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ABSTRACT

My dissertation considers cross-cultural encounter represented in the nineteenth-century novel by focusing on the relationships between England’s imperial nationalism and the novel. Whereas many postcolonial critics have situated the nineteenth-century novelistic process in the national context of English colonialism and have argued that the novel mainly sustained the hegemonic mode of conceptualization of England’s cultural others, I argue that the story of cross-cultural encounters conceives an alternative vision that counters such a hegemonic conceptualization of English subjectivity and its subordinate otherness.

The notion of cross-cultural encounter in my project is differentiated from that of the space of colonial encounter through which the colonizer from the metropolis seeks to assert his superiority and secure his innocence while he is involved with colonial practices. On the contrary, English characters in the texts that I consider experience the sense of guilt, ennui, or uncertainty that is frequently attributed to colonized subjects. Through actual encounter with their cultural others, English characters distance themselves from the dominant cultural order and the imperialist assumptions as to their superiority and engage with other cultures and people. I show how novels suggest the disruption of the claimed cultural hierarchy by addressing the positive alterity of other
cultures and hybridity that the dynamics of cross-cultural encounter invoke.

The individual chapters of my dissertation show that while the English nation confronted various other cultures in the nineteenth century, at the same time the novel was also engaged with such issues as the Irish Question, the Jewish Question, and the Indian Question to conceive a different world order in which the meaning and values of the metropolitan center and its peripheries are reconsidered. In five case studies of different subgenres of the novel such as the Irish national tale, the realist novel, the sensation novel, the Gothic novel, and the early modernist novel, I demonstrate that the nineteenth-century novel engages itself with the shared question of English national identity in its relation to cultural others consistently throughout the various subgenres.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Story of Cross-Cultural Encounter

The title character in George Eliot’s last novel *Daniel Deronda* (1876) challenges “the spoiled child” Gwendolen Harleth, as Book One of the novel puts it, by saying that “I think what we call the dullness of things is a disease in ourselves. Else how could anyone find an intense interest in life? And many do” (395). Eliot’s novel identifies the Jewish people that Daniel meets as those who find “an intense interest in life.” Daniel actually chides Gwendolen for her boredom after he himself has recovered from ennui by being wakened through a new interest in Judaism:

Deronda, like his neighbours, had regarded Judaism as a sort of eccentric fossilized form which an accomplished man might dispense with studying, and leave to specialists. But Mirah, with her terrified flight from one parent, and her yearning after the other, had flashed on him the hitherto neglected reality that Judaism was something still throbbing in human lives, still making for them the only conceivable vesture of the world; and in the idling excursion on which he immediately afterwards set out with Sir Hugo he began to look for the outsides of synagogues, and the titles of books about the Jews. *This wakening of a new interest*—this passing from supposition that we hold the right opinions on a subject we are careless about, to a sudden care for it, and a sense that our opinions were ignorance—is an effectual remedy for ennui, which unhappily cannot be secured on a physician’s prescription; but Deronda had carried it with him, and
endured his weeks of lounging all the better. It was on this journey that he first entered a Jewish synagogue. (Emphasis added; 347)

This example of an English character that recovers his interest in life and overcomes his boredom after his encounter with an other culture illustrates well the focus of my dissertation.

I am interested in the story of cross-cultural encounter in nineteenth-century novels in which English characters like Daniel Deronda find in other cultures a kind of “remedy” for their “disease” and expand their horizons. Their greater knowledge of the world and their transformed attitude toward their cultural others revolve around their changing relationship with their cultural others. As Daniel’s example shows, the transformation is reflected in their changed attitude toward other cultures from merely holding “careless” opinion on them to a care for them. One of the common “diseases” that English characters suffer in the texts that I examine in this dissertation comes in the name of ennui. From Horatio Mortimer in The Wild Irish Girl to Adela Quested in Forster’s A Passage to India, nineteenth-century British novels are shot through with English characters who lack something and suffer from boredom. The new ways of seeing English subjectivity and its cultural others are often suggested by the ways in which English characters are depicted and by the changes that occur in them through their cross-cultural encounters. I am very intrigued by the ways in which many English characters are depicted by the authors to be listless, licentious, and uncertain about whom they are. According to Said’s study, Orientals are portrayed by Westerners as gullible, “devoid of energy and initiative,” much given to “fulsome flattery,” intrigue, cunning, and unkindness to animals; Orientals cannot walk on either a
road or a pavement (their disordered minds fail to understand what the clever European grasps immediately, that roads and pavements are made for walking); Orientals are inveterate liars, they are “lethargic and suspicious,” and in everything oppose the clarity, directness, and nobility of the Anglo-Saxon race. *(Orientalism 38-39).*

The novels that I examine in this dissertation provide many examples of reversed depiction of Orientals or England’s cultural others. For example, many English characters are depicted to suffer from boredom or *ennui*, and they often turn to gambling in order to relieve the boredom. Horatio in *The Wild Irish Girl* and Grandcourt and Gwendolen in *Daniel Deronda* well represent English people who are much given to the attributes such as dissipation and boredom. These English characters are noticeable given that many critics have argued that nineteenth-century novels mainly sustained England’s imperial nationalism along with the nation’s claimed superiority to its cultural others in civilization mission discourse.¹

Edward Said is one of the critics who argue that nineteenth-century novels mainly sustained England’s hegemonic attitude toward its cultural others. Said actually initiated a new way of thinking in which the nineteenth-century novel is situated within the national context of colonialism/imperialism. His pioneering study *Orientalism* argues that many of nineteenth-century novels served to normalize imperial power relations and that the binary opposition between the West as “us” and the East as “them” is crucial to European self-conception.² Said’s analysis of Orientalism as a colonial discourse and his insight into the intersection between cultural, intellectual, and political processes in the formation of colonialism continues in his following study *Culture and Imperialism.*
In *Culture and Imperialism* Said shows that European metropolitans employed the power to narrate in order to differentiate “us” from “them” and to justify reasons for their rule. Said emphasizes culture including literature as “a source of identity” and “a battleground” (xiii) where various political causes contend with one another. He notes on the monolithically hegemonic attitude toward cultural others as follows:

. . . very few of the British or French artists whom I admire took issue with the notion of “subject” or “inferior” races so prevalent among officials who practiced those ideas as a matter of course in ruling India or Algeria. They were widely accepted notions, and they helped fuel the imperial acquisition of territories in Africa throughout the nineteenth century. (xiv)

Said continues to argue that we can find “a particular knowledge and structures of attitude and reference” (53) in nineteenth-century culture. The particular knowledge identifies the systematic discipline through which the Orient was constructed by Western culture, as he shows in *Orientalism*.

Said notes on the “structures of attitude and reference” in *Culture and Imperialism* that we can identify the way in which metropolitan England or Europe is always conceived of as “socially desirable, empowered space” (52) and distant worlds like Ireland and Africa as subordinate. Said points out that those structures of attitude and reference “are bound up with the development of Britain’s cultural identity, as that identity imagines itself in a geographically conceived world” (52). One of Said’s primary contentions in the book is that “there was scarcely any dissent, any departure, any demurral” (53) from these structures of attitude and reference. Said thus argues that in metropolitan culture “there was virtual unanimity that subject races should be ruled, that they *are* subject races, that one race deserves and has consistently earned the right to be considered the race whose main mission is to expand beyond its own domain” (53). Most
of all, the novel is, Said points out, the place where we can easily find these structures of reference and attitude.\(^3\) Said emphasizes the centrality of imperialism in the nineteenth-century novel and argues that imperial policy itself as a narrative is sustained by the novel. While I agree with his point about the continuous intersection between imperialism and the novel throughout the nineteenth-century, I depart from his thesis that the novel reinforced the hegemonic attitude toward England’s colonial and cultural others. Rather, my dissertation shows that certain novels suggest challenges to England’s hegemonic attitude and seek knowledge of other cultures without implying the cultural superiority of the conquering race.

I am particularly intrigued by those authors writing about the differences and difficulties in conceiving the superiority of English cultural identity, because those novels are exceptions that deviate from the monolithic way of English self-conception and its hegemonic attitude toward its cultural others. I am interested in English characters who overreach the boundaries of their culture and nation, enter and learn to appreciate the cultural worlds of English peripheries, and even decide to settle there permanently. For example, Horatio in Sydney Owenson’s *The Wild Irish Girl* ends up discovering an Ireland that is differently conceived from English stereotypes of Ireland as its cultural other. As mentioned in the beginning, the title character in George Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda* finds a solution in Jewish culture to his life-long problem and sets out for the East to live there. I focus on the cross-cultural encounter between English people and their cultural others, because the cross-cultural encounter provokes in English characters the process of reflexive and transformative conception of their English identity and their cultural others. While they learn to understand the disparate cultural world, the characters
revise their sense of who they are as English people and what they are doing. Their new identity often admits the “otherness” of the alien world and these English characters become parts of their alien nations or cultures.

The phrase “cross-cultural encounter” in the title of my dissertation focuses on the novels in which the contrast and attraction of disparate cultural worlds become the main concern of the texts and their characters. My contention is that these cross-cultural encounters function as both content and form by provoking and structuring the series of questioning and transforming of English cultural identity and the relationship between the English and its cultural others. These processes of questioning English identity involve questions about national character, race, or religion. While English imperialist assumptions tend to promote hierarchical understanding themselves and their cultural others, my dissertation shows how Englishness is often questioned, challenged, and expanded through the nation’s encounter with other cultures. Plots of the novel texts that I examine in this dissertation depict that English people escape the limited, hierarchical understanding themselves and their cultural others through their encounter with other cultures. Thus the plots revolve often around the intersection between disparate cultural categories or worlds such as English/Irish, English/Indian, and English/Jewish. The following passage from Robert Young’s *Colonial Desire* well shows the ironical relationship between Englishness and its otherness:

Today the Englishness of the past is often represented in terms of fixity, of certainty, centredness, homogeneity, as something unproblematically identical with itself. But if this was ever so, which is seriously to be doubted, it is noticeable that in the literary sphere such forms of Englishness are always represented as other, as something which other people possess, . . . If we consider the English novel, we find that what is portrayed as characterizing English experience is rather often the opposite, a sense of fluidity and a painful sense of,
or need for, otherness. Perhaps the fixity and identity for which Englishness developed such a reputation arose because it was in fact continually being contested, and was rather designed to mask its uncertainty, its sense of being estranged from itself, sick with desire for the other. (2)

Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* demonstrates this ironical and dual relationship between the English and its other that is embodied in the character of the Count Dracula, although this novel does not necessarily depict English characters to be transformed after their encounter with Dracula. English characters’ encounter with their cultural other Dracula is only self-reflexive, and this is represented in the novel’s Gothic strategy of doublings.

The phrase “cross-cultural encounter” emphasizes difference of culture that is not the old dichotomy of opposition. Emmanuel Levinas’s idea of the otherness of the other can help our understanding of the difference between the dichotomy of opposition and difference, that is, alterity. Levinas explains two different ways of encountering the otherness. Levinas calls the first way of experiencing the otherness “a form of egology” (Peperzak 19) in which all aspects of the otherness “manifested by a phenomenological description” are “immediately integrated by my self-centered, interested, and dominating consciousness” (Peperzak 19). The Orientalism that Said observes can be one example of this way of looking at the other. Levinas sees that this way of looking at the otherness makes the others parts of “my material or spiritual property” (Peperzak, 19).

The second way of encountering the other expands my horizon rather than integrating the others into my world. Levinas explains this way of encountering the other as follows:

Another comes to the fore *as other* if and only if his or her “appearance” breaks, pierces, destroys the horizon of my egocentric monism, that is, when the other’s invasion of my world destroys the empire in which all phenomena are, from the
outset, a priori, condemned to function as moments of my universe. The other’s 
face (i.e., any other’s facing me) or the other’s speech (i.e., any other’s speaking 
to me) interrupts and disturbs the order of my, ego’s, world; it makes a hole in it 
by disarraying my arrangements without ever permitting me to restore the 
previous order. For even if I kill the other or chase the other way in order to be 
safe from the intrusion, nothing will ever be the same as before. (Peperzak, 19- 
20)

Levinas’s second concept of the otherness that transforms the self’s egocentric world is 
very similar to the moments of cross-cultural encounter that I examine in this dissertation 
in that the English self takes its distance from the dominant cultural order and the 
imperialist assumptions as to its superiority through its encounter with various cultural 
others. I show how English people begin to conceive themselves and their cultural others 
deviating from their previous stereotypes through actual encounter with their cultural 
others.

1.2 Methodology

When postcolonial critics argue that the nineteenth-century British novel mainly 
sustained the hegemonic mode of conceptualization of England’s cultural others, they 
turn to colonial discourse analysis. Since Edward Said’s study, critical works focusing on 
colonial discourse analysis have tended to show how Western colonial authority 
functioned by producing a discourse, “a system of knowledge,” or “the corporate 
institution for dealing with the Orient” (Orientalism 6, 3). Discourse analysis is interested 
in how stereotypes and images of colonial subjects and cultures work for economic and 
political control. Said notes that “standardization and cultural stereotyping have 
intensified the hold of the nineteenth-century academic and imaginative demonology of
“the mysterious Orient”’’ (Orientalism 26). While Said argues that “the web of racism, cultural stereotypes, political imperialism, dehumanizing ideology” (27) functions to designate the Orient as being morally and culturally subordinate, I pay attention to the same network of stereotypes, knowledge, and politics to show that certain authors conceived alternatives to the doctrines of European superiority, racism and imperialism. Whereas Said notes that “the kind of narrative voice [the author] adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kinds of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text—all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader, containing the Orient” (Orientalism 20), I will show that certain authors suggest alternative conceptions of England’s cultural others or the Orient and sometimes represent them to be much healthier than the English.

These challenges work through various generic conventions of the novel that the authors choose. I show how authors use different generic conventions in their story of cross-cultural encounter to suggest new ways of seeing Englishness and its otherness and to envision the alternative to their contemporary perspectives. Tilottama Rajan and Julia M. Wright in Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre observe Romantic literature and show that Romantic aesthetics approached genre “as an expression of (cultural) consciousness rather than a purely formal category” (4). My methodology when examining various subgenres of the novel is influenced by their definition of genre as “a transposition into literature of changes occurring at the level of social life” (4), believing that their discussion of genre as “a scene of cultural competition” (2) can be applied to our reading of the nineteenth-century novel texts. I look at various subgenres of the novel such as the Irish national tale, the realist novel, the sensation novel, the Gothic novel, and
the early modernist novel by focusing on how they recounted England’s confrontation
with other cultures in literary texts. I therefore focus on particular social issues in each
chapter such as the Irish question in Chapters 2 and 5, the Jewish question in Chapter 3,
and the Indian question in Chapters 4 and 6. I show in the five case studies that the
nineteenth-century British novel engages itself with the shared question of English
national identity in its relation to its cultural others consistently throughout the various
subgenres.

In order to examine the dynamics of English encounter with other cultures
recounted in the novel, I draw on the studies on the relationship between nationalism and
the nineteenth-century novel. Benedict Anderson’s study *Imagined Communities:
Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1991) has shown the relationship
between nationalism and the nineteenth-century novel. He argues that the inclusive
community of a nation requires cultural work such as literary texts and newspapers for its
production and dissemination. The nation, Anderson argues, as “an imagined political
community” requires an act of solidarity between the people belonging to the nation, and
the narrative form of a novel imposes unity on heterogeneous individuals by embodying
in its narrative the act of relating individuals to the imagined community. Anderson
associates the advent of the modern nation with a specific literary genre, the realistic
novel, which is useful in considering how novelistic genres register the cultural formation
of nationalism and new forms of individual identification with nation-state.

While I agree with Anderson’s view of nationalism as primarily a cultural
formation and with his insight to the connection between nationalism and the novel, I
focus on how the novel registers that the totalizing boundaries of the English nation are
disturbed and expanded through the nation’s confrontation with different cultural worlds such as Ireland and India. This dissertation also shows that not only the particular genre of the realist novel but other subgenres of the nineteenth-century novel were also engaged with the issue of national identity. I therefore consider how different subgenres of the novel that appeared throughout the nineteenth century can be discussed in light of the relationships among nationalism, genre, and the cultural, historical contexts. For example, the Irish national tale that authors like Owenson and Edgeworth wrote needs to be situated in the contexts of Ireland’s union with England. The Union changed the meaning of both English and Irish national identity, and this change and loss of national identity shed light on the thematic obsession with national identity in the Irish national tales.

Another subgenre that I examine is the sensation novel. As Patrick Brantlinger notes, the sensation novels of the 1860s have special structural qualities that need to be considered historically.6 The doubled incidents of the domestic theft and the imperial one and the multiple narrations in Collins’s *The Moonstone* point beyond the domestic mystery of the novel to larger issues such as imperial crime and parochial English perspective.

The Gothic novel has been connected with deep-seated class-based or gender-based dilemmas within national boundary, but this dissertation shows that the Gothic novel also engaged itself with the question of Britain’s contradictory fears and longings of culturally different worlds. Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*, which I examine in Chapter 5, shows these attractions and fears of Dracula and his world that the expanding English Empire encountered. Although the racial other that Dracula embodies is supposed to be kept distant and hidden from England, the count shares many features with them. This duality involved in the relationship between Dracula and English people blurs the
hierarchy of “barbarous” Dracula and “civilized” English.

When a nation is imagined as community, racial categories are important to promote the sameness or identity of the people belonging to the nation in the nineteenth-century. As Ania Loomba observes, we can find a long history of “the connections between the formation of the English nation . . . and the articulation of the superiorities of the Anglo-Saxon race” (Colonialism/Postcolonialism 118). In particular, the nineteenth-century discourses of “scientific” racism hardened the claim that the highest civilization and culture are found among the white races by connecting racial difference with cultural difference. In Colonial Desire, Robert Young points out the fact that the new ethnology or “the science of races,” as he puts it, “not only described physical and linguistic differences between different races, but investigated their intellectual and cultural differences so as to provide the political principles of social and national life” (66), by tracing the history of the development of racial theory in the nineteenth century.7 As Young shows, racial differentiation was used as a component of national identity and “in terms of cultural value and a hierarchy based on the degree of civilization” (68).8 Most of all, this racial theory worked in conjunction with the nation’s colonialism as England’s social mission.9 English nationalism relied upon cultural distinctions between the English and its “lesser” others and rationalized the nation’s overseas expansion as civilization mission.

I therefore examine how racial difference is represented in the novels to show that many novels actually suggest the failure of the claimed cultural hierarchy based on racial difference by addressing hybridity and ambivalence that the dynamics of cross-cultural encounter invoke. In other words, the novels that I examine in this dissertation suggest
that the binary and hierarchical opposition between the “civilized” English race and its counterparts such as the Indian, the Irish, and the Jewish people that is crucial for creating images of both the English and its cultural others is undercut by English characters who find positive alterity in other cultures. The simultaneous sameness and difference that English people find between themselves and their cultural others also suggest ambivalence involved in the relationship between Englishness and its otherness. This ambivalence is vividly shown in *Dracula* in which the English fighters’ confrontation with Dracula is depicted as an encounter with their own dark impulses. Hybridity and ambivalence invoked by cross-cultural encounters question the nation’s imagined solidarity that relies upon the distinctions between the English subject and its racial and cultural others. As Homi Bhabha argues, the sense of solidarity or nationness is produced through “the process of the articulation of elements” (*Nation and Narration* 3) such as class, gender, and race. National identity is always bound to the markers of these elements of class, gender, and race and the process of negotiation between those elements. National identity, therefore, cannot be fixed. Rather, the process of composing a nation’s cultural authority can produce an ambivalent image of authority, because the localities of class, gender, race and region on which the sense of cultural supremacy relies have their boundaries which are always in a process of negotiation.¹⁰ If Bhabha stresses here the internal heterogeneity held together through the process of negotiation within the boundary of a nation, I examine those authors writing about the possibility of crossing the boundaries between England and its cultural others.

I employ a few critical terms to show how English engagement with other cultures questioned the meaning of what it is to be English rather than sanctioning its
governance as a moral force and to show the artificiality of difference between self and other upon which British hegemony depended. First, I use the term “alterity” to differentiate cultural difference from the hierarchical dichotomies of opposition, as I explained with Levinas’s idea of alterity. While binary opposition sustains hierarchical order between England and its cultural others, Levinas in his discussion of the notion of alterity emphasizes the self’s engagement with the other rather than the self’s representations of the other according to its egocentric perspectives. The alterity of the cultural others that many English characters encounter often invigorates them and challenges hierarchical relationships between English and its others. For example, the alterity of Dracula against which English people are played off in *Dracula* actually imparts its vigor to them.

Secondly, the term hybridity is closely tied to the first in that both terms “hybridity” and “alterity” challenge the static, hierarchical categories of cultural difference by recognizing that the construction of self identity always presupposes an antithetical relationship with others. The word “hybrid” was originally a term about racial mixture but its notion later shifted from as a model for the negative implications of racial intermingling to a model for cultural identity that is constructed through negotiations of difference. Robert Young explains that “‘Hybrid’ is the nineteenth-century’s word” by quoting the OED: “A few examples of this word occur early in the seventeenth century; but it was scarcely in use until the nineteenth” (*Colonial Desire* 6). As his study shows, hybridity was an important issue in the discussion about the relationship among culture, nationalism, and Englishness throughout the nineteenth-century; although culture serves as the basis of the nation by countering any disintegrating aspects towards the totality of
the nation, the identification of culture with Englishness is not always obvious and this leads to the question of hybridity.

The concept of hybridity arose in the context of asserting England’s colonial authority that comes from its “pure” blood as the higher race, and the hybrid thus often appeared as the marker of contamination and regression. It is Homi Bhabha that emphasizes the positive feature of hybridity. In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha discusses the cultural politics of hybridity by defining it as “the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority)” (112). Bhabha sees hybridity not as the sum of the intermingled parts but as “a third place” within which different cultures encounter and interact with each other by going beyond a mere celebration or disparagement of difference. The depiction of hybrid characters such as Daniel Deronda, Franklin Blake in *The Moonstone* and Dracula disturbs England’s hegemonic account of Englishness and its otherness. While the presence of otherness in those characters apparently marginalizes them as the marker of contamination or loss, each novel eventually endorses those characters by showing their “superiority” to “purely” English characters such as Godfrey Ablewhite in *The Moonstone* and Mr. Grandcourt in *Daniel Deronda*. For example, foreign education makes Franklin Blake a much better English gentleman than Godfrey Ablewhite, and Ezra Jennings who is a social outcast because of his racial hybridity actually guides Franklin. Dracula’s “bad” Eastern blood is also depicted as invigorating English people. The notion of hybridity in this way demonstrates that what makes them English cannot be referred to notions of nation, race, and culture that are monolithic. This is why many of “English” protagonists
in the novels that I examine in this dissertation are tied to multiple cultures, races, or
cultures, and I show that the novels that I examine in this dissertation depict English
characters who go beyond their contemporary perspectives of hierarchical order of
England and its cultural others. The five case studies in my dissertation are shaped by a
shared question of how British conceptions of the nation are recounted in the novel in its
relation to its cultural others. I use the phrase England’s cultural others rather than its
colonial others, since the Jewish people in Daniel Deronda that I look at in Chapter 3 are
not necessarily colonized people. With emphasis on the intersections between the
formation of English national identity and the generic development of the novel, my
dissertation proposes a new understanding of the nineteenth-century novel by showing
that the story of cross-cultural encounters provides an alternative vision to hegemonic
conceptualization of English subjectivity and its subordinate otherness. This dissertation
therefore provides a powerful counterargument to readings of nineteenth-century novels
as serving to normalize England’s imperial relations to its cultural others.

In Chapter 2, I examine how the writers of the Irish national tale operated within
and at the same time displaced British colonial discourse on the question of national
characters of England and Ireland. I situate Owenson’s The Wild Irish Girl (1806) and
Edgeworth’s The Absentee (1812) in the aftermath of the 1800 Act of England-Ireland
Union, moving the site of the question of English identity from England to Ireland. I
argue that both texts figure cross-cultural encounters between Ireland and England as the
site for transforming the cultural construction of the Irish as England’s subordinate other. I show how the story of cross-cultural encounter in the national tales provides an alternative to the categories of hierarchical difference between Ireland and England.

