴロック・エリス (Havelock Ellis) の著書 (*The Criminal*, 1890) にコンラッドとの接点があったのではないかと推測している (182-216)。また、ロンブローゾに多くを負っているとされる、マックス・ノルダウ (Max Nordau) の著書 (*Degeneration*, 1895) の影響も指摘されている。それに関しては Ray 74, Greenslade 106-7 参照。

⁶ レーテは、『密偵』の語りの性質について論じながら、ステイーヴィーの死という事実が、彼に対するアイロニーをより強めていると述べている(242)。

⁷ ハンターは、ウィニーの人物描写に、1895年に英訳が出版された『女犯罪者』(*La donna delinquente*, 1893)等のロンブローゾの著作の影響が見られると指摘している (182-216)。レベッカ・スコット (Rebecca Scott) は、退廃の徴候を示し始めるウィニーに注目し、その人物像の中に、現代西洋文明とは異質の原初的な闇を見込んでいる (203-12)。

⁸ メルキオーリはまた、19世紀後半に勃興してきたジャンルとしてのアナーキズム小説が、社会主義運動を制度の側に吸収する性格を持っていたと論じている。

⁹ Pick 155-75 参照。退廃を扱った他の小説家として、コナン・ドイル (Conan Doyle) や H・G・ウェルズ (H. G. Wells) の名が挙げられる。

参考文献

- Baines, Jocelyn. *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1960.
- Berthoud, Jacques. *Joseph Conrad: The Major Phase*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- . “The Secret Agent.” *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 100-21.
- Bowler, Peter J. *Darwinism*. New York: Twayne, 1993.
- Conrad, Joseph. *The Secret Agent: A Simple Tale*. 1907. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Greenslade, William. *Degeneration, Culture and the Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Hunter, Allan. *Joseph Conrad and the Ethics of Darwinism*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.
- Kevles, Daniel J. *In the Name of Eugenics*. 1985. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Lombroso, Cesare. Introduction. *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*. By Lombroso. London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- Lothe, Jakob. *Conrad's Narrative Method*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.
- Melchiori, Barbara Arnett. *Terrorism in the Late Victorian Novel*. London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Pick, Daniel. *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c. 1848-c. 1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Ray, Martin. *Joseph Conrad*. London: Edward Arnold, 1993.
- Scott, Rebecca. “Race and Gender in *The Secret Agent*.” *Joseph Conrad*. Ed. Elaine Jordan. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996. 193-214.
- Tennant, Roger. Introduction. *The Secret Agent. By Joseph Conrad*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.

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 31 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

すでにニューズレターで予告していた通りですが、ご覧のように表紙デザインを一新しました。本誌が新しい時代に入ったことの象徴的な意味を持っていますが、同時に、本誌を取り巻く環境の変化の表れでもあります。『試論』には長い、誇るべき伝統があります。しかし、発足後すでに四十年を経過し、世の中の変化に合わせる必要が生じているように思われます。この度の会則改正によって研究組織であることが明確にされましたが、今更こういうことをしなければならないというのも状況の変化の一端であると言えましょう。英文の投稿が多くなっているのはしばらく前からの傾向ですが、今回は東北大学文学部のピーター・ロビンソン先生に編集委員に加わっていただき、かなり徹底した校閲を行っていただきました。大げさかもしれませんが、世界の学界に通用する内容をめざしていきたいと考えています。

なお、今回から印刷方式をかなり変更しました。組版、校正出力から版下作成までを事務局が行うというものです。初めてのことで、出来具合が不安ですが、いかがでしょうか。最近の印刷技術の進歩はめざましく、コストダウンが大きく進んでいます。入稿から印刷完了までの時間も大幅に短縮され、数週間となっています。電算写植機に迫る作業を卓上のパソコンでできる時代になったおかげです。本号は大幅な増ページとなりましたが、費用は前号と変わらないものとなりました。

例年、年末に投稿が出そろったという例がないので、次号の投稿締切は来年2月末日としました。審査が厳正に行われることは当然ですが、問題点のある論文についても、修正を求めたうえで、できるだけ掲載するように努める方針ですので、会員の皆様にはふるってご投稿くださいますようお願いいたします。

(原)

試 論 第 38 集 定価 500 円

平成 11 (1999) 年 7 月 1 日印刷発行

発 行 「試論」英文学研究会
会 長 原 英 一

〒 980-8576 仙台市青葉区川内
東北大学文学部 英文学研究室

電 話 022(217)5961

振替口座番号 02200-1-4966

印 刷 はしもと印刷