Chapter 3 argues that George Eliot’s realist novel *Daniel Deronda* (1876) suggests Jewish culture as a frame for critical view of Englishness and counters contemporary perspectives on the Jews as dangerous other within the nation. I show how the novel depicts the protagonist Daniel Deronda enriched by hybrid cultural heritages as a counterexample to the essentialist conception of English superiority. The novel’s structural division between English and Jewish plots intersects with Eliot’s attempt to depict Jewish Diaspora as an alternative to the parochial English nationalism that served as ideological reasoning for its imperialism.

I examine in Chapter 4 how the domestic scandal of the sensation novel is expanded in Collins’s *The Moonstone* (1868) so that the novel’s double structure compares the private, domestic world of English families and the public dimension of imperialism. I argue that Collins’s novel suggests a critique of the English seizure of the Indian treasure and exposes false assumptions of Victorian imperialism that justified its rule in India. Although there are limitations in Collins’s story of cross-cultural encounter by making the Indians almost silent, the novel suggests that English domestic space whose respectability is challenged is England itself in its expanded form of the sensation novel. I show that the Indian alterity becomes a frame for a critical view of English domestic life shattered by its acquisitive desire.

I look at Bram Stoker’s Gothic novel *Dracula* (1897) in Chapter 5. Whereas critics interpret *Dracula* as a way of talking about the late Victorian fear of racial
degeneration or reverse colonization, I argue that Stoker’s own subject position as an Irishman makes the national and cultural identity politics more complex in his novel. Count Dracula’s eastern invasion of England challenges the crucial element of English national identity, blood. Dracula’s narrative method, however, exploits Gothic conventions to confuse what vampirism means and whose vampirism the novel attacks. By examining the simultaneous sameness and difference that Dracula represents in his relationship with his fighters, I argue that Dracula shows how the “baser” blood of Eastern other, Dracula, actually revivifies the “better” English blood. The hegemonic account of the dominant culture as to the inferiority and criminality of the Count is therefore disrupted in the novel.

In my conclusion, I investigate E. M. Forster’s experiment in new formal possibilities in A Passage to India (1924) in which the difficulty of the two cultures’ reciprocal knowledge is discussed through the novel’s modernist emphasis on the difference between the two cultures’ epistemological landscapes. By handling the issue of cultural and personal differences of perspectives, Forster discusses the possibility of crossing the boundaries of different worlds, not only the divide between English and Indian cultures but also that between the Hindus and the Muslims within India. Whereas the stories of cross-cultural encounter examined in the previous chapters focus on the changes that mainly occur in English characters, Forster’s novel depicts the change that occurs in Indian characters like the Muslim doctor Aziz after his encounter with English people. I show how Forster shares with other authors the question of English national identity in the relation to its cultural others by deploying a critique of the imperial world order in his novel’s modernist concerns with issues involved in knowing and interpreting
other cultures.

---

1 I use the term “English” rather than “British” when I talk about English characters because, as Robert J. C. Young in *Colonial Desire* observes, “Englishness is itself also uncertainly British, a cunning word of apparent political correctness invoked in order to mask the metonymic extension of English dominance over the other kingdoms with which England has constructed illicit acts of union. . . . ‘British’ is the name imposed by the English on the non-English” (3). Another terms “colonialism” and “imperialism” are often used interchangeable. I follow Ania Loomba’s definition that “imperialism . . . as the phenomenon that originates in the metropolis, the process which leads to domination and control. Its result, or what happens in the colonies as a consequence of imperial domination is colonialism or neo-colonialism. Thus the imperial country is the ‘metropole’ from which power flows, and the colony or neo-colony is the place which it penetrates and controls. Imperialism can function without formal colonies . . . but colonialism cannot. (*Colonialism/Postcolonialism* 6-7).

2 Said defines Orientalism as “the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (3).

3 The following passage well shows Said’s argument that the novel consolidated this particular view of England’s others:

Being an English writer meant something quite specific and different from, say, being a French or Portuguese writer. For the British writer, “abroad” was felt vaguely and ineptly to be out there, or exotic and strange, or in some way or other “ours” to control, trade in “freely,” or suppress when the natives were energized into overt military or political resistance. The novel contributed significantly to these feelings, attitudes, and references and became a main element in the consolidated vision, or departmental cultural view, of the globe.

. . . the nineteenth-century English novels stress the continuing existence (as opposed to revolutionary overturning) of England. Moreover, they never advocate giving up colonies, but take the long-range view that since they fall within the orbit of British dominance, that dominance is a sort of norm, and thus conserved along with the colonies. What we have is a slowly built up picture with England—socially, politically, morally chartered and differentiated in immensely fine detail—at the center and a series of overseas territories connected to it at the peripheries. The *continuity* of British imperial policy throughout the nineteenth century—in fact a narrative—is actively accompanied by this novelistic process, whose main purpose is not to raise more questions, not to disturb or otherwise preoccupy attention, but to keep the empire more or less in place. (*Culture and Imperialism* 74)

4 To The Other: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas. Ed. Adriaan Peperzak.

5 Rachel Hollander’s “Daniel Deronda and the Ethics of Alterity” is the only one critical work that, I’ve found, connects Levinas’s idea and the novel.

6 Patrick Brantlinger in his essay, “What is ‘Sensational’ about the Sensational Novel?” argues that the sensation novel breaks down the conventions of realistic novel in order to engage itself with certain types of knowledge that realistic novel had often excluded.

7 See Chapter 3: “The Complicity of Culture: Arnold’s Ethnographic Politics” in his *Colonial Desire*. Young provides the history of the development of the racistal culture of the nineteenth century in this chapter.

8 The criminal anthropology of Cesare Lombroso who is mentioned in Stoker’s *Dracula* is one example of the nineteenth-century “scientific” racism. Lombroso established the connection between physical characteristics and abnormalities of the criminal type and his theory is thus based on scientific positivism. Mr. McBryde’s so-called “Oriental Pathology” is also aligned with the twentieth-century “scientific racism” in that his theory reproduces and perpetuates the connection between racial difference and moral
and cultural difference.

9 David Theo Goldberg notes on the relationship between colonialism and the issue of race: “colonizing states like Britain and the Netherlands proceeded on an assumption of population homogeneity, of ethnoracial sameness and of externalizing difference, purporting at least nominally to keep the different out and at bay lest they undo by infecting the rationality of brotherhood, thus toppling reason’s rule” (82).

10 In *Nation and Narration*, Bhabha argues, therefore, that “The ‘other’ is never outside or beyond us; it emerges forcefully, within cultural discourse, when we think we speak most intimately and indigenously ‘between ourselves’” (4).

11 Nikos Papastergiadis notes that “Hybridity evokes narratives of origin and encounter. Whenever the process of identity formation is premised on an exclusive boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them,’ the hybrid, born out of the transgression of this boundary, figures as a form of danger, loss and degeneration” (259).
CHAPTER 2

The IRISH NATIONAL TALE AND THE IRISH QUESTION IN SYDNEY
OWENSON’S *THE WILD IRISH GIRL* AND MARIA EDGEWORTH’S *THE ABSENTEE*

While Walter Scott’s historical romances have received much critical attention, the national tale that shares a similar romance plot with Scott’s romances has been relatively neglected in critics’ consideration.¹ This lack of critical attention to the national tale is important once we remember that Scott aligned himself with the national tale by acknowledging Maria Edgeworth’s influence on him. In the Postscript of *Waverley*, Scott expresses his attempt to depict the Scottish, “not by a caricatured and exaggerated use of the national dialect, but by their habits, manners and feelings; so as in some distant degree to emulate the admirable Irish portraits drawn by Miss Edgeworth.”² As Marilyn Butler notes, both Scott and Edgeworth had the same goal of educating the English to overcome their prejudice against the Scottish and the Irish respectively in the common features of their “national novel.”³ Even though the national tale has begun to attract critical attention recently, critics’ interest has been usually in whether the genre is
colonial or not, without considering the national tale’s complicated accounts of historical and cultural experiences of Ireland.

The writers of the national tale were mainly female, and they employed romance and international marriage in their works. These features of the genre have generated critical perspectives that read the national tale as reducing political matters into interpersonal relations.\(^4\) Considering the significance of the national tale as a form for not only interpersonal relations suggested in its common romance plot but also public, national life with which the genre was deeply engaged, this chapter examines the formation of the modern British national identity in its relation to the reevaluation of cultural values of Englishness and Irishness discussed intensely in the genre of the national tale.\(^5\) Focusing on Sydney Owenson’s *The Wild Irish Girl: a National Tale* (1806) and Maria Edgeworth’s *The Absentee* (1812), I move the site of the question of English identity from England to Ireland and consider how the two authors operated within and at the same time displaced British colonial discourse on the question of national identities of England and Ireland. My aim in this chapter is to examine how the genre of the national tale was forged in response to the particular historical contexts of post-Union Ireland.

Edward Said’s pioneering studies *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism* opened a new understanding of the nineteenth-century British novel by connecting literary texts with their national context of British national identity.\(^6\) Said’s works were innovative in their use of literary and cultural texts to examine colonial power, and provided us with the methods to analyze cultural, national, or racial stereotypes that appear frequently in nineteenth-century texts. In spite of the great impact of his ideas on
the study of nineteenth-century British novel, the scope of Said’s study was too narrow to consider contradictory feelings, competing interests, and heterogeneous elements in English national identity. My contention is that the national tale by Anglo-Irish women writers such as Maria Edgeworth and Sydney Owenson should be considered in the study of the relationship between the nineteenth-century English novel and the formation of English national identity for the following reasons. First, the texts of Edgeworth and Owenson were circulated through the London market and directed toward London readers. Edgeworth’s *The Absentee* was published at London by Baldwin and Cradock. Her works were reviewed regularly and seriously by the *British Critic*, the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh Review*. As Owenson revealed, both writers were aware of their relation to the intended audience in political terms: “At the moment *The Wild Irish Girl* appeared it was dangerous to write on Ireland, hazardous to praise her, and difficult to find a publisher for an Irish tale which had a political tendency.” Second, the questions of English and Irish national identities that both *The Wild Irish Girl* and *The Absentee* ask cannot be separated from the question of English identity because the national tales of these writers are primarily engaged with the English claim of the hierarchy of the English and Irish cultures.

In order to consider how the national tale challenges the claimed superiority of Englishness, I particularly focus on cross-cultural encounter represented in *The Wild Irish Girl* and *The Absentee*. The Irish-English encounter has two important functions in the two texts. Cross-cultural encounter is the primary concern of the two texts and their characters and it provokes and structures the questioning, disturbing or transforming of English identity and the relationship between England and Ireland. *The Wild Irish Girl*
depicts an English character, Horatio, who crosses the border between England and Ireland, learns to appreciate the different cultural world of Ireland, and eventually marries an Irish girl, Glorvina, and decides to settle there permanently. Although both male and female protagonists, Colambre and Grace, are Anglo-Irish in *The Absentee*, this novel shares the processes of transformative conception of English and Irish identity with *The Wild Irish Girl*. In the two novels, cross-cultural encounters provoke a deep discomfort that continues to disturb the familiar in the minds of both characters and the reader.\(^{10}\) If Horatio learns to understand the disparate world of Ireland and outgrows his English stereotypes of the Irish through his face to face encounter with Glorvina, Colambre’s encounter with Grace marks another moments of disrupting English prejudice against Ireland. These cross-cultural encounters, though in different ways, lead to newly conceived identities into which the characters integrate the “otherness” of Ireland. Additionally, the English or Anglo-Irish characters become parts of Ireland and its culture implied in the common ending of national marriage, and their crossing the border between “us” and “them” suggests the tenuousness of the boundary.

As I mentioned, critics have tended to disagree about whether to position the national tale as promoting or as questioning/disrupting the imperial, hierarchical relations between England and Ireland. Some critics have seen the national tale as imperial romance through which Irish resistance to English rule could be minimized. Robert Tracy analyzes the common plot device of intermarriage in the narratives of Owenson and Edgeworth and argues that both writers attempt to reconcile the legitimate rights of the Irish to their land and the legal rights of the Anglo-Irish after the Union.\(^{11}\) Mary Jean Corbett also argues that the gendered components of intermarriage plot in Edgeworth’s
The Absentee naturalize English imperial power and rule in Ireland by encouraging the growth of familial affection\textsuperscript{12} between the two nations. These critics see the national tale as supporting the imperial project in Ireland by naturalizing the participation of the Irish in the Union performed in its romance plot.

Deviating from this binary framework of colonial against anti-colonial, I focus on the intertwined content and form of the national tale. As Kevin Whelan puts it, Irish writers’ “self-imposed function became the representation of Irish life for the education and edification of an invincibly ignorant and incredulous British audience”\textsuperscript{13} in the post-Union period. This goal to educate the London audience generated disruptive style such as extensive footnotes in The Wild Irish Girl and unconventional female characters like Grace in The Absentee. This formal unconventionality helps the national tales of Owenson and Edgeworth perform the critical task of questioning and even reversing Irish stereotypes and the claimed superiority of the English to the stereotyped Irish. Tilottama Rajan and Julia M. Wright have pointed out that Romantic writers saw genre as “a scene of cultural competition,” which we can find in the fact that “Romantic literature is often characterized by its generic experimentation.”\textsuperscript{14} The Irish national tales also demonstrate the cultural competition between the British nation and a part of the nation, Ireland after the Union in 1800. The national tale both in its form and content provides an alternative to both romance and the colonial categories of “enlightened English” and “barbarous Irish.” The intervention of the national tale in both nineteenth-century literary experimentation and culture provides, therefore, a powerful counterargument to Edward Said’s formulation that nineteenth-century novels monolithically served to normalize imperial power relations.
The cultural, political contexts of the emerging of the national tale are worthy to note because they shed light on the fact that the genre is one medium of a power struggle. The Act of Union in 1800 abolished the Irish Parliament and made Ireland a part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain by bringing Ireland under the rule of the British Parliament. Through this Union, Ireland constituted a problem for the British nation, because Ireland was now, as Ina Ferris puts, “at once part of the scattered colonial body and of the (ideally) compact domestic body.”\(^{15}\) This phrase shows well the problematic nature of Ireland’s Union with Britain, because Ireland is proclaimed by England as an equal partner of the British nation but it is actually a colony of England at the same time. Terry Eagleton notes on the nature of the Union that “Ireland and Britain were united in the sense that the latter confiscated the former’s parliament, and so rather as a fish can be said to be amalgamated with a diner through the act of eating.”\(^{16}\) Eagleton’s analogy, though a bit extreme, shows the unequal relationship between the two nations that the Union tries to hide. The responses of Owenson and Edgeworth to the Irish question, though different from each other, suggest that the particular generic form of the national tale emerged in reaction to particular historical forces. While *The Absentee* highlights the possibility of hybrid identity like “Anglo-Irishness” and promotes, thereupon, a more mobile and temporary notions of the Irish and the English than a permanent, unified categories, *The Wild Irish Girl* enacts a reversal of power relation between England and Ireland, particularly through the recasting of the national characters of the two nations.
2.1 Two Kinds of Friendship: *The Wild Irish Girl*

*The Wild Irish Girl: a National Tale* can be said to chronicle the birth of a new genre, the national tale, as Owenson puts the generic term in the subtitle of her novel.\(^{17}\) As a genre that arose in response to the particular historical context of post-Union Ireland, the national tale developed various generic characteristics such as the connection between politics and romance in its common marriage plot and the intended audience of the English people. More particularly, the problematic nature of the Union is dramatized as romantic love in the form of the common national marriage plot. This link between politics and romantic love has led many critics to read the national tale as an allegory of colonial relations. Terry Eagleton finds in the genre “the perpetual ideological possibility of reducing social questions to interpersonal ones.”\(^{18}\) Similarly, Mary Jean Corbett argues that intermarriage plot in *The Wild Irish Girl* is meant to create affective links between Ireland and England that would cover the violent colonial history.

The national marriage of Glorvina and Horatio is certainly an affective element in the novel, but there are other elements that should be considered. As M. Keating notes, there can be two other elements beyond the affective one in examining England-Ireland relations: “the first element is the cognitive one, that is people must be aware of such a thing as a region . . . A second element is the affective one, that is how people feel about a region and the degree to which it provides a framework for common identity and solidarity . . . [and] the third element, the instrumental one, whether the region is used as a basis for mobilization and collective action in pursuit of social, economic and political goals.”\(^{19}\) *The Wild Irish Girl* encourages a particular way of understanding and approaching Ireland and provides knowledge of the country, by making its plot revolve
around the theme of two kinds of friendship in rivalry, one of which the novel endorses while rejecting the other. The male protagonist, Horatio Mortimer, is sent by his father to Ireland as punishment for his dissipation and gambling. When Horatio falls in love with the Irish girl, Glorvina, he finds that she has a “mysterious friend” (218) with whom she corresponds in secret. In addition, *The Wild Irish Girl* discusses the political, social, and economic effects of the Union on both England and Ireland as well.

Discussing these elements of the national tale, Katie Trumpener suggests that: “it [the national tale] sets out to describe a long-colonized country ‘as it really is,’ attacking the tradition of imperial description from Spenser to Johnson and constructing an alternative picture.”^20 This desire for creating “an alternative picture” of Ireland almost became a didactic burden to the writer and generated a particular formal quality, namely, editorial notes. Through the footnotes, Owenson explains and argues for the excellence of Irish culture to counter English hegemony.

Horatio lands in Ireland filled with “confirmed prejudice” (1) as he confesses in the beginning of *The Wild Irish Girl*, and the cultural difference between England and Ireland attracts most of his attention. But he confesses that “never was I more pleasantly astonished, than when the morning’s dawn gave to my view one of the most splendid spectacles in the scene of picturesque creation I had ever beheld, or indeed even conceived – the bay of Dublin” (2). His character and his focus on Irish landscape—he introduces himself as an artist drawing Irish landscape—set *The Wild Irish Girl* and the title girl, Glorvina, in the context of “the Picturesque’s structure of desire/knowledge,” as Vivien Jones suggests,^21 as objects of Horatio’s gaze. Actually not only landscape but Glorvina also become the objects of Horatio’s paintings. The femininity imagined as the
object of male desire in the Picturesque tradition has generated critics’ arguments that
*The Wild Irish Girl* represents Ireland’s colonial relationship with England in sexual
terms. It is true that the national tale developed its typical plot movement of an English
or Anglo-Irish hero meeting an Irish heroine, learning to understand Irish ways and
finally marrying her. This plot can be said to repeat the romance plot in which the
socially marginal heroine is proved as true heiress to the estate. At first, *The Wild Irish
Girl* seems to support the Union by introducing the exotic attractiveness of Ireland
personified in the heroine Glorvina. Glorvina and landscape around her castle are
described as the object of the English male gaze. Mary Louise Pratt similarly considers
the notion of the European male subject in landscape discourse, namely, “seeing-man”
whose “imperial eyes” possess the object of his gaze. But this suggested reading is
disturbed as much as Horatio’s effort to peep into Glorvina’s castle is ruined through his
falling off the rock. Before this scene, Horatio already became an object of feminine gaze.
Attracted to a countryside barn, Horatio finds a group of young Irish women and an old
lady who are spinning and singing. When Horatio tries to respond to them in English,
they do not understand him, repressing laughter. This rearrangement of English-Irish
relations counters Said’s claim that the colonized other is feminized against the masculine
colonizer as well.

The intertwined national-gender relations can be found in characters that often
personify their national identity. Particularly, the Irish heroine Glorvina seems to
personify Ireland itself. After seeing Glorvina first at the chapel of Inismore, Horatio
soon hears a “witching strain” (43) which turns to be from Glorvina at the Castle of
Inismore. Horatio describes her song in national terms: “those strains which at once
spoke to the heart of the father, the patriot, and the man—breathed from the chords of his country’s emblem—breathed in the pathos of his country’s music—breathed from the lips of his apparently inspired daughter! The white rising of her hands upon the harp” (43). The Castle of Inismore in which Glorvina lives preserves all key aspects of ancient Irish culture.

On this aspect of the nationalism of Celtic peripheries of the British nation in the nineteenth-century, Katie Trumpener’s work stresses the naturalizing impulse of Romantic nationalism. Trumpener uses the term “Bardic nationalism” to define the nationalism of the Celtic periphery that tried to connect land with its distinctive culture, customs, and history so as to establish an organic relationship between the land and its culture.26 The Wild Irish Girl can be certainly aligned with the “bardic nationalism” in that it tries to restore and endorse Irish culture and national identity by showing the organic relationship between its landscape, culture, and its national character.

The Wild Irish Girl consists of a series of Horatio’s letters to his friend in London. Ireland is introduced to the target London audience as Horatio experiences and tells it in his letters. At first, Horatio does not seem to pay much attention to other aspects of Ireland than the Irish girl, Glorvina. Horatio feels that he is almost in another world at the Castle of Inismore where Glorvina and her dispossessed father live:

Thus, suddenly withdrawn from the world’s busiest haunts, its hackneyed modes, its vicious pursuits, and unimportant avocations – dropt as it were amidst scenes of mysterious sublimity – alone – on the wildest shores of the greatest ocean of the universe – immersed amidst the decaying monuments of past ages – still viewing in recollection such forms, such manners, such habits, (as I had lately beheld) which to the worldly mind may well be supposed to belong to a race long passed beyond the barriers of existence, with ‘the years beyond the flood’ – I felt
like the being of some other sphere, newly alighted on a distant orb. (42)

The antiquarianism of Irish culture—Horatio also learns from an Irish servant that the Prince of Inismore “keeps up the old Irish customs and dress” (30)—represented by the description of the mood of the Castle Inismore is argued to obscure England’s historical responsibility for Irish current problems.27 In *The Wild Irish Girl*, it is true that the two national characters Horatio and Glorvina represent two different national identities, which could generate the ahistorical notion of national identity based on essential individuality rather than the historically differentiated national difference. Critics have argued that the image of Glorvina who personifies Ireland as a female facilitates the representation of Irish colonial relationship with England as one of sexual exploitation, reducing social issues to interpersonal relations.28 In addition, Horatio’s depiction of the Castle Inismore and Glorvina is ahistorical enough to invite these kinds of arguments: Horatio depicts her as “the incarnation of some pure ethereal spirit” (39) and “a seraph” (43). She is “vested in a robe of vestal white” (39) and she is, as Horatio finds, an “angel” (44). As Ina Ferris notes, it is possible to read *The Wild Irish Girl* as “privileging individual sensibility” and turning “social and cultural facts into objects of—and for—this sensibility.”29 This personification of Ireland as a female is, however, soon consciously reversed and historical dimension enters the seemingly privileged individual sensibility.

In the apparent romance between Horatio and Glorvina, it is Horatio who is feminine and vulnerable. Horatio falls off a cliff while he is peeping into the Castle of Inismore in order to see Glorvina. He faints frequently and he confesses the absurdity of his sense of inferiority: “It is absurd; but I *cannot* divest myself of a feeling of inferiority
in her presence, as though I were actually that poor, wandering, unconnected being I have feigned myself; and she, as Lingo has it, a *real Princess*” (60; italics in original). In this way, *The Wild Irish Girl* is far from simply reducing Ireland to a sexualized object of English colonial desire. The seemingly interpersonal romance at the Castle of Inismore explores actually “a social reality that appears within the poetic image as if it were in parentheses—aesthetically distanced, held back, and yet historically framed,” as Bhabha has put it.30

Most of all, Horatio learns the history of the English colonial invasion of Ireland and particularly his family’s involvement in the colonial crime. Horatio learns that the very day when he first sees Glorvina in the Chapel of Inismore is “the anniversary of that day on which my ancestors took the life of its venerable prince!” (37). He also identifies himself as “The descendant of a murderer!” (32) and describes his disturbed emotion at finding “The very scoundrel steward of my father reveling in the property of a man, who shelters his aged head beneath the ruins of those walls where his ancestors bled under the uplifted sword of mine!” (32). Therefore, the antiquarian setting of the Castle of Inismore is not a place isolated from history but rather a site which conveys all the history of his family’s colonial usurpation of the estate of Glorvina’s family.31 Due to his historical knowledge, Horatio characterizes his pleasures at Inismore as “intellectual” (131) that vivifies him out of “ennui” or “discontent” (131): “I must again fly to sip from the fountain of intellectual health at Inismore, and receive the vivifying drops from the hand of the presiding priestess, or stay here, and fall into an incurable atrophy of the heart and intellect!” (131). Therefore, the romance between Horatio and Glorvina is not only about romantic emotions but it educates Horatio about the history of the colonial relationship
between England and Ireland.  

The romance plot of Owenson’s national tale simultaneously facilitates and questions the English claim to an organic relationship between national characteristics and its land, which justifies the English stereotyping of the Irish as a backward and different race. Horatio confesses that “My previous prejudices received some mortal strokes, when I observed that the high natives of this barbarous country equal us in every elegant refinement of life and manners” (4). Horatio’s journey to Ireland helps him outgrow those stereotypes that attempt to naturalize Irish and English difference as a matter of blood. Throughout his journey, Horatio develops against the racialized stereotypes a comparison between the two enemies, his own father and Glorvina’s father, the Prince. His English father has his elder son sell “his name and title for a hundred thousand pounds” and tries to force the second son, Horatio himself, to sell “his happiness for ever for something about the same sum” (162). But we are told that the Prince, the Irish father, lives “with that romantic sense of honour which distinguishes his chivalric character” (215). The Prince himself asserts that “the origin of knighthood may be traced in Ireland upon surer ground that any other country whatever” (95) in a reply to Horatio’s question: “How . . . was chivalry so early known in Ireland? Or, rather, did it ever exist here?” (95). Owenson’s didactical burden leads her to add a footnote to the Prince’s reply. In that footnote, Owenson says that “Mr O’Halloran, with a great deal of spirit and ingenuity, endeavors to prove, that the German knighthood (the earliest we read of in chivalry) was of Irish origin: with what success, we leave it to the impartial reader to judge” (95). This comparison of the “good” Irish father and “bad” English father is strong enough to break Horatio’s prejudices against the Irish people and develop a
different bond with the Prince from his filiation with his own father. Further, Horatio writes his reply to the Prince: “I have a father, Sir; this father was once so dear, so precious, to my heart! But since I have been your guest, he, the whole world, has been forgotten. The first tie of nature was dissolved; and from your hands I seem to have received a new existence” (222). Horatio here defines a new type of belonging that is different from the belonging as biological continuity. He develops the new sense of belonging through his contact with Ireland in his journey. If Horatio perceives a new dimension of his identity deviating from the “tie of nature,” the wild Irish girl of the title, Glorvina, is also depicted as possessing accomplishments of all European arts and literature, beyond the natural product of Ireland as she is represented at first. Glorvina is the site where previous literary genres are deployed and Owenson’s discussion of English and Irish national identities is developed. Owenson in this way suggests that national identities, either Irish or English, are not rested on internal homogeneity of elements that consists of the imagined, stabilized national character.

The discussion of reconceived national identities is mainly made through the cultural translation of Irish to English. We encounter many scenes of actual translation in *The Wild Irish Girl*, either literal translation of Irish to English or figurative translation of Irish culture for English characters and readers. Above all, *The Wild Irish Girl* stresses Glorvina’s introduction of Ireland to Horatio through her literal and cultural translation. This space of translation is situated in the colonial relationship between Ireland and England after the Union and the English are Owenson’s target audience. Joep Leerssen noted the tendency of Irish writers after the 1800 Union to “write against English prejudice and English misrepresentation, working towards an amelioration of the Irish
image in England,” and “a paradoxical dissociation of the Irish author from his/her Irish subject-matter” (34). Leerssen explains this paradox relying on Edward Said’s notion of exteriority of representation; because the silenced other, Ireland, can not represent itself in its own voice, it is spoken for. But this paradox rather reflects the diverse cultural and political forces with which Owenson engaged herself in her writing. Written in the form of a series of an English character’s letters to his friend in London, *The Wild Irish Girl* can be read to be a record of how an English subject experiences Ireland. However, we are interestingly given only one-way correspondence because we have only Horatio’s letters but none of his friend’s responses to Horatio. As Claire Connolly notes, this form of one-way letters excludes the metropolitan reader from the text. The metropolitan audience that Horatio’s epistolary reader, his friend J. D., represents is completely rejected through the sudden shift to the third person narrator in the concluding chapter. In this way, *The Wild Irish Girl* reverses the colonial power relations between Ireland and England and this reversion intersects with the novel’s formal properties.

The ideological deception of the mythology of “superior” English national identity is debunked most remarkably at the end of the novel. Owenson ends her novel with the letter of Horatio’s father to his son. In this letter, Owenson examines the ironic instability of English perspective represented by Horatio’s father. We can see that his father cannot see the actual relationship between Ireland and England that Horatio has learned throughout his travel to Ireland and the whole course of the novel has painstakingly shown. This letter of Lord M., Horatio’s father, reveals the deception and fictitiousness of English way of conceiving Ireland as its subordinate. Lord M. talks about the process of his approach to Ireland:
It is now unnecessary for me fully to explain all the motives which led me to appear at the Castle of Inismore in a fictitious character. Deeply interested for a people whose national character I had hitherto viewed through the false medium of prejudice; anxious to make it my study in a situation and under such circumstances which, as an English landholder, as the Earl of M--, were denied me, and to turn the stream of my acquired information to that channel which would tend to the promotion of the happiness and welfare of those whose destiny in some measure was consigned to my guidance; solicitous to triumph over the hereditary prejudices of my hereditary enemy; to seduce him into amity, and force him to esteem the man he hated, while he unconsciously became his accessory in promoting the welfare of those of his humble compatriots who dwelt within the sphere of our mutual observation: such were the motives which principally guided my late apparently romantic adventure; would that the means had been equally laudable (italics in original; 248-49).

This passage betrays the true nature of the motive of the Union between England and Ireland. The proclaimed nature of “amity” or friendship that the Union was said to bring into the England and Ireland is as fictitious as Lord M.’s deceptive approach to Ireland indicates. The intended friendship is initiated by only one party of the relationship, England, who approached this relationship through deception. This deception and one-sidedness characterize the very nature of the Union between England and Ireland. Ireland was “seduced” and “forced” into the proclaimed friendship or amity without knowing the true motive and character of its partner. The seemingly legitimate union between England and Ireland is based on deception and one-sidedness. Ireland will become only England’s “accessory” and this union is, therefore, far from friendship. In this way, this passage proves the deceptiveness and falsity of the following passage of his letter: “For some months, in succeeding summers, I contrived to perpetuate with plausive details the mystery I had forged; and to confirm the interest I had been so fortunate at first to awaken into an ardent friendship, which became as reciprocal as it was disinterested.”
(249). Owenson’s national tale endorses the son’s relationship to Glorvina by rejecting that of the father. The difference between Horatio and his father can be explained by two different kinds of friendship. The friendship that Horatio’s father claims is built on his egocentric deception of the other party of the relationship. Although Horatio also disguises himself at first as an itinerant artist Henry Mortimer to hide his true identity of descendent of Glorvina’s family enemy, the friendship of Horatio with Glorvina is constructed on mutual agreement and reciprocal understanding. While his father’s intention to marry Glorvina was to make legitimate the colonial, unjust relationship between his family and Glorvina’s family as the Union, the English claimed, would do, Horatio’s relation to Glorvina develops to generate mutual understanding. As Joseph W. Lew has put, Lord M. “plays upon the prince’s patriotism,” providing material support for the prince impoverished by the usurpation of Lord M’s family. The whole processes of Horatio’s encounter with Ireland and historical knowledge of the relationship between Ireland and England is transformative and thus develops reciprocal perspectives between him and Glorvina, which Owenson allegorically dramatized as precondition of the Union between the two nations.

The rejection of the English father in the plot of *The Wild Irish Girl* has some parallels with Owenson’s simultaneous investment in and rejection of previous literary genres in her novel. As I mentioned above, the convention of the Picturesque suggests Glorvina’s role be an object of male desire, which is soon reversed so as to depict Horatio Mortimer’s guilt and vulnerability at Inismore. The Orientalist discourse that Said has observed in the nineteenth century novels is also reversed. Said has pointed out the “structures of attitude and reference” to indicate “the way in which structures of location
and geographical reference appear in the cultural languages of literature, history, or ethnography, sometimes allusively and sometimes carefully plotted”: the structures fix “socially desirable, empowered space in metropolitan England or Europe and connect it by design, motive, and development to distant or peripheral worlds (Ireland, Venice, Africa, Jamaica), conceived of as desirable but subordinate.”39 For example, Horatio finds and learns about “the language, history, and antiquities of Ireland” (27) in the very place which he expected to be his father’s “harem” (26). He confesses that “my father’s Sultana is no other than the Irish muse” (emphasis in original, 27). These Oriental attributes of Glorvina imagined in English prejudice ironically reveal Horatio’s understanding of his English father as an oriental ruler indulging in sensual pleasure. Horatio’s former lifestyle of dissipation and ennui are also usually what Irishness means in English stereotypes.

On the generic feature of the national tale, namely, its emphasis on transformation of metropolitan perspectives, Ina Ferris observes how the genre exploits “the romance trope of encounter.”40 Ferris notes that “the national tale relocates the scene of cultural encounter, confounding the distinction between “over here” and “over there” in order to move the modern metropolitan subject/reader into a potentially transformative relation of proximity.”41 Defining the national tale as “autoethnography” as “a speaking from the peripheries that engages the language of the metropolis,” Ferris argues that the national tale gets “its authority from the impurity or hybridity of its site of enunciation.”42 And the hybridity of the Anglo-Irish site where the national tale represents the periphery of Ireland is the focus of the following discussion of The Absentee.
2.2 National Identity and Hybridity: The Absentee

As I discussed before, many critics have noted that like Owenson’s The Wild Irish Girl, Maria Edgeworth’s The Absentee promotes English political rule in Ireland in its marriage plot. For example, Mary Jean Corbett argues that the analogy between family and nation and the resolution through the intermarriage of the ending signals that a familial order between the two nations has been secured, which then would promote and naturalize English attempts to enforce colonial power on Ireland through the Union.43 This kind of description of Edgeworth as a colonialist writer who supports English rule over Ireland can be complicated if we pay attention to the depiction of national difference and identity in The Absentee. It is the ambiguities of Irishness and Englishness that The Absentee mainly concerns itself with when Irish national identity seemed lost through the Union. As Terry Eagleton discusses the ambivalent nature of the Union, “Identity is at once the precondition of unity, and its potential disruption; without a degree of identity there is nothing to amalgamate, and with too much identity no possibility of accord.”44 This paradoxical nature of the relationship between the British nation and colonial Ireland after the Union is central to Edgeworth’s discussion of what Englishness and Irishness mean in The Absentee.

Discussing the tenuousness of imagined solidarity of the nation or claimed homogenous nationality, Homi Bhabha argues in Nation and Narration that the sense of solidarity or national character is produced through “the process of the articulation of elements” (3) such as class, gender, and race. The national identity bound to the markers of these elements of class, gender, and race is not fixed. Rather, the process of composing a nation’s authority can produce an ambivalent image of authority, because the localities
of class, gender, race and region on which the sense of supremacy relies have boundaries that are always in a process of negotiation. Bhabha stresses here the internal heterogeneity held together through the process of negotiation within the boundary of a nation, but the national tales of my focus examine the possibility of crossing the boundaries between nations. Both the two main characters, Horatio of *The Wild Irish Girl* and Colambre of *The Absentee*, cross the geographic border between England and Ireland and the cultural border between the English and the Irish. The common thematic elements of cross-cultural contact in the two national tales become the generic characteristic of the national tale, which Ina Ferris defines: “the national tale is constituted as a genre less by a belonging (to one culture or another) than by a migratory impulse through which contending cultures may come into contact. It operates, that is, in much the same literary space as does translation, and translation inevitably takes on a charged status under colonial conditions” (47). If *The Wild Irish Girl* provides English readers with a cultural translation of Ireland inverting the familiar colonial stereotypes of barbarous Irish and civilized English, *The Absentee* more explicitly asks the question of sameness and difference about national identities of the two nations.

*The Absentee* tells the story of Lord Colambre, born in Ireland, but educated in England. The main plot almost repeats that of other national tales but the hero is not English but Anglo-Irish. Grace, the heroine, is not Irish but Anglo-Irish as well, born to English parents but raised in Ireland and linked to its culture. By making her protagonists Anglo-Irish, Edgeworth develops the complicated questions of national identities. This question revolves around Colambre’s quest for Grace’s legitimacy that is central to the
romance plot in *The Absentee*. Along with this question, the hierarchical structure between England and Ireland is disrupted and the disruption is suggested by the coexistence of Irishness and Englishness in the main characters.

The postcolonial concept of hybridity is relevant to exploring how *The Absentee* discusses the question of national identity and belonging in the contexts of the post-Union relationship between Ireland and England. The characters’ simultaneous belonging to both Ireland and England in *The Absentee* reflects the way in which discursive formation of national identity is a process of negotiation between different elements. Robert J. C. Young notes on the constant process of negotiation between self and other that “Englishness . . . has never been successfully characterized by an essential, core identity from which the other is excluded.” In postcolonial criticism, the notion of hybridity indicates a new way of thinking about identity. Postcolonial criticism has tried to move away from thinking about power within the binary opposition between colonizer and colonized by using the term hybridity. The term, therefore, tries to disrupt the very patterns of categorization and control that colonial discourse turns to. Hybridity exposes the insufficiency of the colonial formation of identity that attempts to fix categories such as civilized English and barbarous Irish through flattened national stereotypes. The notion of hybridity is more about renegotiating the structure of power built on differences than about the dissolution of differences. Therefore, the term hybridity engages itself with critical understanding that undermines the hegemonic attempt to fix cultural and national identities based on stereotyped cultural categories. Because the notion of hybridity refutes the dominant culture’s account of hierarchical meanings of national identities, the term can be employed to indicate the critical view through which *The Absentee* draws
attention to the structure of power built on the differences between the two nations.

Analyzing Bakhtin’s notion of hybridity, Robert Young points out that Bakhtin’s two distinct forms of hybridity provide a “dialectical model for cultural interaction.” While “intentional hybridity” sets different cultures or points of view against each other, “unconscious hybridity” indicates the process whereby the mixture between different cultures remains “mute and opaque, never making use of conscious contrasts and oppositions” and they actually merge into a new world view. The ambiguity of Englishness and Irishness in *The Absentee* can be explained by the second form of hybridity, namely “unconscious hybridity.” The cultural interaction between England and Ireland depicted in *The Absentee* tends more towards merging rather than setting cultural differences against each other.

The two different forms of hybridity are found in the novel’s depiction of two different groups of characters and their modes of living. If characters aligned with “intentional hybridity” are critiqued, characters that fall into “unconscious hybridity” are endorsed in the novel. The Irish absentees and English culture of London higher classes are critiqued, because they share a common understanding that English culture is higher than Irish culture. This assumed hierarchy causes London upper classes to despise the Irish absentees who struggle to imitate them. But the main characters Colambre and Grace are depicted to embody the merging of Englishness and Irishness into a new positive world view. Colambre’s journey incognito to Ireland gives him an opportunity of cultural learning that enables him to outgrow old stereotypes of both countries. Grace embodies the meaning of “unconscious hybridity” in that Englishness and Irishness are mixed in her but the mixture remains silent and obscure as Bakhtin explains. Through
the second group of hybridity, the novel endorses the critical understanding of the ambivalence at the base of English discourses on cultural authority.

Most of all, Grace’s identity demonstrates the critical notion of hybridity. First, her unconventional alliance with Catholicism disrupts the held generalization of the Protestant Anglo-Irish and the Catholic Irish. The generally held difference between the English and Irish national identities based on the different religion becomes questioned. The experience of one character, Count O’Halloran, shows well the antagonistic relationship between Protestant English and Catholic Irish. He received his title after a career in the Austrian army, which becomes the reason for the hostility of the English soldiers toward him in their visit to Ireland with Colambre. Irish gentlemen traditionally served in the army of the Catholic powers, but after Europe was dominated by Revolutionary France, they returned to Ireland as Catholic gentlemen. This sheds light on the centrality of religion to the relations between England and Ireland. Linda Colley has discussed how Ireland was situated as a margin of Britain due to its religion: “The invention of Britishness was so closely bound up with Protestantism, with war with France and with the acquisition of empire, that Ireland was never able or willing to play a satisfactory part in it. Its population was more Catholic than Protestant. . . Ireland’s relationship with the empire was always a deeply ambiguous one.” Catholic Ireland was an obstacle to British nation formation which was bound up with Protestantism. Similarly, the Catholic Irish people saw the proposed union as an act that would protect interests of Protestant English or Anglo-Irish settlers in Ireland.

Grace’s hybrid identity deviates from the usual division between the Irish and the English, which is discussed in the question of her legitimacy. Colambre’s concern about
Grace’s legitimacy is aroused by “a family secret” (111) about Grace’s mother that Lady Dashfort purposely delivers to him. Lady Dashfort mentions that the maiden name of Grace’s mother was St. Omar and her comment is intended to mark Grace as associated with Catholic resistance and immorality; St. Omar was a French seminary at which many Irish Catholic priests were educated in the eighteenth century. Grace is, however, proved to be legitimate and English through the discovery of the marriage certificate of her father and mother. Her father was an English officer, Mr. Reynolds, and he was legally married to an English lady. This shows that the binary opposition of Protestant English and Catholic Irish is not consistent always and how privileges are annexed to being an Englishman and stigma is associated with being an Irishman.

That Grace who is reputed to be Irish is actually English shows that the categories of Irish and English and their implications are slippery. Grace’s being English has been obscured from the beginning of the novel, and she is given an Irish dimension again after she is proven to be English by lineage. Even though Grace was born to English parents, she was raised by the Clonbronys in Ireland and she has early fond memories of living in Ireland. Most of all, Edgeworth depicts Grace as Irish by situating her in Irish history and Irish tradition. When a harper plays the popular song “Gracey Nugent” in the ending of *The Absentee*, Grace is remarkably inscribed in Irish culture. As McCormack points out, Grace Nugent is drawn into an Irish folk tradition in this way and embodies Irish excellence and dignity.53

In this way, hybridity is embodied in the figure of Grace. This coexistence of Englishness and Irishness in Grace can be read as a powerful refutation of the claim of superior Englishness as a fixed category equivalent to blood or lineage. By disgracing
Irish aspects of Grace, the English stigmatize themselves, because Grace proves to be actually English.\textsuperscript{54} The Irish dimension in Grace’s English body symbolically reveals the long history of intercultural contact between Ireland and England and signals the interdependence of the two nations.\textsuperscript{55} The “English” Irish Colambre and the “Irish” English Grace being the ideal couple whose union ends *The Absentee* indicates not only the long history of intercultural contact but also suggests that the future of Ireland begins from refuting the claims of national identity as fixed categories based on the binary opposition of superior England and inferior Ireland.

Edgeworth also opens the possibility of the critical concept of hybridity by redefining national identity as sociocultural rather than biological.\textsuperscript{56} Education comes as the key foundation to the more inclusive definition of national identity in *The Absentee*. Lord Colambre is depicted through the clear contrast of the concepts of heredity and education as the different foundations of his identity: “he [Colambre] was carried far away from all that were bound or willing to submit to his commands, far away from all signs of hereditary grandeur—plunged into one of our great public schools—into a new world (emphasis added, 6).” School education here enables Colambre to liberate himself from the bond of genetic transmission so as to experience “a new world” which his hereditary bond would prevent him from encountering.\textsuperscript{57} Given that his education is English, this passage could be interpreted to value his English education over his Irish heritage. But further comments are following on his education at Cambridge stressing the coexistence of Irishness and Englishness within his mind: “The sobriety of English good sense mixed most advantageously with Irish vivacity: English prudence governed, but did not extinguish, his Irish enthusiasm. But, in fact, English and Irish had not been
invidiously contrasted in his mind” (6). This passage depicts that the Anglo-Irishness in Colambre is the product of the “mixture” of different and Irish characters rather than antagonistic contestation between them.

The function of education to merge differences into new worldviews is again emphasized by the English officer, James Brooke, whom Colambre encounters in Dublin. James Brooke describes the society of Dublin after the Union: “So that now . . . you find a society in Dublin composed of a most agreeable and salutary *mixture of birth and education*, gentility and knowledge, manner and matter; and you see pervading the whole new life and energy, new talent, new ambition, a desire and a determination to *improve* and be improved (emphasis added, 84).” In both passages, the same rhetoric of “newness” comes as a common trope of education. Education opens “a new world” for both the individual Colambre and Dublin society after the Union.

James Brooke’s statements that education has made possible the improvement that the Union has brought to the two countries should be considered in its link with the novel’s concern about the political, social, and economic effects of the Union on both England and Ireland. Views on the Union expressed by characters like James Brooke in the novel have influenced many readers to interpret the novel as endorsing the colonial union between the two nations. Those views only repeat the colonial assumption that Ireland is a barbarous country in need of English civilization, while *The Absentee* questions them by considering the instability of the colonial union between the two nations. *The Absentee* particularly stresses that the instability stems from English stereotypes of Ireland that have been formed to legitimate English colonial rule. The critique of English stereotypes is connected with that of London higher classes. The first
a few chapters vividly depict how Irish men and women, particularly Irish absentee landlords in London, are ridiculed by the English upper class. Chapter Three dramatizes the snobbery of the London higher classes by depicting that they are “skilled in the art of making others unhappy,” and “they just looked round with an air of apathy” (34). Colambre’s mother in her efforts to pass as English becomes the victim of their “talent and habit of ridicule” (36) “even in her own house, on her gala night” (35). Both groups of the English high class and Irish absentee landlords in London are critiqued because they understand the relationship between England and Ireland in terms of essentialism or dualism on which the colonial discourse is based.

Considering this colonial relations and hierarchical division between the two cultures, The Absentee emphasizes the need of Ireland’s proper introduction to its newly found relation to England. On the history of the development of England-Ireland relationship, Sir James Brooke in chapter VI introduces “An intercepted Letter from China” and the works of Spencer, Davies, Young and Beaufort as a reading list for Colambre to acquire different views on Ireland. As McCormack and Walker’s notes explain, “An intercepted Letter from China” has been identified as John Wilson Croker’s An Intercepted Letter from J__ T__ Esq.: Writer at Canton to his Friend in Dublin, Ireland (1804), which is a highly critical view on the Union’s effect on Dublin society. Edmund Spenser’s View of the Present State of Ireland (1596), Sir Jon Davies’ Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued (1612), Arthur Young’s A Tour in Ireland (1780), and Daniel Augustus Beaufort’s Memoir of a Map of Ireland (1792) show, as McCormack and Walker note, “a certain ‘development’ of English attitude towards Ireland”: Spencer argued for “a policy of near-extirmination,” Davies
urged “the complete subjugation of Ireland to English law, without toleration of native custom,” Young stressed “the positive exploitation of Irish resources,” and Beaufort advocated “a need to better to know the country” (298). As McCormack and Walker point out, the latest English policies to Ireland might be found in *TheAbsentee* itself (298).

The policy that *TheAbsentee* suggests is, as the narrator points out, that there is still the need to better know Ireland because there are common errors of a traveler who tends toward “deducing general conclusions from a few particular cases, or arguing from exceptions” (81-82). Undermining hierarchical difference of English and Irish cultures that travelers retain in their writing, *TheAbsentee* guides its English audience into Irish culture and history through Colamble’s journey to his father’s estates in Ireland. As Sir James Brooke says, the English audience needs to sort through the “different representations and misrepresentations of Ireland” (81) just as Colambre needs to do so before his union with Grace Nugent. This task of sorting through the proper representations and misrepresentations of Ireland will be the process of undoing the stereotypes of “Irishness” that English people have formed for their rule.

*TheAbsentee* critiques representations of Ireland as barbarous in the following anecdote. When Colambre visits Count O’Halloran with Lady Dashfort and the English officers during his journey, Colambre learns how the relationship between England and Ireland has been formed in terms of the contrast of culture and barbarity. O’Halloran casts himself as a barbarous Scythian in his use of a political metaphor:
“As to the rest,” said he [O’Halloran], turning to lady Dashfort, “a mouse, a bird, and a fish, are, you know, tribute from earth, air, and water, to a conqueror—”
“But from no barbarous Scythian!” said lord Colambre, smiling. The count looked at lord Colambre; as at a person worthy his attention; but his first care was to keep the peace between his loving subjects and his foreign visitors. It was difficult to dislodge the old settlers, to make room for the new comers. (emphasis added, 115-116)

To consider who the old settlers are and who foreign visitors are in this political metaphor, McCormack provides the background of this metaphor by reading Herodotus’s Histories. According to Herodotus, the Scythians responded to the Persian invasion led by Darius, by refusing to fight. Instead, the Scythians retreated constantly and even left a few of head of cattle for the Persian armies to eat. This refusing to fight and the Scythians’ “hospitality” continued until at last Darius was so embarrassed that he did not know where to turn. Seeing Darius’s embarrassment, the Scythians sent him the promised presents—a bird, a mouse, a frog, and five arrows. Darius interprets these objects as signs of submission, but a wiser counselor sees them as warnings to depart. Therefore, the invader had to withdraw, embarrassed and humiliated. The seemingly “barbarous” Scythians defeated the Persian armies with their virtue of hospitality.

In addition to this background of the metaphor, the contemporary tendency to relate race with particular dispositions of mind associated the Scythian with barbarity (74). This tendeney promoted contemporary beliefs that superior races produced superior cultures and it served to create racialized structure between England and Ireland. In short, Ireland was a nation which differs in race from England in English people’s mind. By positioning himself as an invaded Scythian, a barbarian, O’Halloran critiques the stereotyped relations between England and Ireland in terms of the contrast of
civilization and barbarity and implies that the English people “invaded” Ireland, justifying the invasion with the racially based stereotypes.63

Just as *The Absentee* further stresses the good parts of Irish tradition by positioning the heroine Grace in the Irish folk tradition, it also seeks to justify Irish manners and customs to its intended London audience, especially through Colambre’s cultural learning. The journey to his father’s estate in Ireland gives Lord Colambre the cultural knowledge that he needs to undo the negative English stereotypes of the Irish. Colambre in Dublin finds the hospitality of which his father boasted in all its warmth. He does not see in Dublin society “any of that confusion of ranks or predominance of vulgarity, of which his mother had complained” (82). About the anecdote of a grocer’s wife who expressed her anger in a very vulgar manner to lady Clonbrony when she accidentally stepped on the train of the grocer’s wife, Sir James Brooke says that “this was one of the extraordinary cases which ought not to pass into a general rule,--that it was a slight instance of that influence of temporary causes, from which no conclusions, as to national manners, should be drawn” (emphasis added, 83). The concern about the politics of representation is significant in the discussion of national identities in *The Absentee*, because the representation of the Irish race as tainted with barbarism and as the slaves of passion has facilitated English colonial rule in Ireland.64 The case of lady Dashfort is a good example that shows how representation is manipulated according to the political purpose. The narrator says: “It was her [lady Dashfort’s] settled purpose to make the Irish and Ireland ridiculous and contemptible to lord Colambre; to disgust him with his native country; to make him abandon the wish of residing on his own estate” (105). We are told about the politics of representation again: “She [lady Dashfort] knew
and followed all the arts of misrepresentation; . . . She knew how, not only to seize the ridiculous points, to make the most respectable people ridiculous, but she knew how to select the worst instances, the worst exceptions; and to produce them as examples, as precedents, from which to condemn whole classes, and establish general false conclusions respecting a nation (107).” As the last word, “a nation” in this passage shows, Edgeworth takes lady Dashfort’s case as an example of how English people represent Irishness in their colonial discourse.

By pointing out the colonial, unequal relationship between England and Ireland, The Absentee suggests an alternative relationship based on mutual understanding to the colonial Union of territories. This ideal union is embodied in the marriage of Colambre and Grace, which is depicted in terms of love and friendship in the novel. Colambre says to O’Halloran that he could escape lady Dashfort’s manipulation not due to his own “wit or wisdom” but thanks to “love and friendship” (247). Edgeworth reveals her belief through Colambre’s voice here that the union of England and Ireland should be based on reciprocal understanding rather than political intention. Sir James Brooke who is also going to marry into an Irish family points out the cases of ill-intended English-Irish relations: “I expressed, as a general friend to Ireland, antipathy to those who return the hospitality they received from a warm-hearted people, by publicly setting the example of elegant sentimental hypocrisy, or daring disregard of peace of families on which, at last, public as well as private virtue and happiness depend” (248). Sir James Brooke’s point can be extended to the national dimension: if English people return Irish hospitality by misrepresenting Irishness for the sake of their colonial consumption, the peace between the two nations will be threatened.
The transformation of the colonial Union of England and Ireland requires a change in identity conception as well. English stereotypes of Irishness are based on essentialism or dualism that perpetuates the colonial contrast between a “civilized” race and a “barbarous” one. The concept of hybridity acknowledges that those concepts are constructed through a negotiation of difference and thus “explain the relationship between centre and periphery by a stress on the dynamics of contesting difference in culture.” Colambre and Grace embody the critical notion of hybridity that is conceived as “about Becoming, about transformation . . . about flow and flux,” in that they are not uncritically limited to one nation and culture, rather they enact the concept of a “Third Space,” a space in which they could live in-between the two cultures. The concept of hybridity, therefore, opens up the possibility of redefining national identity as a more inclusive and mobile condition rather than the fixed classification based on national stereotypes.

This critical notion of hybridity in The Absentee to some degree parallels its formal quality. The novel employs third person perspective until the last few pages where that perspective is interrupted by a sudden introduction of a letter of Larry Brady, an Irish peasant. Larry Brady writes to his brother, Pat Brady, who stays in London, and his letter leads us to many significant observations. First, Larry’s first-person voice in the letter provides a chance to reconsider the ridiculed Irish language. This shift in narrative perspective to Irish voice parallels the novel’s endorsing the periphery, Ireland, and associating snobbery and folly with the metropolitan center, London. The comic depiction of London upper classes in the opening pages stresses their snobbery of ridiculing the Irish absentee, Lady Clonbrony, who almost pathetically tries to “pass for
English” (2) and “to look, speak, move, breathe, like an Englishwoman” (2), inviting English upper-class women to her expensive galas. Particularly, the third-person perspective stresses Lady Clonbrony’s vain effort to change her “strong Hibernian accent” to “an English tone” (5), and describes her distorted effort toward English pronunciation as follows: “the extraordinary precision of her London phraseology betrayed her not to be a Londoner, as the man who strove to pass for an Athenian was detected by his Attic dialect” (5). But the ridiculed Lady Clonbrony is redeemed by returning to Ireland and becomes a friend to an oppressed Irish widow. This is delivered through the very Irish accents that were subjected to ridicule and contempt in the earlier parts of the novel. Second, Larry’s letter implies that the return of Irish absentees, particularly those of the Clonronys, brings justice and order to Ireland. Larry tells how the returned landlords judge between bad and good agents and redeem the oppressed Irish peasants.68 Larry tells his brother that the cruel agent, Old Nick is gone now and the “smart and clever” (262) agent, Mr. Burke is leading the town of Clonbrony, “cleaning” the town in double senses of the word. Lord Clonbrony, who was ridiculed by London people as “Nothing, nobody” (2), is redeemed himself to a good landlord by restoring his tenants. Colambre calls Larry “Friend Larry” (262) and introduces an Irish orphaned girl, also named Grace, to his would-be wife Grace. Significantly, the heroine Grace is again aligned with the Irish by sharing her name with the poor Irish girl.

The Irish tenant Larry’s voice narrating the absentee landlords’ return to Ireland sets positive images of Ireland in opposition to the London aristocracy’s ridicule and contempt of Irish language. If the third-person narration is more aligned with the metropolitan perspective and London English through which the perspective is expressed,
the privilege that it enjoyed is now surrendered to the Irish tenants and their language in Larry’s letter. If the English male desire delivered through the first-person voice of Horatio in *The Wild Irish Girl* is literally rejected at the end of the novel by shifting to the third-person perspective, the English characteristics of the third-person voice is surrendered to the Irish first-person voice of Larry Brady in *The Absentee*. These formal experiments in my two national tales are not dissociable from their focus on the particular historical contexts of the post-Union relationship between England and Ireland. Making a contrast between the national tale and the historical novel like Sir Walter Scott’s, Katie Trumpener has observed that the historical novel after the 1814 publication of *Waverley* historicized the national tale’s allegorical framework. But *The Absentee* and *The Wild Irish Girl*, though written before 1814, historicize the political contexts of the post-Union in their allegorical framework as well. For example, the centrality of discovery of Grace’s legitimacy to *The Absentee*’s plot repeats the typical plot of romance, but the process of the discovery also uncovers the history and nature of England-Ireland relationship. Cross-cultural encounters between England and Ireland represented in *The Wild Irish Girl* and *The Absentee*, though in different ways, show how metropolitan, colonial ways of thinking are subjected to transformation through the characters who cross the boundaries of their culture and nation. Reconfiguration of differences of national characters comes as a constitutive element of both *The Wild Irish Girl* and *The Absentee*, whose common obsessive focus on national identities tells that the genre itself was forged in response to the particular historical context.

Larry Brady’s letter provides me with a transition from the current chapter to the next one; according to his letter, his brother Pat Brady stays at “Mr. Mordicai’s,
Coachmaker, London” (261). Through this address, we can identify Paddy, “the Irish workman” (9) who works at Mordicai’s coach shop, as Larry’s brother. The beginning pages of The Absentee depict a vivid image of a Shylock-like Jew, Mordicai, whose figure actually offers the transition to the next chapter on the Jewish question in George Eliot’s Daniel Deronda by the following reasons. First, while the character Mordicai in The Absentee is depicted in obvious anti-Semitic stereotyping, George Eliot in Daniel Deronda endorses the culture and values of Jewish society including another Jew, also similarly named Mordecai. Second, the first chapter of The Absentee ends with Mordicai’s phrase “Between ourselves” (11) that Homi Bhabha uses in order to discuss the process of negotiation between class, gender, and race in Nation and Narration: “The ‘other’ is never outside or beyond us; it emerges forcefully, within cultural discourse, when we think we speak most intimately and indigenously ‘between ourselves,’” which also becomes one of the concerns of Eliot’s Daniel Deronda.

---
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This passage originally comes from The Education of the Heart; the Correspondence of Rachel Mordecai and Maria Edgeworth. Ed. Edgar E. MacDonald, 6.

CHAPTER 3

“THE BALANCE OF SEPARATION AND COMMUNICATION”: KNOWING OTHER CULTURES IN GEORGE ELIOT’S DANIEL DERONDA

While Mordicai in The Absentee is stereotyped as a malevolent and greedy Jew, George Eliot’s Daniel Deronda, in characterizing another Jew also named Mordecai, depicts many positive sides of the complex characters of Jewish people and sheds new light on Jewish culture even as a healthier alternative to English culture.1 The unconventionally favorable portraits of many Jews and the harsh critique of upper-class English society in Daniel Deronda parallel the structural division between the two subplots of the English and Jewish parts.2 The novel’s apparent lack of formal consistency has been a focus of many critics from the moment of its first appearance. Noting some formal changes that the novel indicates in Eliot’s oeuvre, critics have tended to read Daniel Deronda as “the most unreal”3 of Eliot’s novels, particularly stressing the improbability and sharp division between the two subplots of Jewish and English society. On the Jewish part’s different mode from realism, Peter K. Garrett notes in The Victorian Multiplot Novel that “Deronda’s story turns from the familiar and conventionally probable toward the idealized figures, mythic patterns, and visionary utterances of
romance; it unfolds not as a sequence of choices and consequences but as a process of
discovery, of prophecy and fulfillment, where meaning is determined by a remote,
mysterious origin and a remote, beckoning goal.4

In addition to the visionary aspects of the Jewish part, its foreignness has been
considered as a formal problem. One of Eliot’s contemporary responses to Daniel
Deronda demonstrates that the Jewish half was considered by many English readers too
foreign and thus inappropriate for an English novel:

The author is ever driving at something foreign to his habits of thought. The
leading persons—those with whom her sympathies lie—are guided by interests
and motives with which he has never come into contact. . . . 5
And not only are these personages outside our interests, but the author seems to
go out with them into a world completely foreign to us. What can be the design
of this ostentatious separation from the universal instinct of Christendom, this
subsidence into Jewish hopes and aims? . . .
She must know her public too well . . . [not to] have been fully aware that
Mordecai would be caviare to the multitude, and unintelligible idea to all but an
inner circle.6

Even though this novel is Eliot’s only work set in contemporary times, many
contemporary responses including this review expressed doubts as to whether Eliot’s
representation of Jews and the religious and cultural vitality of Judaism could be a
suitable subject for her realist novel.

The critics’ reservation about the Jewish parts is linked with another concern
about how to perceive the relation between the Jewish and the English parts. In addition
to the contrast between depicted Jewish ideal and English social problems, the
coexistence of the different genres of realism and romance7 in Daniel Deronda has made
it hard to connect between the two subplots. The structural division between English and
Jewish parts parallels the disparity between social criticism in the realistic story of
Gwendolen and visionary corrective to it depicted in the romance of the Jewish half. As F. R. Leavis’s later renaming the novel as “Gwendolen Harleth” representatively demonstrates, many of the early receptions and later criticisms of the novel particularly have revealed uneasiness about its Jewish plot. But there were a few contemporary Jewish critics who appreciated the novel’s formal unity. A contemporary Jewish critic, David Kaufmann, noted in 1877 that “An examination of that part of ‘Daniel Deronda’ which relates specially to the Jews and Judaism is inseparable from an aesthetic estimate of it as a whole.” While the contrast between the degradation of English culture depicted in the English half and the vigor of Judaism has mainly generated doubt about the realism of Daniel Deronda, the same contrast has been the main focus of criticism that appreciates the novel’s shift from realist conventions to experimental forms at the same time. For instance, George Levine considers Daniel Deronda as “a test of realism,” and argues for the possibility of reading “the “Jewish” half as an attempt to create a plausible alternative to realism.”

Other critics have also interpreted the novel’s formal shift as a break from the limits of determining realist conventions and they have read the favorably depicted Jewish culture as the alternatives to English culture whose narrow-mindedness is depicted in realist mode. Christina Crosby, for example, notes on the novel’s division into “an ideal, world-historical half (the Jewish half) and an experiential, psychological, domestic half (Gwendolen Harleth’s half),” and argues that the novel shows “English life as shallow, mercenary, and exploitative” against “the ideal union of individual and collective life” in the Jewish half. I interpret the formal inconsistency in Daniel Deronda as an alternative form that Eliot is compelled to create in order to represent the
alternative Jewish culture. Jews were considered as culturally inferior to English people in nineteenth-century English society, and the novel’s unconventional attention to Jewish community, therefore, needs to transform the realist novel produced by the majority culture. The romance and visionary aspects of the Jewish plot should not be separated from the novel’s engagement with societal problems.¹²

The favorable representation of Jews in Daniel Deronda was interpreted “as signs of a foreign intervention into English literature, alien to the English imagination and unfit subjects for literature”¹³ by many of Eliot’s contemporary readers. Anticipating the aversion of contemporary responses, George Eliot herself made clear in her letter to Harriet Beecher Stowe what her intention was in the novel:

As to the Jewish element in ‘Deronda,’ I expected from first to last in writing it, that it would create much stronger resistance and even repulsion than it has actually met with. But precisely because I felt that the usual attitude of Christians towards Jews is—I hardly know whether to say more impious or more stupid when viewed in the light of their professed principles, I therefore felt urged to treat Jews with such sympathy and understanding as my nature and knowledge could attain to. Moreover, not only towards the Jews, but towards all oriental peoples with whom we English come in contact, a spirit of arrogance and contemptuous dictatorialness is observable which has become a national disgrace to us. There is nothing I should care more to do, if it were possible, than to rouse the imagination of men and women to a vision of human claims in those races of their fellow-men who most differ from them in customs and beliefs. But towards the Hebrews we western people who have been reared in Christianity, have a peculiar debt and, whether we acknowledge it or not, a peculiar thoroughness of fellowship in religious and moral sentiment. Can anything be more disgusting than to hear people called ‘educated’ making small jokes about eating ham, and showing themselves empty of any real knowledge as to the relation of their own social and religious life to the history of the people they think themselves witty in insulting? They hardly know that Christ was a Jew.¹⁴
As Eliot writes, *Daniel Deronda* deals with the historical connection between Christianity and Judaism, or the fellowship between the English and the Jewish in terms of “religious and moral sentiment.” The novel’s plot seems, at first, to depend on the contrast of Daniel Deronda with Gwendolen Harleth, which generates “a moral opposition,” or “social antithesis” of the two different worlds of Jewish and English society.\(^{15}\) The contrast between two societies or two cultures, however, becomes more complicated beyond the antithesis. For example, the contrast of Gwendolen with Mirah includes some degree of similarity in it, because Mirah’s Jewish father and Gwendolen’s English mother and her uncle reveal a similar view of marriage as the only way of women’s social promotion. While Gwendolen follows her society’s value by accepting Grandcourt’s proposal, Mirah resists marriage as a way to wealth. Another English woman, Catherine Arrowpoint, shares with Mirah her belief in marriage based on love, by giving up her fortune for her marriage to Klesmer. By establishing resemblance between some English and Jewish characters, Eliot does not construct a sheer contrast between the English and the Jewish parts. We can, however, still find the antithesis between English and Jewish perspectives in *Daniel Deronda*. For example, Mirah reacts to the similarly limited circumstances in a very different manner from Gwendolen’s and the narrator tells us that the different reaction comes from her religion. Eliot’s last novel structures the cross-cultural encounter between the English and the Jewish in its engagement with contemporary ideas of cultural, racial differences between the English and the Jewish people and it challenges those ideas. Eliot’s attempt to depict some of Jewish culture as an alternative to the parochial English nationalism generates the structural division between English and Jewish parts.\(^{16}\) Just as her letter to Harriet Beecher Stowe shows Eliot’s sympathy for the
Jews, we can find in the two subplots of English and Jewish cultures Eliot’s attempt to make Jewish vision inscribe itself into the English culture so that English readers might consider the positive values of Jewish culture. The title character, Daniel Deronda, represents well the ways in which the English and Jewish cultures are combined to enrich his life.

3.1 Race, Culture, and Nationalism

_Daniel Deronda_ includes a sentence that describes doubtfulness of the idea of pure, distinctive English blood: “pure English blood (if leech or lancet can furnish us with the precise product) did not declare itself predominantly in the party at present assembled” (504). As the cynical tone of this sentence reveals, Eliot challenges the contemporary notion of permanent differences of fixed, hierarchical categories of races in _Daniel Deronda_. Charles Darwin argued in _The Origin of Species_ (1859) that “no clear distinction has been, or can be, drawn between species and well-marked varieties,”

which shows that the idea of fixed, distinct races was not without any challenge in Victorian period. While Darwin’s ideas on the one hand blurred the boundaries between “civilized” and “barbarous” peoples and thus generated profound cultural anxieties, his ideas on the other hand facilitated social Darwinism which gave moral dimension to the idea that “strong” individuals, groups, or nations achieve advantage over others who are “weak.” This issue of human race continued to be discussed, and, as Kwame Anthony Appiah notes, many Victorians by the mid-nineteenth-century believed that all the members of each race shared not only certain biologically heritable but also “moral and
intellectual characteristics” with each other. With the idea of heritable moral characteristics, the concepts of races became hierarchical as well, which means that, according to this idea, some races have morally “good” characteristics that make them superior to those of “bad” characteristics. Gillian Beer also finds a common assumption of racial hierarchy in the Victorian ideas on race.

This idea that racial groups could be identified “culturally” through their shared “moral and intellectual characteristics” makes an important link between race and culture. Nation became added to this ally between culture and race, and this can be found in various discussions of culture’s role in national character in Victorian periods. Contemporary intellectual work reflects that there was wide awareness that uniformity of national character formed from the same tradition and culture was significant in building British national identity. For example, John Stuart Mill emphasized that “national cohesion” and national character could derive from historical tradition and homogeneous culture.

The Jewish race in Eliot’s time was a peculiar difficulty to the common assumptions on this alliance of race, culture, and nation. First, the Jewish race was an Oriental one but did not conform with characteristics ascribed to Oriental races. They could not be seen as one of the less developed races, because they resisted extinction and scattering during their long period of homelessness. Second, the Jewish race represented difference that could contaminate the healthy sameness of the English nation, and thus embodied a dangerous racial other, or “a foreign body inimical to collective health” of the nation, as Crosby notes. Eliot’s engagement with contemporary debates on the value of the Jewish race, the role of its cultural heritage in the English nation, and
its relation to the English people has been discussed by more than one critic. Eliot’s *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such* (1879) offers her ideas on these issues relevant to our reading of *Daniel Deronda*. The last chapter of *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such* “The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” especially can be read with *Daniel Deronda*, because this chapter discusses the Jewish Question, national characters, and the relationship between the Jewish people and the English people. “Hep! Hep! Hep!” is a cry that the Crusaders used during their attacks on the Jews, deriving from “Hierosolyma est perdita” (“Jerusalem is lost”). The narrator intensely discusses the issue of difference and sameness between the Jewish race and the English people. In the beginning of the chapter, the narrator asserts that there are at least two kinds of likeness between the two people: “There is more likeness than contrast between the way we English got our island and the way the Israelites got Canaan. . . . We must rather refer the passionate use of the Hebrew writings to affinities of disposition between our own race and the Jewish. Is it true that the arrogance of a Jew was so immeasurably beyond that of a Calvinist?” (141-42).

Eliot’s chapter “The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” argues that many vices of the Jewish people are “answering vices” rather than a reflection of the race’s inherent character: “An oppressive government and a persecuting religion, while breeding vices in those who hold power, are well known to breed answering vices in those who are powerless and suffering” (144). This narrator critiques English habits of mind that categorize certain races as lesser than the English people:

It is a striking spectacle to witness minds so panting for advancement in some directions that they are ready to force it on an unwilling society, in this instance despairingly recurring to medieval types of thinking—insisting that the Jews are
made viciously cosmopolitan by holding the world’s money-bag, that for them all national interests are resolved into the algebra of loans, that they have suffered an inward degradation stamping them as morally inferior, and —‘serve them right,’ since they rejected Christianity. All which is mirrored in an analogy, namely, that of the Irish, also a servile race, who have rejected Protestantism though it has been repeatedly urged on them by fire and sword and penal laws, and whose place in the moral scale may be judged by our advertisements, where the clause, ‘No Irish need apply,’ parallels the sentence which for many polite persons sums up the questions of Judaism—‘I never did like the Jews.’ (146)

Eliot’s narrator Theophrastus25 here finds an analogy between the Jewish and the Irish in terms of their status in the English nation. Both the Irish and the Jewish were labeled by the English nation as “morally inferior” due to their rejection of English religion. This last chapter in The Impressions of Theophrastus Such, however, provides a counterargument to this idea of the Jewish people’s moral inferiority to the English people, by finding that the Jews were more educated “into a sense of their supreme moral value” (142) in spite of their long history of dispersion and oppression under “foreign tyrants” (142).

This counterargument that the Jewish people are “a sublime type of steadfastness” (141) in The Impressions of Theophrastus Such becomes very meaningful in our reading of Daniel Deronda, given that the concept of Jewish nationhood without its own national territory completely disturbs contemporary social Darwinist categories as well. According to social Darwinist imperialism and racism, nations develop like individuals: strong nations and races survive as empire-building states to expand to other national territories, while weak ones don’t, and this idea justifies an imperial nation’s expansion to and exploitation of weak nations.26 The paradox embodied in the Jews in Daniel Deronda demonstrates that Eliot calls into question the very ideological reasoning for English imperialism.
By engaging itself with contemporary discourses on race, nationalism, and imperialism, *Daniel Deronda* presents alternatives to them. Daniel Deronda’s embrace of Jewish nationalism endorses openness to other cultures rather than exclusively approving the Jewish culture. On the relationship between nationality and race, we can see at first that the meaning of national identity is complicated in *Daniel Deronda*. By nationality Eliot appears to mean a cultural identity rather than a biological one. As Daniel’s case demonstrates, no race or blood can be pure in the physical sense and therefore the only possible national coherence is cultural. Audrey Jaffe puts the same idea in other words: “issues of race . . . are transmuted into the category of sensibility or taste” (124). On *Daniel Deronda*’s discussion of race, Gillian Beer sees that George Eliot examines the old theme of the English gentleman in terms of “intellectual relations” by widening the meaning of “breeding” in the novel (187). Sir Hugo Mallinger’s upbringing makes Daniel an English gentleman. But it does not necessarily mean that he ceases to be an Englishman when he discovers his Jewish heritage and consents to be a Jew. This idea of national identity in terms of culture, sensibility or intellectual relations is demonstrated in the novel’s representation of different Jewish individuals in “The Philosophers” party who are from different national backgrounds:

Miller, the broad man, an exceptional second-hand bookseller who knew the insides of books, had at least grand-parents who called themselves German, and possibly far-away ancestors who denied themselves to be Jews; Buchan, the saddler, was Scotch; Pas, the watchmaker, was a small, dark, vivacious, triplebaked Jew; Gideon, the optical instrument maker, was a Jew of the red-haired, generous-featured type easily passing for Englishmen of unusually cordial manners; and Croop . . . was probably more Celtic than he knew. Only three would have been discernible everywhere as Englishmen. (581-82)
Jewish identity appears in varying degrees, which is suggestively related to different national backgrounds in which the individual has been reared. The different nationalities with their different customs and cultures make difference in the degree of each individual’s Jewishness, and therefore some Jews look apparently like Jews but some can “pass” as Englishmen. Eliot makes Deronda’s Jewishness invisible as well until Mordecai recognizes him as a Jew and Deronda himself discovers his Jewish heritage. While the novel’s ending seems to depict his new-found identity in narrowly Jewish terms by telling us Daniel sets out for the East, Eliot at the same time depicts Daniel’s new identity to give weight on the multiple national and cultural heritages in the novel.28

Daniel appears as an Englishman in the beginning of the novel and he later turns out to be of Jewish origin. Until the discovery of his being Jewish, Daniel is depicted to suffer from senses of uncertainty of his identity. In Chapter 16, the narrator tells us that “a question about his [Daniel’s] birth was throbbing within him” (169) and uncertainties about origin characterize the spiritual condition of both Daniel and English society. Daniel assumes himself to be Sir Hugo’s illegitimate son and he expresses his intention against Sir Hugo’s desire to provide Daniel with “the education of an English gentleman” (165): “I want to be an Englishman, but I want to understand other points of view. And I want to get rid of a merely English attitude in studies” (176). Daniel expresses here his sense of lack that he gets in this English society.

The narrator also describes another aspect of Daniel’s character: “There had sprung up in him a meditative yearning after wide knowledge which is likely always to abate ardour in the fight for prize acquirement in narrow tracks (170). His desire for “wide knowledge” made him to reproach “himself for having been attracted by the
conventional advantage of belonging to an English university, and was tempted towards the
project of asking Sir Hugo to let him quit Cambridge and pursue a more independent
line of study abroad” (172-173). Daniel’s desire reveals want of wider perspectives in his
English society and education. He meets Mordecai who is Minah’s Jewish brother and
gets introduced to the different world of Judaism.

Eliot emphasizes throughout the novel that Deronda returns to his Jewish cultural
heritage by acknowledging and having dialogues with other cultural heritages including
his English heritages within him. Habermas’ notion of the difference between “a merely
ethical standpoint” and “morality” is relevant to our understanding of Daniel’s new-
found identity with multiple heritages. According to Habermas, ethics concerns collective
ideas of who we are and thus conceives the good as closely linked with “cultural values”
and “the shared traditions” of the community. Therefore, an ethical viewpoint cannot
“free itself from a particular tradition and its “ethnocentric” values and self-
understanding” (Warnke 88). Mordecai’s ideal of the Jewish people can be categorized to
fall into this ethical viewpoint. Morality, according to Habermas, is more associated with
“a hermeneutics that critically appropriates traditions” and it is thus linked with
“questions of justice” which are not “inherently related to a specific collectivity and its
form of life” (Warnke 88). Daniel Deronda’s perspective on his people and other culture
resembles Habermas’ notion of morality, because he questions deeply held values of both
the Jewish people and the English people rather than insisting on only one of them.
Insisting on only one culture could violate the values and equality of the two cultures.
Habermas’ notion of morality is connected with “a justice issue” that is subject to
“principles that state what is equally good for all” and thus is “not inherently related to a
This justice that is beyond a particular collectivity resonates with the concerns of the narrator in Eliot’s *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such* as well. The ultimate concern in the chapter “The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” about Jewish issues is the fact that the Jews “have been excepted from the rules of justice and mercy, which are based on human likeness,” which is “a demoralizing offence” (140). This is why the chapter develops an analogy between the Jewish people and the Irish people, because the two groups of people are in the same manner “excepted” from the principle of justice in the reasoning of a specific collectivity of the English people. This chapter especially suggests that “the comity of nations” begins from “the dignity of being included in a people” (147), the lack of which is identified as a problem of the English society in *Daniel Deronda*.

This distinction between ethical perspective and moral one sheds light on the two types of nationalism in *Daniel Deronda*. Amanda Anderson in her analysis of the novel suggests two models of nationalism. One is the German romantic model on which Mordecai’s Zionism depends. This model reflects German romantic social doctrine, which reifies national community into a collective will modeled on the single individual. This nationalism demands the total subjugation of the individual into the state and favors charismatic leadership. 30 But the novel depicts Mordecai’s Zionism as based on the European binary opposition between the Occidental and the Oriental:

There is store of wisdom among us to found a new Jewish polity, grand, simple, just, like the old – a republic where there is equality of protection, an equality which shone like a star on the forehead of our ancient community, and gave it more than the brightness of Western freedom amid the despotisms of the East. Then our race shall have an organic centre, a heart and brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defence in the court of nations, as the outraged Englishman or American. And the world will gain as Israel gains. For
there will be a community in the van of the East which carries the culture and the sympathies of every great nation in its bosom; there will be a land set for a halting-place of enmities, a neutral ground for the East as Belgium is for the West. (516)

Mordecai ironically associates the new Jewish nation with Western nations like England that he attempts to replace. Perpetuating the binary opposition of a degraded East and a noble, enlightened West, Mordecai’s Zionism is depicted as a way for transforming the East into the West. Compared to the ultimate other of “despotic” Orientals, the Jews become like Europeans in Mordecai’s Zionism.31

The other is the civic model of nationalism that is reflected in Deronda’s position. Daniel’s concept of nation-building comes from his broad understanding of cultures beyond his own, and this is enabled by his own identity formed from out of hybrid traditions. Deronda’s position on Jewish nation state is therefore more reflective and critical than Mordecai’s. In his conversation with one of his grandfather’s friends, Daniel expresses his own perspective different from his forefathers: “I will not say that I shall profess to believe exactly as my fathers have believed. Our fathers themselves changed the horizon of their belief and learned of other races” (698). In this more dialogical way, Daniel conceives a way to succeed with modification his grandfather’s notion of “the balance of separateness and communication” (697), which is open to different cultures and thus negates the ideas that one race is better than another.

As Gillian Beer notes in Darwin’s Plots, Eliot emphasizes “the failure of the British to perceive their connections with other races and culture” (187) in Daniel Deronda. If Eliot’s Middlemarch the social organism, as represented by the provincial town itself, swallows the reformist idealism of the characters within its narrow limits,
Daniel Deronda works toward liberation from provincial, national confinement. Eliot portrays Daniel’s gradual accession to his Judaic heritage as an antidote to his personal aimlessness that is conceptualized as an unhealthy remoteness from the rest of the social organism: “A too reflective and diffusive sympathy was in danger of paralysing in him [Deronda] that indignation against wrong and that selectness of fellowship which are the conditions of moral force; . . . But how and whence was the needed event to come? – the influence that would justify partiality, and make him what he longed to be yet was unable to make himself – an organic part of social life, instead of roaming in it like a yearning disembodied spirit, stirred with a vague social passion, but without fixed local habitation to render fellowship real?” (413).

What is remarkable about Deronda’s Jewish identity is that it is represented not as his birth into a Jewish family but as his choice or consent to be a Jew. In other words, his Jewish identity is depicted not as coming from “origin” but as coming from his choice:

The effect of my education can never be done away with. . . . But I consider it my duty – it is the impulse of my feeling – to identify myself, as far as possible, with my hereditary people, and if I can see any work to be done for them that I can give my soul and hand to, I shall choose to do it. (Emphasis added: 724)

Therefore, the novel is actually less about Deronda’s discovery of his Jewishness than it is about his choice to be a Jew. His consent to be a Jew is more crucial in the construction of Deronda’s identity than his of Jewish birth. Exploring the roles of the intersection between race and culture played in the construction of national identity, Eliot endorses a self-conscious subject who is able to return to his cultural heritage with reflective and critical perspectives, as Amanda Anderson notes, and Eliot thus resists the racial determinism of national identity. This means that Daniel’s story is Eliot’s consideration
of particular issues of her contemporary English society and an expression of her position to the issues rather than a manifestation of her exclusive endorsement of Jewish superiority. The difference between Mordecai and Deronda in their notions of who the Jewish race is demonstrates well that Eliot endorses openness toward other cultures rather than accepting one culture’s superiority to another. Mordecai seems to believe the collective superiority of the Jewish race as seen in his speech at “The Philosophers” party:

The divine principle of our race is action, choice, resolved memory. Let us contradict the blasphemy, and help to will our own better future and the better future of the world – not renounce our higher gift and say, “Let us be as if we were not among the population;” but choose our full heritage, claim the brotherhood of our nation, and carry into it a new brotherhood with the nations of Gentiles. The vision is there; it will be fulfilled. (598)

Mordecai’s speech demands individual Jews’ full acceptance of his vision, rather than asking whether they consent to the vision itself or not. This is why his speech quells all dialogue. After this impassioned speech, “No one spoke” (598).35

While Eliot depicts disapprovingly Mordecai’s romantic doctrine of nationalism, her narrative affirms Daniel’s self-reflective relation to his cultural heritage and openness to other cultures.36 Eliot certainly reveals reservations about both Mordecai’s doctrine and Leonora’s absolute repudiation of her Jewish heritage, while she promotes throughout the novel reflective interrogation of the bonds of family, community, and nation. Eliot puts this idea as “choosing with noble partiality” in the following passage:

As he [Deronda] neared England on his way from Mainz, he felt the remaining distance more and more of an obstruction. It was as if he had found an added soul in finding his ancestry – his judgment no longer wandering in the mazes of impartial sympathy, but choosing, with the noble partiality which is man’s best strength, the closer fellowship that makes sympathy practical – exchanging that
This passage clearly expresses that Daniel believes that a traditional sense of community, a sense of oneness with “men of like inheritance,” must provide something that gives stability to the greater ideals, in order to avoid absolute dissociation from one’s cultural heritage seen in Deronda’s mother, Leonora’s case. Deronda realizes the atomizing effects of “impartial sympathy” and acknowledges that “the noble partiality” can provide the counterweight to the consequences of radical repudiation of one’s heritage in the name of impartiality. Both Daniel Deronda and The Impressions of Theophrastus Such present the lack of a sense of special belonging as a serious problem of English society.

3.2 Cross-Cultural Encounter and Gender in Gwendolen Harleth’s Plot

In so-called Gwendolen’s plot, the lack of particular belonging is linked with the suffering of Gwendolen Harleth. Eliot explores the “Woman Question” in a wider scope than in her previous novels and it discusses the English social limitations of women’s boundary in comparison with an alien culture of Judaism. The depiction of a beautiful Jewess Mirah as the ideal woman in Daniel Deronda exemplifies Eliot’s attempt to challenge contemporary discourse that Jews are less worthy than English people. But the harsh depiction of a strong, self-asserting Gwendolen Harleth in contrast with the novel’s endorsement of submissive Mirah appears to uphold contemporary society’s views on the submissive, subservient role of women. For example, Christina Crosby argues that George Eliot sees the woman question from the masculine point of view and her solution
to it is so conventionally limited that there are only “courtship, marriage, and motherhood” possible in the woman’s story. Gillian Beer similarly notes that Daniel Deronda asks the question of “whether there can be new plots for stories about women.” The seemingly conservative upholding of women’s subservient role should, however, be complicated by a consideration of the novel’s conscious emphasis on the contrast between Mirah and Gwendolen. Through the contrast between the two female characters, the novel makes a comparison of the idealized Jewish vision with emptiness of English aristocratic class.

Connecting gender and race issues, Susan Meyer argues that Daniel Deronda associates alien races with female rebellion depicted through Gwendolen and suppresses both female social discontent and the Jews, by removing them away from the English world of the novel. Eliot’s novel, however, carefully depicts Gwendolen as a part or product of her English society and its world view, rather than as associated with the alien Jewish people. My contention is that the plot of a proud young woman’s moral education in the story of Gwendolen is a critique of moral emptiness of her culture, particularly the class that she desires to belong to through marriage, rather than that of independence of her gender. Therefore, the focus of Eliot’s comparison of Gwendolen with Mirah is on their different cultural values rather than on their different understanding of gender roles. As the cultural difference between Mirah and Gwendolen, Sally Shuttleworth finds two different kinds of memory in Daniel Deronda, “the optimistic model of organic memory associated with Daniel and his rediscovered Jewish ancestry” and the memory of “Gwendolen Harleth, a rootless creature whose life seems dictated more by Darwinian chance than rooted inheritance.”
Although many critics note that Mirah is so submissive a female character in the novel, the novel depicts Mirah as self-assertive in the following anecdote. As an example of ideal women who “are specially framed for the love which feels possession in renouncing” (707), Mordecai tells a story of a Jewish girl who loved a Gentile king: “She entered into prison and changed clothes with the woman who was beloved by the king, that she might deliver the woman from death by dying in her stead, and leave the king to be happy in his love which was not for her. This is the surpassing love, that loses self in the object of love” (708). To Mordecai’s interpretation of the story, Mirah replies: “No, Ezra, no, . . . that was not it. She wanted the king when she was dead to know what she had done, and feel that she was better than the other. It was her strong self, wanting to conquer, that made her die” (708). Mirah’s interpretation of this anecdote explains why the contrast between Mirah and Gwendolen should be placed on the comparison of the idealized Jewish vision with the emptiness of English aristocratic class. The novel’s criticism opens with Gwendolen’s spiritual emptiness, but the criticism extends to the critique of larger institutions like the aristocratic classes and their imperialism.

The novel begins by depicting Gwendolen occupied in gambling in a casino at Leubronn. The narrator ironically talks about “the passion of gambling” (6) which the narrator later describes: “while every single player differed markedly from every other, there was a certain uniform negativeness of expression which had the effect of a mask—as if they had all eaten of some root that for the time compelled the brains of each to the same narrow monotony of action” (7). The individual players are so obsessed with gambling that they do not pay attention to one another but ironically they construct certain sameness in spite of individual differences. The narrator in other place describes
them: “Those who were taking their pleasure at a higher strength, and were absorbed in play, . . . Here certainly was a striking admission of human equality” (6). Their desire to win comprises a resemblance among them. The narrator interestingly develops an analogy between gambling, trade, and social rank by depicting a London tradesman: “In his bearing there might be something of the tradesman, but in his pleasures he was fit to rank with the owners of the oldest titles” (7). It is the market value of tradesman, the pursuit of Luck in gambling, and the spiritual emptiness of the upper-class that are the objects of the novel’s critique. Gambling is in this novel deployed as a symbol of these critiqued values and the symbol develops in depiction of Gwendolen’s life.

Gwendolen herself embodies the irony of egoism and luck involved in gambling. As the narrator tells us, Gwendolen “had begun to believe in her luck,” considering herself as “a goddess of luck” (8) in the gambling casino in the beginning of the novel, but she received a letter from her mother in the next chapter that informed her of “stupefying” news: “Grapnell & Co. have failed for a million and we are totally ruined” (13). Later, the narrator makes an analogy between Gwendolen as “a goddess of luck” and Grapnell & Co. as another reign of luck, describing the ironical reversal of luck: “We have seen, too, that certain persons, mysteriously symbolized as Grapnell & Co., having also thought of reigning in the realm of luck, and being also bent on amusing themselves, no matter how, had brought about a painful change in her family circumstance” (149). 41 Daniel, from the first moment of seeing Gwendolen at the gambling table, fixes his “measuring gaze” (11) upon her and feels himself “in a region outside and above her” (8), “examining her as a specimen of a lower order” (8). He later tells Gwendolen that “There are enough inevitable turns of fortune which force us to see that our gain is another’s
loss: - that is one of the ugly aspects of life” (322). The narrow desire of Gwendolen’s egoism cannot see “turns of fortune” which made her win once but lose later in her life.

When Gwendolen asks Daniel, “I want to know why you thought it wrong for me to gamble. Is it because I am a woman?” (322), he replies, “Not altogether; . . . there is something revolting to me in raking a heap of money together, and internally chuckling over it, when others are feeling the loss of it. . . There are enough inevitable turns of fortune which force us to see that our gain is another’s loss” (322). Daniel’s reply clearly demonstrates his revulsion against Gwendolen’s world view based on Darwinian chance, pointing out her blindness to the truth that her gain is another’s loss. The narrator describes Gwendolen from the beginning in Darwinian terms: “she [Gwendolen] would no longer be sacrificed to creatures worth less than herself, but would make the very best of the chances that life offered her, and conquer circumstance by her exceptional cleverness. . . She felt well equipped for the mastery of life” (36). The novel critiques not Gwendolen’s independence but her world view that considers only her own gain. The narrator tells that “Gwendolen . . . passed her time abroad in the new excitement of gambling, and in imagining herself an empress of luck” (149). This indifference to others’ loss that is predominant in Gwendolen’s society extends to the country’s imperialism. The fortune of Gwendolen’s family was a product of British imperialism, because the narrator notes that “for on the point of birth Gwendolen was quite easy. She had no notion how her maternal grandfather got the fortune inherited by his two daughters; but he had been a West Indian” (20). The story implies that the fortune that this family enjoys is made out of another race’s loss.
Gwendolen’s encounter with Mrs. Glasher also demonstrates well that it is Gwendolen’s egoistic desire to make her gain even of another’s loss that is critiqued in the novel. Gwendolen learns that Grandcourt has illegitimate children in his relationship with Mrs. Glasher and replies “I will not interfere with your wishes” (145) to Mrs. Glasher who wants her son to become Grandcourt’s heir. In spite of her knowledge of the presence of Mrs. Glasher and the children, Gwendolen later accepts Grandcourt’s proposal. Mrs. Glasher’s letter to Gwendolen expresses clearly how Gwendolen makes her gain of the loss of Mrs. Glasher and her children by marrying Grandcourt: “You have broken your word to her [Lydia Glasher], that you might possess what was hers. Perhaps you think of being happy, as she once was, and of having beautiful children such as hers, who will thrust hers aside” (343). Later, Daniel critiques Gwendolen’s egoism: “look on other lives besides your own. See what their troubles are, and how they are borne. Try to care about something in this vast world besides the gratification of small selfish desires” (429).

In addition to the narrowness of Gwendolen’s self-seeking desire, the upper-class that Gwendolen seeks to belong to through her marriage to Henleigh Grandcourt is severely critiqued in the novel. Grandcourt himself embodies the values of his class about which David Kaufmann notes: “Everything remains fair outwardly, while beneath the glitter of the tinsel there is naught but hollowness and decay, and while hidden beneath this beauteous envelope the heart is lying broken.” Matthew Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* includes a passage on the Barbarians that resonates with *Daniel Deronda*’s depiction of English aristocratic class. Arnold defines the distinctive quality of aristocracies as the idea of the Barbarians: “The Barbarians brought with them that
staunch individualism, as the modern phrase is, and that passion for doing as one likes, for the assertion of personal liberty. . . . The stronghold and natural seat of this passion was in the nobles of whom our aristocratic class are the inheritors.⁴³ Both Gwendolen and Grandcourt are exemplary of those who have “that passion for doing as one likes” as Arnold describes. About their marriage relationship, the narrator tells that “he [Grandcourt] wanted to feel more securely that she [Gwendolen] was his to do as he liked with, and to make her feel it also. . . . she meant to rule and have her own way” (644). In this way, the novel’s critique of Gwendolen is clearly focused on her “indulgence in the disposition to dominate” (644) and on her “habits of mind” in which “it had been taken for granted that she knew what was admirable and that she herself was admired” (9). This is partly why Gwendolen in the first chapter of the novel is named “the spoiled child,” which is also the title of Book One.

Daniel Deronda depicts the English upper-classes as Arnold defines them. According to Arnold, the Barbarian idea of English aristocratic class is associated with their main concern about appearance: “The care of the Barbarians for the body, and for all manly exercises; the vigour, good looks, and fine complexion which they acquired and perpetuated in their families by these means—all this may be observed still in our aristocratic class. . . . all this culture (to call it by that name) of the Barbarians was an exterior culture mainly: it consisted principally in outward gifts and graces, in looks, manners, accomplishments, prowess.”⁴⁴ In the beginning of Daniel Deronda, we are told that Gwendolen’s complexion is “one of her chief charms” (10). Eliot’s novel depicts Grandcourt, the arrogant English aristocratic man, and his wife Gwendolen as Arnold describes the Barbarian quality of the English aristocratic class: “He [Grandcourt] had
remarkable physical courage, and was proud of it—or rather he had a great contempt for the coarser, bulkier men who generally had less. . . . This handsome, fair-skinned English couple manifesting the usual eccentricity of their nation, both of them proud, pale, and calm, without a smile on their faces, moving like creatures who were fulfilling a supernatural destiny” (656). The narrator interestingly associates the qualities of the English couple with their national identity, and the implied comparison here between English nationality and other nationalities is repeated in the novel’s comparison of English characters with characters from other cultures.

The composer Herr Klesmer is one of those characters from other cultures. The outward-oriented English culture is critiqued by Klesmer, depicted as “a felicitous combination of the German, the Slave, and the Semite” (43). He critiques Gwendolen’s choice of inferior music and her narrow artistic horizon that he interprets as reflecting English cultural narrowness: “It is a form of melody which expresses a puerile state of culture—a dandling, canting, seesaw kind of stuff—the passion and thought of people without any breadth of horizon. There is a sort of self-satisfied folly about every phrase of such melody; no cries of deep, mysterious passion—no conflict—no sense of the universal. It makes men small as they listen to it. Sing now something larger” (45). The narrator tells that “For a young lady desiring to lead, this first encounter in her campaign was startling” (45). Gwendolen’s encounter with the outsider Klesmer is presented as a challenge to the narrowness of her culture. This theme of the corrective of foreignness and moral narrowness of English culture is implied in the contrast that the novel makes between the cosmopolitan Klesmer and the English family of the Meyricks: “when he [Klesmer] entered, the rooms shrank into closets, the cottage piano, Mab thought, seemed
a ridiculous toy, and the entire family existence as petty and private as an establishment of mice in the Tuileries” (463). This domestic space of England seems to shrink in front of the “massive” (463) Klesmer, which is suggestive of the pettiness of Englishness in comparison with the width of combined diverse cultures embodied in Klesmer’s cultural identity. In addition to the lack of wide horizon, Klesmer points out “lack of discipline” and “lack of instruction” (247) that he finds in “the drawing-room standpoint” (245):

“You have not yet conceived what excellence is: you must unlearn your mistaken admirations. You must know what you have to strive for, and then you must subdue your mind and body to unbroken discipline. Your mind, I say” (245). Gwendolen’s encounter with other cultures through Herr Klesmer and later through Daniel Deronda repeats the challenge from other cultures to the dominant English culture depicted as narrow and egoistic.

The novel makes an explicit comparison between Gwendolen and Mirah when Gwendolen, Mirah, Klesmer and Daniel attend a musical party at Lady Mallinger’s. Klesmer tells Gwendolen about the worth of taking lesson in singing from Mirah. Although Mirah presents herself in the “light of neediness” (541), the narrator predicts that “this Jewish protégée [Mirah] would ever make a more important difference in her [Gwendolen’s] life than the possible improvement of her singing—if the leisure and spirits of a Mrs. Grandcourt would allow of other lessons than such as the world was giving her at rather a high charge” (541). After this passage, the narrator tells us about Gwendolen’s “wonted alteration from resolute care of appearances to some rash indulgence of an impulse” (541), which characterizes Gwendolen sustained by the two poles of “care of appearance” and “indulgence of an impulse.” The character Klesmer
helps the story establish the contrast between Mirah and Gwendolen as that of two different cultures rather than that of independent and submissive women. If Gwendolen’s faults are termed as “manifesting the usual eccentricity of their nation” (656), Mirah’s virtue is attributed to her being a Jewess. When Mrs. Meyrick praises Mirah by saying, “She is an angel,” Klesmer replies that “she is a pretty Jewess: the angels must not get the credit of her” (467).

Another contrast between Gwendolen and Mirah is made in terms of the different spiritual conditions of their communities. Gwendolen is depicted as lacking an “early home” where she could experience “the love of tender kinship”:

A human life, I think, should be well rooted in some spot of a native land, where it may get the love of tender kinship for the face of earth, for the labours men go forth to, for the sounds and accents that haunt it, for whatever will give that early home a familiar unmistakable difference amidst the future widening of knowledge: a spot where the definiteness of early memories may be inwrought with affection, and kindly acquaintance with all neighbours, even to the dogs and donkeys, may spread not by sentimental effort and reflection, but as a sweet habit of the blood. At five years old, mortals are not prepared to be citizens of the world, to be stimulated by abstract nouns, to soar above preference into impartiality; and that prejudice in favour of milk with which we blindly begin, is a type of the way body and soul must get nourished at least for a time. The best introduction to astronomy is to think of the nightly heavens as a little lot of stars belonging to one’s own homestead.

But this blessed persistence in which affection can take root had been wanting in Gwendolen’s life. (19)

This passage hints at how Eliot’s novel establishes a link between rootedness and being “citizens of the world.” In order to love all citizens of the world, one should love one’s early home, constructing early memories of affection of all neighbors of one’s hometown. The “sweet habit of the blood” should be established in one’s life at first before one
outgrows “preference” to “impartiality.” Eliot’s The Impressions of Theophrastus Such also discusses the same idea: “the consciousness of having a native country, the birthplace of common memories and habits of mind, existing like a parental hearth” is “the root of human virtues, both public and private” (147), which will prevent Englishmen from suffering “moral degradation” (147). Both Daniel Deronda and The Impressions of Theophrastus Such stress the importance of national memories as “an element and a means of national greatness” (135) as Eliot’s narrator, Theophrastus Such, puts it.

The religion of the Jewish people comes as an element of national memories that becomes a moral principle of the Jewish people that the English people in the novel lack. The English people’s lack of moral principles is seen dramatically in the contrast between Gwendolen and Mirah again. Mirah’s story tells that it is her mother who keeps Mirah from being wicked and connects her with the Hebrew religion. Mirah tells Mrs. Meyrick and her daughters about her world view that “if I got wicked I should lose my world of happy thoughts where my mother lived with me” (205) and it was her mother that taught Mirah about her religion and the history of her people. Mirah’s mother also taught her “Hebrew hymns” (202) from her early childhood. The difference between Mirah and Gwendolen’s singing lies in that Mirah’s singing is linked with her religion and the history of her people. This is why Klesmer points out the defect of “the passion and thought of people without any breadth of horizon” (45) in Gwendolen’s singing. Mirah wins Klesmer’s praises on her talent as a musician. Mirah chooses Leopardi’s patriotic Ode to Italy: “O my fatherland, I see the walls and the arches and the columns and the images and the lonely towers of our ancestors . . . But I do not see the glory . . . Most
blessed are you who offered your breasts to the enemy lances for love of her who gave you to the sun . . . O long life to you: you shall be most blessed while there is speech or writing in the world” (465).\textsuperscript{45} The patriotism of this song can be interpreted to be “preference” that one should enjoy before he outgrows it to “impartiality” (19). As Amanda Anderson notes, Mirah represents “the importance of a deeply felt connection to family and culture”\textsuperscript{46} which is the main lack of Gwendolen and her society. This theme resonates with Daniel’s advice to Gwendolen. He makes a comparison between her world in which “all passion is spent in that narrow round, for want of ideas and sympathies to make a larger home for it” and “the higher, religious life” in which “the affection are clad with knowledge” or which “holds an enthusiasm for something more than our own appetites and vanities” (434-435).

As I have pointed out, Eliot’s novel emphasizes that Gwendolen is a part of the whole English society. Her uncle Mr. Gascoigne who is the Rector of Pennicote fails to guide Gwendolen with religious truth. Rather, he looks at Gwendolen “as a girl likely to make a brilliant marriage” (35) and he means her “to be seen to advantage in the best society of the neighborhood” (35). As the narrator says, Gwendolen and Mr. Gascoigne share the idea that “marriage was social promotion” (36). Their view of marriage is not different from the rest of their society, as the narrator puts: “Why should he [Mr. Gascoigne] be expected to differ from his contemporaries in this matter” (35). Mr. Gascoigne demonstrates that the church of this society fails to educate the young with truth of what marriage should be like.

If Mr. Gascoigne stands for the church’s failure to direct Gwendolen’s community, Mrs. Davilow, Gwendolen’s mother, who is always described as timid,
represents the failure of the family to guide it. Mrs. Davilow passes down to her daughter the society’s view that “Marriage is the only state for a woman” (26). “Mrs. Davilow’s timid maternal conscience dreaded whatever had brought on the slightest hint of reproach” (91), and that generated Gwendolen’s “favourite key of life—doing as she liked” (130). When Gwendolen considers marrying Grandcourt, she expects the following from her marriage: “the dignities, the luxuries, the power of doing a great deal of what she liked to do” (130). The story makes clear that it is the lack of moral guidance of the church and the family that leads to Gwendolen’s egoistic desire that is vividly depicted as “the self-delight with which she [Gwendolen] had kissed her image in the glass” (220). As Nancy L. Paxton correctly notes, Gwendolen considers marriage in terms of power and according to the marriage market rather than love. The narrator describes the marriage between Gwendolen and Grandcourt as “a contract”: He [Grandcourt] knew quite well that she [Gwendolen] had not married him—had not overcome her repugnance to certain facts—out of love to him personally; he had won her by the rank and luxuries he had to give her, and these she had got” (644). In this way, Grandcourt fulfills his side of the contract through his advantages of using “his power to hinder her from any injurious self-committal or unsuitable behavior” (644).

While Grandcourt and Gwendolen reveal their conception of marriage in terms of market values, the novel depicts different notions of marriage in non-English characters such as Mirah and Klesmer. Mrs. Arrowpoint does not consent to her daughter’s marriage to Klesmer and says to him that “If Catherine disobeys us we shall disinherit her. You will not marry her fortune.” To her words, Klesmer replies that “Madam, her fortune has been the only thing I have had to regret about her. . . . I am able
to maintain your daughter, and I ask for no change in my life but her companionship” (239). While Gwendolen follows her mother and uncle’s guidance to marriage as a way of “entering on a luxurious life by a short and easy road” (249), Mirah firmly refuses a marriage to a Count that would lead her to the Count’s place where she could be “queen of everything” (209). Mirah attributes her thought to God and her mother: “I thought God was warning me: my mother’s voice was in my soul” (211). According to Mirah, the existence of God and her mother made her see better with “the strange clearness within” (211). Memory of her mother sustains Mirah because it is also linked with the history of her people who had been “driven from land to land and been afflicted” (213). The narrator describes Mirah as a figure conveying the history of her people’s suffering: “Mirah was not childlike from ignorance: her experience of evil and trouble was deeper and stranger than his own. He felt inclined to watch her and listen to her as if she had come from a far-off shore inhabited by a race different from our own” (216). Deronda’s encounter with Mirah is therefore the beginning of his knowing the Jewish race, as the narrator puts it. Deronda senses something new from Mirah and becomes interested in her different but “deeper” experience associated with her people’s long history of persecution.

While Daniel finds a solution to his long sense of uncertainty about his origin and to his ennui in Judaism and finally sets out with Mirah for the East to help his people, Gwendolen seems to have no way to escape her community’s spiritual emptiness. The alien tradition of Judaism gives fellowship that Daniel’s life lacked, but Gwendolen’s lack of unity set against Daniel’s new-found origin now seems much worse than before. Gwendolen’s previous statement “I am bored to death” (12) in Chapter 2 and the depiction of her lack of “a native land” and “early home” demonstrate that the
fragmentation of her identity has only led to gambling reliant on chance. But Daniel’s encounter with Mirah awakens in him an interest in Judaism: “Mirah, with her terrified flight from one parent, and her yearning after the other, had flashed on him the hitherto neglected reality that Judaism was something still throbbing in human lives, still making for them the only conceivable vesture of the world” (347). The narrator describes Daniel’s interest in Judaism as a corrective to his “ennui”: “This awakening of a new interest—this passing from the supposition that we hold the right opinions on a subject we are careless about, to a sudden care for it, and a sense that our opinions were ignorance—is an effectual remedy for ennui” (347). Daniel’s interest in Judaism aroused by his encounter with Mirah is “some external event, or some inward light” that urges Daniel “into a definite line of action” (349). The narrator defines Daniel’s problem in this way: “A too reflective and diffusive sympathy was in danger of paralyzing in him that indignation against wrong and that selectness of fellowship which are the conditions of moral force” (349). Daniel’s encounter with Judaism is depicted as “the influence that would justify partiality, and make him what he longed to be yet was unable to make himself—an organic part of social life, instead of roaming in it like a yearning disembodied spirit, stirred with a vague social passion, but without fixed local habitation to render fellowship real?” (349). On this difference between Daniel and Gwendolen, Shuttleworth writes that organic memory “supplies a unity and continuity which Daniel’s personal life lacked, and gives historical grandeur to the individual life. To set against that, however, there is the depiction of Gwendolen’s fragmentation, her lack of unity, continuity and control.”48
If we consider the English half of *Daniel Deronda* as a story of Gwendolen’s moral education, her *Bildungsroman* consists of a series of widening of her horizon. After Klesmer’s judgment of her singing, the narrator describes Gwendolen “with a sinking of heart at the sudden width of horizon opened round her small musical performance. For a young lady desiring to lead, this first encounter in her campaign was startling” (45). The narrator in the beginning of the novel describes Gwendolen as the fittest who finally survives with “inborn energy of egoistic desire, and her power of inspiring fear as to what she might say or do” (38). If her life resembles the lives of people who live with “a strong determination to have what was pleasant, with a total fearlessness in making themselves disagreeable or dangerous when they did not get it” (38), her education is a series of encounters with others who provoke her to consider others around her overcoming her egoistic desire. Daniel describes that education as “a painful letting in of light” (435) through which she could know more of the way in which her life is connected with others. Since Gwendolen’s personal problem synecdochically represents the problem of her society, Daniel’s advice could be extended in larger terms: Gwendolen’s society should know how its own life is linked with others.

3.3 Judaism as an Enlarged Perspective

Analyzing the novel’s favorable depiction of Jewish culture, George Levine identifies an ethical and epistemological ideal of knowing other cultures as *Daniel Deronda*’s main subject, noting the problem of solipsism that Western philosophy encountered:
Western philosophy has struggled persistently with the problem of whether the mind is capable of getting outside of itself. How can we know anything about what isn’t us when standing between us and the world is that enormous, overshadowing, often inchoate self, which filters all signals from the outside, obtrudes its desires on everything, limits the angles from which the outside can be perceived, and forces the very distinction between inside and outside? Within the framework of this threat, eliminating the embodied self is the task of epistemology if any science—and I extend the term here to mean any systematic natural knowledge—is to be possible. Obviously, any such effort entails ethical choices, not only because the self must be restrained, diminished, eliminated, but because only by breaking the constraints of the self can we make true contact with other people and not simply impose ourselves upon them.50

Daniel Deronda is truly about overcoming English perspective that is limited by its “inchoate self” and the novel is concerned about knowing other cultures, in the novel’s case, the Jewish people and their culture “by breaking the constraints of the self,” as Levine puts it. The significance of the fact that Daniel Deronda sets Jewish culture in opposition to English culture lies in that Daniel’s turn to Jewish culture works as a means of therapy for his growing awareness of the ennui that he finds in English culture.

According to Edward Said in Orientalism, nineteenth-century culture including the novel monolithically contributed to the construction of England’s cultural others as backward races and cultures by depicting them as “devoid of energy and initiative” (38) and “lethargic” (39). But Daniel Deronda depicts from its first chapter the main English characters’ ennui and boredom. The first chapter ends with Gwendolen’s “I am always bored” (12), and she later compares the boredom of women’s restricted life to plants: “We women can’t go in search of adventures—to find out the North-West Passage or the source of the Nile, or to hunt tigers in the East. We must stay where we grow, or where the gardeners like to transplant us. We are brought up like the flowers, to look as pretty as
we can, and be dull without complaining” (128-29). These words indicate Gwendolen’s awareness of social constriction on her gender, but Grandcourt’s reply to her that “Most things are bores” (129) shows that both men and women in this society suffer from boredom. The narrator also later depicts Grandcourt “grumbling at the ennui of staying so long in this stupid dance” (426). Men and women of upper-class English society dance, practice archery, hunt in order to get out of their boredom. But it is only Daniel who identifies the boredom of this English life as “a disease”: “I think what we call the dullness of things is a disease in ourselves” (395) against Gwendolen’s justification of gambling as a refuge from boredom.

In the form of cross-cultural relationship in Daniel Deronda, the difference between English and Jewish cultures is not depicted to be maintained according to the hegemonic discourses on the superiority of English culture. One example of the contemporary discourses against which Eliot sets her novel is the discourse on converting Jewish people to Christianity of the English nation. When Daniel told the Mallingers about a Jewess, Mirah, Lady Mallinger immediately mentions that “there was a Society for the Conversion of the Jews, and that it was to be hoped Mirah would embrace Christianity” (217). If this attempt to convert the Jews to Christianity reveals hegemonic attitudes toward other cultures, Eliot suggests an alternative perspective on the culture of Jewish people in Daniel Deronda. As I have shown, the novel suggests the church’s failure to direct its society and the novel makes remarkable its critique of English people who try to convert Jewish people by highlighting them suffering from ennui. The narrator clearly depicts the difference between appearing to be a “genuine” Englishman and actually being an ideal. While Daniel’s “face was not as unmistakably English” (425),
“Grandcourt’s appearance . . . was not impeached with foreignness: . . . It was agreed that Mr. Grandcourt could never be taken for anything but what he was—a born gentleman” (425-26). David Kaufmann also compares Daniel with Grandcourt as follows:

“In the one [Grandcourt] we see emptiness and blunted perception, the disgust which is born of satiety, polish and fascinating adroitness combined with absolute want of feeling, and perfect worldly wisdom hiding heartless barbarity; in the other [Daniel], a full and rich mental life, an open sense for all that is great and beautiful, a moral fibre of the utmost toughness and yet of the utmost delicacy, and the readiest and most willing disinterestedness and self-sacrifice” (52).51

This juxtaposition of Daniel and Grandcourt suggests a counterargument against the so-called conversion discourse by showing that it is rather English people that are in need of something to be cured of their boredom and emptiness. 52 The Jewish culture inherited through multiple generations becomes a frame for a critical view of English society. Eliot reveals her different attitudes toward the Jewish culture in the novel’s double plot in which Daniel achieves a greater understanding of his life and the world by integrating his English and Jewish cultural heritages.53 Eliot here suggests the value of self-critical appropriation of different cultures rather than just insisting on only one’s own culture. As I have shown, Eliot suggests her endorsement of Daniel not Mordecai by making him die before he sets off for the East.

Daniel’s increasing partiality toward Judaism then seems to be contradictory with his previous aversion to narrowness and the novel’s reservation about insisting on only one culture. His chosen engagement with Jewishness is, however, depicted as a solution to the problem of attenuated “moral force” (349) of his society. The narrator defines “selectness of fellowship” as “the conditions of moral force” with “indignation against
wrong,” and Daniel’s fellowship with Jewishness charges with moral rhetoric Daniel’s simultaneous detachment from Englishness and engagement with Jewishness. This explains why Daniel before the discovery of his Jewish origin is depicted in danger of being paralyzed due to the lack of direction. Daniel’s partiality for particular fellowship with Jewish people functions as both enlargement from parochial Englishness and an example of critical appropriation of different cultures. Daniel’s newly found hybrid identity could be explained as part of “the aspiration to a distanced view . . . envisioned as complex and ongoing self-critical practices” that Amanda Anderson argues to be a Victorian cultural ideal. Anderson defines this ideal as “a dialectic between detachment and engagement, between a cultivated distance and a newly informed partiality,” and the dialectic is dramatized in the development of Daniel’s character after his discovery of Jewish origin in Daniel Deronda. While Daniel increasingly detaches himself from English culture, he develops a partiality toward Judaism after his acquaintance with Mordecai and Judaism. As the narrator notes, Daniel’s love of universal history makes him “want to be at home in foreign countries” (173). Another way to explain the significance of Daniel’s engagement with Judaism is to relate it to Victorian cultural identity. Since Jews are situated outside idealized Victorian identity and thus signify “absence of cultural value,” Daniel’s association himself with the social outcasts, Jews, make his cultural identity “attenuated” or more vulnerable in his society. Making the main character in her novel become one of the social outcasts or shadows, Eliot structures Daniel Deronda to have Daniel’s English identity modified through his encounter with Judaism. By engaging itself with contemporary discourses on cultural, racial and gender differences, Daniel Deronda depicts the process in which claimed English norms and
superiority are attenuated and modified through cross-cultural encounters.
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CHAPTER 4

“I HAD DISCOVERED MYSELF AS THE THIEF”: IMPERIALISM AND SENSATIONAL NATIONAL CHARACTER IN WILKIE COLLINS’S

*THE MOONSTONE*

Wilkie Collins’s *The Moonstone* (1868) represents the English nation’s relationship with another culturally different world, India. Although major parts of the novel are set in everyday English middle-class domestic life, the story also engages with world history. While the domestic plot revolves around the theft of the diamond of the novel’s title, the Moonstone, the novel’s Prologue and Epilogue situate the theft of the diamond in the history of English rule in India. Extracted from a family paper, the Prologue provides a historical scene of the English looting of the Moonstone. The Prologue describes the storming of Seringapatam in 1799, which strengthened the power of the East India Company. The Epilogue depicts the scene of restoring the stolen diamond to its sacred origin, the Indian god’s forehead. Although we do not get told much from the Indian Brahmins who intruded England to restore their god’s diamond, the Prologue and Epilogue locate the root of the theft of the Moonstone in an English colonial officer’s looting it at the storming of Seringapatam. The loss of the diamond
destabilizes individual characters in the domestic setting and provokes each character to suspect one another. The loss of individual character’s respectability in domesticity extends to an international dimension of the loss of English national respectability in *The Moonstone* in which we see apparently innocent English characters turn out to have stolen the diamond three times in the history of England’s relationship with India.

In an article titled “What Is “Sensational” about the “Sensation Novel”?,” Patrick Brantlinger notes that the sensation novel posed disturbing questions among Victorian readers partly due to its mixture of domestic realism with the Gothic elements of mystery and secrets. In addition to the mixture of the two different conventions, its “moral ambiguity” (5), Brantlinger notes, made the sensation novel to appear dangerous to contemporary Victorian readers, because the sensation novel challenges contemporary readers’ cherished values and domesticity through its depiction of sensational events such as adultery, bigamy, theft, or murder committed under false pretenses. The sensation novel exposes extreme evils of murderer and adulterers behind their fair appearances and false identities, and their evils are sensational enough to attack the falsity of Victorian respectability. One contemporary review quoted by Brantlinger complained of the contents of Wilkie Collins’s *No Name* that its actions and values “are not in accordance with our rules of respectability,” attributing the illegitimacy of the contents to foreign influence, in this case France.

The association between the foreign and disrespectability is found in *The Moonstone*. The novel depicts that how the steward of the Verinder estate, Gabriel Betteredge reveals his hysteric distrust of foreignness. Betteredge repeatedly describes foreignness in derogatory terms. When Franklin Blake returns from his study in foreign
countries, Betteredge finds “the varnish from foreign parts” (80) in Franklin who is, to Betteredge’s ears, talking “the foreign gibberish” (98). The household steward deplores that Franklin “had come back with so many different sides to his character, all more or less jarring with each other” (98) due to his foreign training. In contrast, the most solid English man by appearance, Godfrey Ablewhite, seems to Betteredge’s eyes to be a perfect English gentleman. Collins’s novel, however, critiques his dismissive attitude toward foreign culture. In particular, Betteredge’s view of the characters of Franklin and Godfrey turns out to be false in the novel. Betteredge’s blind suspicion of foreignness prevents him from discerning innocent characters from the most hypocritical character in the novel. The novel makes ironic Betteredge’s following sentence: “I [Betteredge] suspect some imprudence of Mr. Franklin’s on the Continent—with a woman or a debt at the bottom of it—had followed him to England” (113), because the novel clearly shows that it is Godfrey Ablewhite not Franklin Blake who reveals his sensuality and debt under the guise of a philanthropist.

While Betteredge enacts the conventional matching of disrespectability with foreignness, *The Moonstone* in this way reverses the moral identity of the English and Indian characters. This reversal must have been sensational enough to Victorian contemporary readers to reconsider their conventional understanding of English respectability. The sensationalism of Franklin Blake’s cry, “I had discovered Myself as the Thief”³ dramatically constitutes the synecdoche of the primary theme of *The Moonstone*, that is the sensation of the revelation of English national character as the thief. The novel reveals the apparently innocent English gentlemen such as Colonel Herncastle and Godfrey Ablewhite as thieves and the Indian “invaders” as sacrificing
heroes. While some critics like Brantlinger note that “the mystery of *The Moonstone*, . . . does not explicitly point beyond itself to larger issues,” the sensational event of the novel is closely related with larger issue of the history of English rule in India. While both thematic and structural elements of the sensation novel provoked doubts or sense of threat in Victorian readers, the same disturbing elements are significant in our reading of Collins’s *The Moonstone* in that the novel emphasizes the very sensation of English disrespectability in its discussion of national characters. *The Moonstone* deals with crime in domestic settings as other sensation novels do, but the crime in the novel is cross-cultural in its nature.

4.1 The Mutiny and Sensational National Character

If *The Moonstone* is situated in the history of English rule in India, the Mutiny of 1857 should be examined as one of the backgrounds of the novel. Although it is hard to find explicit references to the 1857 Rebellion in the novel and Collins sets his novel in 1848 and 1849, distanced from the Mutiny, critics like Jaya Mehta note that “The Mutiny, simultaneously absent and present, inhabits *The Moonstone* as a powerful yet invisible undertow, featureless like the quicksand in the novel, yet drawing all into it.” The storming of Seringapatam in 1799 that Collins substitutes in *The Moonstone* for the Mutiny in 1857 is significant in the historical context of English rule in India, because after the victory at Seringapatam England could secure control of all of southern India and lay the foundation of English rule throughout India. John Reed points out the significance of English victory at Seringapatam as follows:
An important English victory in what was the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War of 1798-99 distinguished the beginning of Arthur Wellesley’s rule as Governor-General, which was characterized by ruthless diplomacy extending what Wellesley referred to now as “the empire” of the East India Company. In fact, the victory at Seringapatam, as Collins knew, represented the establishment of England as the major power on the sub-continent, at the same time confirming expansion and exploitation as a company practice.7

Another thing that makes this event famous is that this victory was followed by English looting of storehouses of Tipoo, Sultan of Seringapatam who was killed at the storming in 1799. The narrator of the Prologue in The Moonstone who fought at the storming describes English looting in detail: “the soldiers found their way, by an unguarded door, into the treasury of the Palace, and loaded themselves with gold and jewels” (56). The narrator who identifies himself as Colonel John Herncastle’s cousin reports that he met the Colonel in the court outside the Sultan’s treasury “to enforce the laws of discipline on our own soldiers,” since there was “riot and confusion enough in the treasury” (56). As the narrator in the Prologue puts it, Colonel Herncastle turns out to be “very unfit . . . to perform the duty that had been entrusted to him” (56), because he himself stole the Moonstone that was placed then in the handle of a dagger by the Sultan. The Prologue vividly depicts the English colonel who violently kills the three Brahmin priests who guard the Moonstone: “I [Herncastle’s cousin] saw John Herncastle, with a torch in one hand, and a dagger dripping with blood in the other” (56). This image remarkably delivers the sense of self-contradiction of an English officer’s abuse of power in the name of bringing “light” to the “darkness” of the colonized people.8
This depiction of English looting in the Prologue locates it as the origin of violence involved in the relationship between England and India. The Prologue maps the East India Company in Indian History as the inheritor of the hegemony of the Muslim empire that conquered India in 1526. By aligning English imperial practices in India with the previous Muslim invasion of India, the Prologue suggests an image of English atrocities done toward the Indian in their retaliation for the Mutiny’s massacre of English people including women and children at Cawnpore in 1857. Collins’s substituting the storming of Seringapatam for the Mutiny as the historical context of *The Moonstone*, therefore, suggests Collins’s more sympathetic understanding of the Mutiny than his contemporary Victorians, because that substitution emphasizes English crimes toward the Indian rather than vice versa. While much Mutiny literature demonstrated the hegemonic conceptualization of innocent English versus the depraved Indian, Collins’s novel breaks with the conventions of Mutiny literature. Numerous Victorian essays, novels, and poems represented the Indian character as barbarous and irrational, reducing moral complexities involved in the event to binary oppositions between innocent English victims and evil Indian villains: “Most Victorian accounts insistently mystify the causes of the Mutiny, treating the motives of the rebels as wholly irrational, at once childish and diabolic. Politics turns into crime (mutiny, massacre) and is further trivialized by personification.” Patrick Brantlinger in *Rule of Darkness* notes on Victorian writing about the Mutiny:

Victorian writing about the Mutiny expresses in concentrated form the racist ideology that Edward Said calls Orientalism, the hegemonic discourse of imperialist domination which applies specifically to the Near and Far East. . . Victorian accounts of the Mutiny display extreme forms of extropunitive projection, the racist pattern of blaming the victim expressed in terms of an
absolute polarization of good and evil, innocence and guilt, justice and injustice, moral restraint and sexual depravity, civilization and barbarism. These categories are perceived as racially determined attributes in an imperialist allegory that calls for the total subjugation of India and at times for the wholesale extermination of Indians. . . . If a humanist text can be imagined which will break down national, social class, religious, racist, and sexist barriers to understanding, then nearly all nineteenth-century and many twentieth-century accounts of the Mutiny are versions of its antithesis.\textsuperscript{11}

As quoted above, the racist attitude toward the Indians became spread much more after the Mutiny in 1857, but, at the same time, the Mutiny shook the British Indian Empire to its foundations and Victorians had to reconsider their policy and goals of English rule in India. Initially, British audiences seemed to believe the horrible stories of Indian atrocities. For example, Dickens expressed extreme hatred against Indians probably in his response to these stories: “I should do my utmost to exterminate the Race upon whom the stain of the late cruelties rested . . . to blot it out of mankind and raze it off the face of the earth.”\textsuperscript{12}

Situating his story in \textit{The Moonstone} in the notorious English looting and plunder at the storming of Seringapatam, however, Collins suggests a counterargument to British responses to those stories about the Mutiny like Dickens’s response quoted above. When Dickens and Collins responded to the Mutiny by writing “The Perils of Certain English Prisoners” in \textit{Household Words} in late 1857, Collins’s part of the tale depicts Indians more sympathetically than Dickens’s part.\textsuperscript{13} Collins’s depiction of English looting at Seringapatam in \textit{The Moonstone} vividly shows John Herncastle’s dagger “dripping with blood” (56) that characterizes English imperial practice in India as “crime.” Collins’s different interpretation of the Indian Mutiny from those of Victorian other writing is worthy to note because it sheds light on Collins’s different position on
England’s relationship with India. The Moonstone’s Prologue particularly becomes an alternative depiction of the Mutiny by portraying the English authority committing a crime.

Considering the history of English reform policy in India is necessary for our understanding of the historical implication of the 1857 Mutiny and what The Moonstone suggests on the England-India relationship. English policies to “reform” India based on English model and value began with Lord William Bentinck’s arrival in Calcutta in 1828 as Governor-General. The Victorian attempt to transform India into a modern society upon a European model for almost thirty years can be defined as “the task of raising the moral and intellectual character” of India. The doctrines of liberalism and evangelicalism were central to Victorian reforming enthusiasm. Thomas Metcalf defines liberalism and evangelicalism as “movements of individualism which sought to free the individual from his age-old bondage to noble and priest. Both had a remarkable faith in the power of ideas and institutions to mould men’s character. . . . the two groups struck out together against the stagnation and backwardness they found in traditional India, and together prescribed the remedies which would rouse it from its torpor” (8). John Stuart Mill, succeeding his father’s concern with India, also found only solution for the “barbarous” Indian society in the liberal ideal of individuality and rationalism, through which India could be transformed into a more “civilized” country. The Indian reform movement asserted that the subversion of the Hindu religious system would effect real change in India because Victorian reformers found that Brahminism and caste were the main forces holding the Indian mind in backwardness.
Collins’s novel, however, shows that the Indian Brahmin priests are nobler heroes than English characters by juxtaposing the three Indian Brahmins and English “Christian” characters. While the novel depicts the Indian Brahmins devoting to their faith even to sacrificing their caste in order to restore their god’s diamond, the novel challenges the English Christian system by showing the hypocrisy of the supposedly altruistic Christian acts of Godfrey and Miss Clack. Given that the Indian reform is often characterized by the lack of knowledge of Indian society and colonial condemnations of Indian irrationality and fanaticism, the novel’s critique of not Indian but English religion is worthy to note.

As Gautam Chakravarty notes, it is “an exegetical task”\textsuperscript{18} to write a history of the rebellion because narratives of the 1857 event were altered by the different concerns of England and India. If England was concerned about its colonial policy and the nation’s image as an empire, India thought the event as the first war of independence. Proponents of the East India Company described the events as a mutiny and a military aberration. On civil participation in the events, they asserted that “we have to deal now with a revolt caused by a mutiny, not with a mutiny growing out of a national discontent.”\textsuperscript{19} T. R. Holmes’s passage shows well that they tried to define civil participation as individual crime rather than national discontent: “just as a general mutiny of the London police would be followed by a violent outburst of crime on the part of the London thieves and rough, so the talukdars, and the dispossessed landholders, the Gujars, and the budmashees of India welcomed the first signs of governmental weakness as a signal for gratifying their selfish interests.”\textsuperscript{20} On the contrary, Indian historians tend to interpret the events as part of India’s struggle for independence, by pointing out the fact that the 1857 insurgents
were accompanied by the civil population. They pointed out that the reform challenged traditional faith and customs, and those challenges were pointed out as part of the causes of the events. As Metcalf notes, some Victorians including Disraeli found the cause of the Mutiny in the reforms of the past thirty years and the evangelical zeal that accompanied them. Indian grievances against English attempts to reform Indian according to English models were well expressed in The Hindoo Patriot, which was one of English language papers owned and run by Indians. The Hindoo Patriot presented India as possessing its own culture, philosophy and religion in no way inferior to those of England, and it, therefore, had no need for English people who attempted to transform India based on their own model. The editors of the Hindoo Patriot once wrote that the Mutiny should teach the English “in their future intercourse with and legislation for the Natives . . . that they have a civilized people to deal with.” The Calcutta Review similarly noted that “nothing short of the electric shock of this mutiny would have aroused the people of England from their culpable and mischievous apathy on the affairs of India.”

Collins’s article “A Sermon for Sepoys” appeared in Household Words in 1858 and addressed the English Christian attempt to reform the Indians as the Hindoo Patriot had described it. Collins describes the movements: “While we are still fighting for the possession of India, benevolent men of various religious denominations are making their arrangements for taming the human tigers in that country by Christian means.” Making a contrast between English desire to possess India and the seemingly benevolent Englishmen occupied with the task of reforming the Indians, Collins suggests an opposition to what they are doing. Collins argues for using the Indians’ own Oriental
literature in addressing moral lessons to Indians rather than depending on “Christian means.” The Oriental moral fable that Collins uses in his “A Sermon for Sepoys” mentions such words as “gifts,” “sacrifice,” and “charity,” including the following statement: “all wisdom which extends no farther than yourself is unworthy of you. A life sacrificed to subtle speculations is a life wasted.” The discussion of meanings of charity and sacrifice here not only emphasizes that Indians have their own moral system but also foreshadows Collins’s same concern in The Moonstone about the meanings of sacrifice and charity.

The Moonstone’s cross-cultural comparison between Hindu and English religious values revolves around its discussion of the notions of giving. Sacrifice and charity come in the novel as two different ways of giving. If Christian value of charity is discussed through the novel’s depiction of two English characters, Godfrey Ablewhite and Miss Clack, the three Indian Brahmin priests embody a true meaning of sacrifice that the novel seeks to endorse. The Moonstone begins with a scene of giving, John Herncastle’s making over the diamond to his niece, Rachel Verinder. As the narrator in the Prologue writes, Colonel John Herncastle stole the Moonstone at the storming of Seringapatam in 1799. Influenced by a dying Indian’s words that “The Moonstone will have its vengeance yet on you and yours” (57), the narrator of the Prologue warns his family about the fatality that the diamond would bring: “I am not only persuaded of Herncastle’s guilt; I am even fanciful enough to believe that he will live to regret it, if he keeps the Diamond; and that others will live to regret taking it from him, if he gives the Diamond away” (58).

This family paper explains why the Colonel was ostracized by his family including Lady Verinder who is Rachel’s mother. After learning about this background,
Franklin, who is Rachel’s cousin, asks the following question which is the novel’s own concern as well: “In bringing the Moonstone to my aunt’s house, am I serving his [John Herncastle’s] vengeance blindfold, or am I vindicating him in the character of a penitent and Christian man?” (96-97). As this question shows, the Colonel gives the gift to his niece intended as an expression of his forgiveness but the novel’s narrative shows it as disguised vengeance. Given that forgiveness is a Christian value, Colonel Herncastle’s vengeance disguised as forgiveness demonstrates the hollowness of English religious values.

Miss Clack is another character who is connected with the novel’s concern with the theme of cross-cultural comparison of religious values. She is also one of the multiple narrators in The Moonstone and her narrative comes first among the second period’s eight narratives. Although the spinster Miss Clack’s hypocrisy of hiding her desire for Godfrey Ablewhite makes her narrative an unreliable, “meaningless “clacking”” as Tamar Heller puts it, her narrative is significant for us to understand the novel’s critique of the superficiality of religious fanaticism of English society. One contemporary reader noted in the Spectator that “Miss Clack is an absurd exaggeration of the bitter evangelical type, a woman who reveals her greed and spitefulness and love of power in broad splashes, not touches, in her own letters.”27 As Ilana Blumberg notes, Miss Clack’s story reveals “the impossibility of pure giving, or perhaps giving at all, for the Christian believer.”28 Slipping her evangelical tracts into the letter-box and between the sofa cushions, Miss Clack feels relieved of “a heavy responsibility towards others” (258). In order to save the tip when she “committed the prodigality of taking a cab” (280) rather than traveling by the omnibus, Miss Clack pays the cabman “exactly his fare” (280) and slips her
evangelical tract into the cab’s window in order to pay the difference of the tip. This
episode shows the hypocrisy and inconsistency of Miss Clack’s attempt to translate to
currency her evangelical tracts that she usually claims as “spiritual property” (289). Her
tract sometimes becomes “spiritual” property to hide her poverty, but Miss Clack
sometimes uses that “spiritual” tract as material property. Blumberg reads this scene thus:
“To the cabbie, the tip is not a gift freely given, but part of the contract; subsumed into
requirement, its absence is a form of robbery.” Miss Clack’s following statements
ironically betray the self-centeredness of her religious values:

Once self-supported by conscience, once embarked on a career of manifest
usefulness, the true Christian never yields. Neither public nor private influences
produce the slightest effect on us, when we have once got our mission. . . we go
on with our work, irrespective of every human consideration which moves the
world outside us. We are above reason; we are beyond ridicule; we see with
nobody’s eyes, we hear with nobody’s ears, we feel with nobody’s hears, but our
own. (293)

The hollowness of England’s religious values shown by Miss Clack’s self-centeredness
and fanaticism becomes more remarkable set against the Oriental fable in Collins’s “A
Sermon for Sepoys.” In the Oriental apologue, we are told of the wisdom of a sage,
Abbas. The sage retired from the world and his previous career of medical science in
order to pursue “a purely religious life,” suffering the hardship of poverty and severe
self-restraint. The sage saw in a vision that an eagle carried a morsel of goat’s flesh
before a crippled, exhausted fox. Interpreting the vision that the divine Power
acknowledged the sage’s sacrifice of withdrawing himself from the world and his Creator
would provide for his wants, the sage stopped searching the woods for food and just sat at
the entrance of his cavern. An angel appeared to reprove the sage:
The blindness of your vision and the vainglory of your heart have together perverted a lesson which was mercifully intended to teach you the duties that your Creator expects you to perform. . . . Rise, and let the example of the eagle guide you, henceforth, in the right direction. Go back to the city from which you have fled. Be, for the future, the messenger of health and life to those who groan on the hard bed of sickness. Ill-judging mortal! The virtue that dies in this solitude, lives in the world from which you have withdrawn. Prove your gratitude to your Creator by the good that you do among his helpless and afflicted creatures. (592)

While Miss Clack’s hypocrisy shows well self-deceit of her religious notion of giving by alleging her “spiritual” tracts as currency in order to save her money, the Oriental fable in “A Sermon for Sepoys” emphasizes that the service of one’s religious faith should be one’s “usefulness among [one’s] fellow-creatures” (593). This fable’s critique of English attempt to remake its colony in its own image to achieve a control also becomes a direct counterargument to the English policy of “Anglicization” that was explained by English people like Thomas Babington Macaulay. While Macaulay argues in his “Minute on Indian Education” for “the intrinsic superiority of . . . Western literature” and for producing “a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect,”32 this fable demonstrates that Oriental people can achieve moral reform by their own means.

Usefulness that the Oriental fable defines as providing for fellow-creatures’ wants is compared with the so-called “moral and material usefulness” (258) that English evangelicals like Miss Clack attribute to their work. Clack describes Godfrey Ablewhite as “a promoter of public charities” (260) and as “the Christian Hero” (260). Defining England as “a Christian country” (266), Miss Clack introduces Godfrey as “the true Christian” (267). The Moonstone, however, reveals that the alleged “Christian Hero”
Godfrey has become involved with a scandalous theft by his greed for money. It is later revealed that Godfrey needed the money to pay the debts incurred for a lady and a villa that he enjoyed in secret. Before Godfrey has the Moonstone cut into separate stones to “make a marketable commodity” (532), the diamond is restored and placed back into its original place of Indian god’s forehead by the three sacrificing Brahmin priests. The Moonstone attacks severely the English philanthropist’s value immersed in capitalistic system of imperial economy and the critique becomes more remarkable by being set against Indian Brahmin’s self-sacrificing devotion. Collins’s novel shows that the Moonstone becomes an object of possession in English culture that destabilizes English characters such as Colonel Herncastle and Godfrey Ablewhite, but the same diamond is considered as a sacred object for which the Brahmins sacrifice their caste in Indian society.

The Moonstone’s attack on Godfrey’s character becomes another critique of English national character in that the novel depicts Godfrey as a representative of English character by embodying Anglo-Saxon fairness. Gabriel Betteredge, the house steward, praises Godfrey in his comparison with Franklin: “Mr. Godfrey was, in point of size, the finer man by far of the two. He stood over six feet high; he had a beautiful red and white hair; a smooth round face, shaved as bare as your hand; and a head of lovely long flaxen hair, falling negligently over the poll of his neck” (110). To Betteredge, Godfrey is a more truly English man than Franklin whose foreign aspects Betteredge regrets: “these puzzling shifts and transformations in Mr. Franklin were due to the effect on him of his foreign training” (98). Looking at his appearance, Betteredge calls Godfrey “the most accomplished philanthropist that England ever produced,” “a public character,” and “the
sweetest-tempered person” (111).

Betteredge’s comparison of “pure” English Godfrey and Franklin’s “puzzling shifts and transformations” (98) due to his foreign training demonstrates his belief in the binarism of “superior” Englishness and “inferior” foreignness. We can find in Betteredge English way of seeing themselves and others, though comically represented here in his figure, that “Both nations and races are imagined as communities which bind fellow human beings and demarcate them from others. . . From the sixteenth century on, we can trace the connections between the formation of the English nation and the articulation of the superiorities of the Anglo-Saxon race,” as Ania Loomba puts it.33 In Betteredge’s eyes, Franklin who speaks “the foreign gibberish” (98) is “a perfect savage by comparison with him [Godfrey]” (119). In contrast, Godfrey, the “promoter of public charities” (260) is an eloquent speaker of English. The whole course of The Moonstone, however, reveals the doubled character of Godfrey as well as his double life. Sergeant Cuff’s narrative summarizes the two sides of Godfrey’s life:

The side turned up to the public view, presented the spectacle of a gentleman, possessed of considerable reputation as a speaker at charitable meetings, and endowed with administrative abilities, which he placed at the disposal of various Benevolent Societies, mostly of the female sort. The side kept hidden from the general notice, exhibited this same gentleman in the totally different character of a man of pleasure, with a villa in the suburbs which was not taken in his own name, and with a lady in the villa, who was not taken in his own name, either. (525)

The sergeant concludes that “the debts incurred for the lady and the villa” (526) have pushed Godfrey to pocket the diamond. Debt characterizes many of English characters in the novel, as Alexander Welsh notes that “every proven or supposed motive for stealing it [the Moonstone] put forward in the novel involves the payment of debts.”34 It is the idea
of debt that makes characters suspect one another of stealing the diamond. Rachel suspects Franklin after hearing about his debts and Sergeant Cuff suspects Rachel as the thief based on his own experience of twenty years of his domestic practice: “It is well within my experience, that young ladies of rank and position do occasionally have private debts which they dare not acknowledge to their nearest relatives and friends. Sometimes, the milliner and the jeweler are at the bottom of it. Sometimes, the money is wanted for purposes which I don’t suspect in this case, and which I won’t shock you by mentioning” (227). This idea of debt and the series of characters’ suspicion of one another remarkably damage the image of English respectability. The irony that many of the English characters suffer under the pressure of private debts betrays the illusion of Betteredge’s belief that he lives in “an age of progress” (88).

Critics like Ian Duncan associate prevailing debts in English society in the novel with its involvement in “a modern, global, imperial commercial economy,” and argue that this involvement causes a crisis in English national character in The Moonstone. If English economy of commercialism and capitalism was proclaimed as progressive by English colonizers, the crisis and debt that, the novel describes, English society suffers, undermine racial hierarchies based on economic distinctions. Collins in the novel persistently juxtaposes the two different worlds of imperial, commercial economy of England and virtues and sublimity of Hindu culture. Family scandals that most sensation novels deal with extend to national scandal of England’s plundering in India in Collins’s The Moonstone. The concerns for colonial governance caused by the Indian Mutiny of 1857 inflected the English way of seeing themselves as superior to their colony, India. It is significant that The Moonstone begins its story by emphasizing the
moral stain of Colonel Herncastle who brings the diamond into the family in Yorkshire by plundering it at the storming of Seringapatam. The Colonel’s theft and his giving it as a “gift” to Rachel bring forth the “attack of the detective-fever” (215) as Betteredge calls it. The detective-fever attacks every person of the household from Rachel herself to servants and everyone suspects one another. This attack launches a series of character analyses. The plot of *The Moonstone* therefore becomes a narrative form in which individual character is discussed and evaluated in the process of detecting the thief.

In other words, this detective-attack that the theft of the Moonstone provoked destabilizes characters’ assumed respectability. The sense of anarchy that the diamond brought to the household is well expressed the house steward: “here was our quiet English house suddenly invaded by a devilish Indian Diamond—bringing after it a conspiracy of living rogues, set loose on us by the vengeance of a dead man. . . . Who ever heard the like of it—in the nineteenth century, mind; in an age of progress, and in a country which rejoices in the blessings of the British constitution?” (88). It is not only the house but also the perspective like Betteredge’s that is “invaded” in the novel. That is, the novel destabilizes the English way of seeing England as a blessed country that claimed its mission of delivering the nation’s progress to colonies like India. *The Moonstone* reverses this kind of Victorian world order so that the dividing lines between respectable/disrespectable and the colonizer/the colonized are challenged.

Collins’s *The Moonstone* similarly challenges the Victorian reformist view of the Hindu religious system as barbarous and backward by depicting the savagery of the English class system. This challenge is suggested by the fact that English characters in the novel suspect that the little English boy with the three Indian Brahmins is “ill-used by
the foreigners” (70). It turns out, however, that the Indian Brahmins treat the boy better than English people do. Collins depicts the boy in his London life as “a hungry, ragged, and forsaken little boy, . . . sleeping in an empty basket in a market” (71). *The Moonstone* shows the “barbarity” of London and the poverty of lower-class people rather than that of Indian Brahminism and caste.

Alexander Welsh notes rightly that *The Moonstone* is not about the object of its title, but it is about “the experience of knowing.” If we can find “a process of comprehension” in Collins’s novel as Welsh notes, it is each individual’s character and national character of the two nations that we become comprehend more and more as the novel reveals the mystery of the loss and discovery of the diamond. The experience of knowing in *The Moonstone* entails “a sense of self-abasement” that Franklin Blake’s discovery of himself as the thief symbolically shows. His statement that “We often hear (almost invariably, however, from superficial observers) that guilt can look like innocence. I believe it to be infinitely the truer axiom of the two that innocence can look like guilt” (407) is proved by many characters in the novel. The three Indian priests and Rosanna Spearman are the cases where “innocence can look like guilt,” while Godfrey demonstrates that “guilt can look like innocence.” *The Moonstone* shows in this way that the master-myth that proclaims the hierarchical boundary between colonizer and colonized is challenged in the cross-cultural comparison.
4.2 The Sensation Novel, Scandal, and Victorian Identity

Whereas an English character Horatio in *The Wild Irish Girl* experiences a reshaping of the stereotypical image of Ireland after his actual encounter with Ireland, the main English characters in *The Moonstone* are not given chances of encountering India with exception of a few characters. The limitations of the cross-cultural encounter in this novel can be found in the fact that the Indians never get to speak directly to the reader. The Indians first appear in the novel’s first section narrated by Betteredge, who ironically quotes the chief Indian’s words about the miserable life of the poor in London. The Indians’ silence in the text could be interpreted to stress their outside status, but the novel gives them the chance to express the critique of the barbarity of London poverty, though quoted by Betteredge.

The Indians are also introduced through the mediation of Mr. Murthwaite, who is an English expert on India and can be said to be an Orientalist. While the typical Orientalist’s scholarly knowledge of Oriental cultures works together with “disguised ethnocentric race prejudice” and his “loyalties and sympathies” always lie with “the conquering West” as Said notes, Mr. Murthwaite’s knowledge of Indian culture increases our appreciation of the degree and intensity of the Indian Brahmins’ sacrifices. The representation of the Indians and their religion that Mr. Murthwaite produces does not focus on the characteristics that were attributed to the Oriental people such as being irrational, backward, and licentious. According to Mr. Murthwaite, the Indian Brahmins “have doubly sacrificed their caste—first, in crossing the sea; secondly, in disguising themselves as jugglers. In the land they live in, that is a tremendous sacrifice to make” (129). After speaking with the Brahmins, Mr. Murthwaite opposes Betteredge’s
evaluation of the Brahmins as “a set of murdering thieves” (130) by replying to him that “they [the Brahmins] were a wonderful people” (130-31). Although the Brahmins kill Godfrey later, Collins’s novel mitigates the Indians’ crime partly through the juxtaposition of the sacrifice involved in the Indians’ disguise and the greed of Godfrey disguised behind his “swarthy face” (519). In spite of the limited scenes of actual India and Indian people encountered by English people, *The Moonstone* suggests a positive cultural alterity of India just as the Irish national tales assert an alternative Ireland toward contemporary stereotype of the nation. Given that English nationalism relied upon cultural distinctions which demarcated the English from its Others and that imperialism as England’s civilization mission was a crucial part of “the cultural representation of England to the English,” the asserted positives of Indian religion suggest a critique of the process of constructing English identity as superior to its cultural others such as India. The novel’s critique of imperialism can be said to be what Fredric Jameson would call the “political unconscious” that finds its function in guiding the formal and thematic choices of Collins in *The Moonstone*.

The novel’s attack on English respectability is suggested by its sensation novel plotting through which Collins discusses sensational events committed under false pretenses of English characters such as Colonel Herncastle and Godfrey. Collins expands the domestic scandal of the sensation novel in *The Moonstone* so that the domestic space whose respectability is challenged is England itself. A stain on one’s clothing appears repeatedly in *The Moonstone* as a clue to crime that the person has committed in the past and it thus reveals the person’s true character. The sensational image of Godfrey Ablewhite who was found dead while committing a theft under a disguise of dark
complexion becomes more sensational after the novel’s depiction of characters such as Rosanna Spearman who was wrongly alleged not to be innocent.

Rosanna Spearman is the first character who is associated with a moral stain in *The Moonstone*. She was a thief and spent some of her time in the prison and the Reformatory before she was given a chance to “prove herself worthy of any Christian woman’s interest in her” (75), as Betteredge puts it. To Rosanna Spearman who worries that “My past life still comes back to me sometimes,” Betteredge says to relieve her from that worry that “your past life is all sponged out. Why can’t you forget it?” (78). Rosanna who once cleaned a spot on the lappet of his coat says that “The stain is taken off . . . But the place shows, Mr. Betteredge—the place shows!” (78). As Betteredge unwittingly interprets, a stain is associated with characters’ scandal in *The Moonstone*: “she [Rosanna] looked at me with a sort of respect for my happy old age and my good character, as things for ever out of her own reach” (78). Betteredge’s self-image as a happy old man of a good character that is enabled by the contrast with the second housemaid’s criminal past is a comic caricature of the sense of English respectability enabled by being set against the disrespectability of its cultural others.

Another scandalous character in the novel is Ezra Jennings who is Mr. Candy’s assistant. Ezra Jennings once describes himself to Franklin as follows: “The cloud of a horrible accusation has rested on me for years. I tell you the worst at once. I am a man whose life is a wreck, and whose character is gone” (446). As he himself says, Jennings is another character whose past has determined his future already and ruined the public estimation of his character. He explains that to Franklin: “At the outset of my career in this country, the vile slander to which I have referred struck me down at once and for
ever” (447). That vile slander could be connected with his racial hybridity, which is implied in his conversation with Franklin. Jennings replies to Franklin’s question of whether he has not always been in England: “No. I was born, and partly brought up, in one of our colonies. My father was an Englishman; but my mother—We are straying away from our subject, Mr. Blake” (439). From Jennings’ reluctance to mention his mother, Franklin infers that “He [Jennings] had suffered as few men suffer; and there was the mixture of some foreign race in his English blood” (439).

If Collins makes remarkable Rosanna’s being excluded from the boundary of English respectability by making her one shoulder bigger than the other one, Jennings’ appearance also makes his disrespectability remarkable as well: “His complexion was of a gipsy darkness; his fleshless cheeks had fallen into deep hollows, over which the bone projected like a pent-house. . . Add to this a quantity of thick closely-curling hair, which, by some freak of Nature, had lost its colour in the most startlingly partial and capricious manner” (390). His racial adulteration is reflected in the irregularity that his hair colors show: “The line between the two colours preserved no sort of regularity. At one place, the white hair ran up into the black; at another, the black hair ran down into the white” (390). As Ashish Roy notes, Ezra Jennings in Collins’s narrative becomes “a graphic figure for the separation and logical resolution, simultaneously, of alien and native, inside and outside, white and black.” Although Ezra Jennings deviates from the genuine English identity, it is Ezra Jennings who Collins portrays favorably: he is the most rational man in the novel who solves the mystery of the theft of the Moonstone which English specialists with legal expertise like Sergeant Cuff and the family lawyer Mr. Bruff fail to explain.
The physical unattractiveness of Rosanna Spearman and Ezra Jennings makes a remarkable contrast with the beauty of Godfrey Ablewhite, who is depicted as the most solidly English man. As in the cases of Rosanna Spearman and Ezra Jennings, Franklin Blake and Rachel Verinder’s incorporation of otherness was marked in their apparent resemblance of a race other than the Anglo-Saxon race. Betteredge once praised Godfrey’s beauty by comparing him with Franklin and describes Rachel’s hair and eyes: “Her hair was the blackest I ever saw. Her eyes matched her hair” (108). Godfrey Ablewhite is depicted as the most solid English man in his appearance and his last name symbolically suggests the privilege of being white. On Victorian cultural self-conceptions, Clare Simmons has noted that the Saxon ideal embodied in the person of Queen Victoria during her reign as “a bringer of peace and culture” was aligned with the nation’s imperialism. Given that Godfrey Ablewhite represents the Anglo-Saxon fairness in his appearance and that he could be combined with the Saxon ideal, the novel’s severe attack on his character becomes the critique of the nation’s imperialism as well.

The reversed relation between appearance and character in domestic plot parallels the similar twist in the novel’s account of the Indian characters in the novel’s international plot. Most of all, the diamond of the novel’s title becomes the site of converging and comparing the two different cultures of England and India with each other. Franklin’s intention of having various characters record what they know about “the story of the Moonstone” implies the diamond’s function as nexus between the two cultures. Franklin says that “In this matter of the Diamond, . . . the characters of innocent people have suffered under suspicion already—as you know. The memories of innocent people may suffer, hereafter, for want of a record of the facts to which those who come
after us can appeal. There can be no doubt that this strange family story of ours ought to be told” (60). After this statement, Franklin connects the old family paper that becomes the Prologue of *The Moonstone* with the rest of the novel, because, Franklin says, the family paper was written out of the writer’s personal experience and therefore has “the authority of an eye-witness” (60), and the rest of the novel is also told by multiple narrators from their own personal experience.

If this story about the diamond is intended to save innocent people from suspicion, *The Moonstone* shows that the Indian guards of the diamond come first on the list of the innocent people. The Indian Brahmin priests who sacrifice their caste in order to restore the Moonstone to their god demonstrate the sublime dimension of Indian religion. The same Moonstone in England is, however, an object of loot and considered as a commodity circulating through the diamond market of the capitalist world of England. The whole course of the novel’s narrative dramatically shows the contrary cultural position that the Moonstone is placed in the two different cultural worlds. The Moonstone generates a sense of uncertainty to English eyes that consider the jewel only according to market value: “The question of accurately valuing it [the Moonstone] presented some serious difficulties. Its size made it a phenomenon it the diamond-market; its colour placed it in a category by itself; and, to add to these elements of uncertainty, there was a defect, in the shape of a flaw, in the very heart of the stone” (92). English characters such as Colonel Herncastle and Godfrey Ablewhite try to have the diamond cut into several “perfect brilliants” so that the diamond would be worth more money than “the large—but imperfect—single stone” (94). The Moonstone, however, resists the commercial society’s valuation of it only as a marketable commodity. All the aspects of
the diamond’s appearance, size, color, and shape resist to its placement in the categories made by the commercial society, and that resistance is symbolized by the defect “in the very heart of the stone.” Characters such as Franklin, Rosanna, Rachel and Ezra resemble the diamond’s resistance to being placed in the categories made by the commercial society in that those characters’ appearance do not justice to who they are actually.

Collins includes the three Brahmins in the list of characters who show that identity constructed based on appearance is false and deceiving by making sublime the three Indian Brahmins’ sacrifice that prevented the intended disintegration of the diamond into marketable commodities from happening. Information on India and Indian culture told by the seemingly typical orientalist Mr. Murthwaite, however, contributes to the novel’s attack on English culture by helping our understanding of the nature and degree of the Brahmin’s sacrifice, rather than contributing to strengthening orientalist views on India. Explaining that “A Hindoo diamond is sometimes part of a Hindoo religion” (123), Mr. Murthwaite helps his English audience understand the meaning of the three Brahmins’ sacrifice who came to England to find the stolen diamond: “They have doubly sacrificed their caste—first, in crossing the sea; secondly, in disguising themselves as jugglers. In the land they live in, that is a tremendous sacrifice to make” (129).

In addition, Mr. Murthwaite’s letter to Mr. Bruff that comprises a part of the Epilogue of the novel provides us with the sublime scene of India. The Epilogue emphasizes not only the restoration of the Moonstone to its sacred origin but also the grandeur and sublimity of the Indian Brahmins’ sacrifice of their caste. If according to Edmund Burke’s definition sublimity refers to a power that is in excess of any kind of
boundary or categorization and it thus implies the impossibility of knowledge, the depiction of the shrine and the ceremony of the Indian god of the Moon strongly suggests quality of sublimity:

... we found the shrine hidden from our view by a curtain hung between two magnificent trees. Beneath the trees a flat projection of rock jutted out, and formed a species of natural platform. Looking back down the hill, the view presented the grandest spectacle of Nature and Man, in combination, that I [Mr. Murthwaite] have ever seen. The lower slopes of the eminence melted imperceptibly into a grassy plain, the place of the meeting of three rivers. On one side, the graceful winding of the waters stretched away, now visible, now hidden by trees, as far as the eye could see. On the other, the waveless ocean slept in the calm of the night. People this lovely scene with tens of thousands of human creatures, all dressed in white, stretching down the sides of the hill, overflowing into the plain, and fringing the nearer banks of the winding rivers. Light this halt of the pilgrims by the wild red flames of cressets and torches, streaming up at intervals from every part of the innumerable throng. Imagine the moonlight of the East, pouring in unclouded glory over all—and you will form some idea of the view that met me when I looked forth from the summit of the hill. (541)

This passage indicates that the Indian scene of the magnificent trees, the ocean, the enormous size of the pilgrims and the moonlight pouring “in unclouded glory” exceed Mr. Murthwaite’s capability of explaining to his English reader. The apparent Orientalist Mr. Murthwaite admires the Indian sublime rather than refiguring it in the mode of the picturesque, because, as Burke puts it, “we submit to what we admire, but we love what submits to us” (103). The Indian sublimity in this way reverses the hierarchy of colonial English-Indian relationship. Sara Suleri in The Rhetoric of English India notes that the notion of sublimity in Edmund Burke’s A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful “becomes the first terrain in which Burke can bury his intuitive understanding of the irrationality that lies at the heart of rationalism.” Mr.
Murthwaite concludes his report by emphasizing again the inadequacy of his cultural, historical tools to interpret the adventure of the Moonstone.

Mr. Murthwaite also depicts in his letter what he heard about the three Brahmin priests: “The god had commanded that their purification should be the purification by pilgrimage. On that night, the three men were to part. In three separate directions, they were to set forth as pilgrims to the shrines of India. Never more were they to look on each other’s faces. Never more were they to rest on their wanderings, from the day which witnessed their separation, to the day which witnessed their death” (541-42). The vastness of the Brahmins’ sacrifice and the pain that follows the sacrifice cause a great sense of sublimity as well. Given that the sublime is “a way of thinking about excess as the key to a new kind of subjectivity,” this sublimity of the priestly devotion demonstrates the sublime alterity of India that is a new kind of subjectivity to English eyes. The Indian alterity represented in the Epilogue becomes a frame through which the inside story of English domestic life is exposed to show that religion has lost its true devotion and only hypocrisy and self-centered fanaticism are left. The sublime alterity of India becomes, therefore, a frame for a critical view of English society. As Ezra Jennings records in his journal, *The Moonstone* critiques English national character that alleges its consolidation by subjugating and excluding its others: “I [Jennings] thought of Mrs. Merridew and her embroidery, and of Betteredge and his conscience. There is a wonderful sameness in the solid side of the English character—just as there is a wonderful sameness in the solid expression of the English face” (488). The ironical “wonderful sameness” of the English character is what makes Mrs. Merridew utter “a
faint little scream at the first sight of my [Jennings’] gipsy complexion and my piebald hair” (486).

If Mrs. Merridew represents in her person a kind of xenophobia, Betteredge represents a naïve imperial ideal as his “worship” of Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* shows. Ian Watt in *The Rise of the Novel* notes that Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* can be aligned with “the great myths of Western civilization.”\(^45\) Robinson Crusoe is the protagonist of “the characteristic desires of Western man” that makes Crusoe “an inspiration to economists and educators, and a symbol both for the displaced persons of urban capitalism . . . and for its more practical heroes, the empire builders.”\(^46\) Betteredge treats *Robinson Crusoe* as his alternative Bible, referring to it frequently when he needs guidance, but *The Moonstone* as a whole does not endorse the household steward’s imperial ideal. Many critics have noted the role that *Robinson Crusoe* plays in Collins’s novel. For example, Lillian Nayder argues that the ironies of Betteredge’s position as “a servant who speaks like a master” reveals his blindness to the connection between racial and social oppression.\(^47\) *The Moonstone*’s attack on the imperial ideology of *Robinson Crusoe* is found in the novel’s critique of Betteredge’s ironic worship of the ideology. Like Robinson Crusoe, Betteredge believes in “Economy” (63), but the novel critiques his principle of economy; Betteredge says that he married his wife because it is cheaper than keeping her as his maid. This shows an extreme, though comical, case of economic individualism that Betteredge’s worship of *Robinson Crusoe* already implies.\(^48\) The novel’s social critique of Betteredge’s devaluation of the family according to economic individualism becomes the critique of English social system driven by laissez-faire economics whose doctrine became the basis of individualism and utilitarian ethics.
Given that the doctrine of laissez-faire generated social problems of extensive poverty of the lower classes, one scene in The Moonstone strongly suggests social critique of the individualism-driven social, economic system of England. As shown early in the chapter, one little boy that the three Indians found in London does not want to be sent back to London where he was sleeping “in an empty basket in a market” (71). The barbarous aspects of English economic and class system are discussed in the characters such as Rosanna Spearman and her friend Limping Lucy as well. Rosanna’s friend Lucy expresses her abhorrence against class distinction: “the day is not far off when the poor will rise against the rich” (248). But Rosanna admits that her love for Franklin transgresses the boundary of class and cannot be acknowledged in her society. Rosanna therefore hides the secret of her desire in the Shivering Sand, which she describes as follows: “It looks as if it had hundreds of suffocating people under it—all struggling to get to the surface, and all sinking lower and lower in the dreadful deeps!” (79). “The broad brown face” (79) of the Shivering Sand recalls the brown faces of the three Indian Brahmins, and that connection suggests the lower class Rosanna and cultural Other, Indians, as English nation’s others. Although the resistance of lower-class women like Rosanna and Lucy could be connected with that of Indians expressed in the Mutiny, the novel’s two endings depict the two resistances in different manner. The fact that resistance of the lower classes against the upper classes in English domestic setting is suppressed in the domestic plot that ends with the marriage of Franklin and Rachel only emphasizes the positive otherness of the Indian plot that resists any happy ending that silences voices of resistance.
If there were not the Prologue’s situating the story in the history of English imperialism and the Epilogue’s predicting a cyclical repetition of the Indian resistance, *The Moonstone* could be a structurally balanced romance, as Collins puts romance as his novel’s subtitle. Before the Epilogue we are told that Franklin’s character is restored thanks to Ezra Jennings and he finally marries Rachel. Collins, however, depicts that the home regained from disturbance is not in the English domestic scene but in the distant and alien India in the Epilogue. The Epilogue announces a cyclical repetition of the Moonstone’s adventure that marks its resistance to the colonizing, rationalizing Western linear history: “So the years pass, and repeat each other; so the same events revolve in the cycles of time. What will be the next adventures of the Moonstone? Who can tell!” (542). India depicted in the Epilogue is not a cultural idea of English home represented in typical romance any more, but an alien home that is beyond English ways of seeing themselves and the other world. Collins depicts India in *The Moonstone* as “a powerful alien origin that constitutes the limit or end of English national historical identity.”

When Collins depicts India as a cultural origin of its own not as mere periphery sustaining the metropolitan center, we can find his anti-imperialistic view in his depiction of one character Betteredge as well. Collins rejects Betteredge’s interpretation of the novel’s event that “here was our quiet English house suddenly invaded by a devilish Indian Diamond—bringing after it a conspiracy of living rogues” (88). Since Betteredge believes that he lives “in an age of progress, and in a country which rejoices in the blessings of the British constitution” (88) that is superior to the devilish Indian country, he cannot understand the positive otherness of India that the novel endorses. Rather, *The Moonstone* shows the illegitimacy that the country of “constitution” committed in India.
Betteredge’s statement that “The man who doesn’t believe in Robinson Crusoe, after that, is a man with a screw loose in his understanding, or a man lost in the mist of his own self-conceit!” (132) ironically describes the very self-conceit of himself as the whole course of the narrative depicts him.

The Moonstone’s sensational plotting of characters’ scandals shows that the more solid English characters in their appearance turn out to be less virtuous characters. The fact that the characters’ apparent respectability hides their disrespectability is the very characteristic of the sensation novel’s plot which dramatizes extreme evils committed behind false identities. Collins in The Moonstone opens the novel with issue of the illegitimacy attributed to the Indian “invaders” who are involved with the theft of the Moonstone. The sensational plot of The Moonstone, however, shows that this illegitimacy originates from an event of English theft as Franklin’s following statements summarize: “I don’t believe there was a happier household in England than this. Look at the household now! Scattered, disunited—the very air of the place poisoned with mystery and suspicion! . . . The Moonstone has served the Colonel’s vengeance, . . . by means which the Colonel himself never dreamt of!” (244). The novel demonstrates that the chaos that shatters the seemingly happiest domesticity in England originates from an English imperial officer’s crime committed in India. The scattered country house as a synecdoche for England demonstrates a crisis of national dimensions caused by England’s imperial involvement. As I have pointed out earlier, the disintegrating agent, the Indian diamond, baffles the law and the police of the English society. Sergeant Cuff and Mr. Bruff, the most intelligent figures and therefore guardians of the society mislead the characters, failing to account for the crime. The Moonstone in this way exposes the
false assumptions and values underlying the English society to undermine them. While the Moonstone could be associated with the Koh-i-Noor diamond presented to Queen Victoria in 1850 as “the jewel in the crown” and therefore could mean England’s gain of India, Collins represents the seeming gain as both England’s theft and thus England’s loss of national respectability.

3 Wilkie Collins, The Moonstone, 377. All subsequent references will be to this edition, and are cited by page in the text.
5 I call the 1857 event the Mutiny to quote other critics, but I point out here that Indian critics tend to call it the Sepoy Rebellion in order to emphasize the nationalist element of the event.
6 Quoted in Christopher GoGwilt, The Fiction of Geopolitics, 67.
8 Christopher GoGwilt notes that “Honourable John” alludes to the slang name for the East India Company. The Fiction of Geopolitics: Afterimages of Culture from Wilkie Collins to Alfred Hitchcock, 83.
10 Ibid, 222.
13 Farmer, 25.
16 Ibid, 3.
17 Ibid, 10. We can find the first expression of the liberal attitude to India in James Mill’s The History of British India published in 1818. Although he had never been to India, Mill particularly critiqued the despotism of the Brahmin and princely classes. Metcalf notes that John Stuart Mill’s divergence from his father can be found in his emphasis on education not on law as his father did. Metcalf comments that this difference demonstrates their different views on man; while James Mill saw man “as an inherently selfish being, capable of being acted upon only by the external sanctions of law,” John Stuart Mill believed that man could be educated to cultivate moral character.
18 The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination, 22.
19 Charles Raikes, Notes on the Revolt in the North-Western Provinces of India (London, 1858), 156. Quoted in Chakravarty, 23.
21 Ibid, 54-91. Metcalf notes that “The suppression of sati, the promotion of Western education, the introduction of telegraphs and railways, the sanction afforded widow remarriage and Christian mission activity—all profoundly alarmed the orthodox, for they seemed calculated to destroy the traditional Indian social system, and particular to undermine the position of the professional religious classes” (61).
22 The Hindoo Patriot, 22 April 1858, 124. Quoted in Metcalf, 84.

132

24 Household Words: A Weekly Journal, no. 414, Saturday, February 27, 1858, 244. Quoted in The Moonstone, Ed. Steve Farmer, 587 (Appendix D).


26 Heller, Dead Secret: Wilkie Collins and the Female Gothic (1992), 154.


29 The London omnibus was “cramped, dirty, crowded—seating upwards of twenty-five people—but inexpensive.” See note 1 on p. 280 in Farmer.


33 Colonialism/Postcolonialism. (1998), 118.


36 Strong Representations, 201.


39 Fredric Jameson defines literature as “a socially symbolic act” in which we can always find the fundamental history of struggle between oppressor and oppressed. Jameson argues that the doctrine of the political unconscious is necessary in the analysis of literature because the unconscious framework guides the formal and thematic choices of the writer. The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. (1981).


41 Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature. (1990), 192

42 Edmund Burke notes that “power is undoubtedly a capital source of the sublime” and “sublime objects are vast in their dimensions.” A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful. Ed. Adam Phillips. (1990), p. 65 and p. 113.

43 The Rhetoric of English India (1992), 36.

44 Ibid, ix.


46 Ibid, p. 95 and pp. 96-97.


48 Ian Watt describes economic individualism that Robinson Crusoe embodies: “The hypostasis of the economic motive logically entails a devaluation of other modes of thought, feeling, and action: the various forms of traditional group relationship, the family, the guild, the village, the sense of nationality—all are weakened.” The Rise of the Novel, 70.

CHAPTER 5

“THIS VAMPIRE WHICH IS AMONGST US”: THE NATION, RACE, AND THE GOTHIC IN BRAM STOKER’S *DRACULA*

Jonathan Harker’s journal entry that begins *Dracula* includes an episode revealing one of the novel’s main themes, namely, the ambivalent relationship between self and other. At Dracula’s castle, Harker describes the mysterious moment of his encounter with the Count.

Suddenly I felt a hand on my shoulder, and heard the Count’s voice saying to me, “Good-morning.” I started, for it amazed me that I had not seen him, since the reflection of the glass covered the whole room behind me. In starting I had cut myself slightly, but did not notice it at the moment. Having answered the Count’s salutation, I turned to the glass again to see how I had been mistaken. This time there could be no error, for the man was close to me, and I could see him over my shoulder. But there was no reflection of him in the mirror! The whole room behind me was displayed; but there was no sign of a man in it, except myself.1

The reflection of Dracula that Harker expected to find in the mirror is not there, and he finds only that of himself. After this encounter with Dracula, Harker wonders whether he is “either being deceived, like a baby, by my own fears, or else I am in desperate straits” (28). The narrative of *Dracula* at other places suggests that Harker’s fear is self-generated.
Harker repeats throughout the first chapter that he “had all sorts of queer dreams” (2) and his experience of visiting Dracula’s Castle was “like a sort of awful nightmare” (13). Along with the fact that Harker found his own reflection in the mirror when he expected to see Dracula, his picturing of Dracula’s place as having impelling force (“whirlpool”) but as “imaginative” (2) as well suggests that his fear is self-generated in the “imaginative” place. The nature of Harker’s anxiety can be inferred from those quotes that suggest an interpretation of Dracula as a projection of his anxious self.²

The inconsistency between Harker’s knowledge about and attitude toward the place emphasizes that his fear is generated from his own prejudice against the place. Before Harker left London for his meeting with Dracula in order to explain the count’s purchase of a London estate, he did some research at the British Museum in London and learned that the Castle of Dracula is geographically in “the extreme east” (2) of Transylvania, on the borders of three states, which comprise “one of the wildest and least known portions of Europe” (2). The last thing that Harker has learned about this country is that “every known superstition in the world is gathered into” (2) this place, which forces Harker to picture the place as “the centre of some sort of imaginative whirlpool” (2). In spite of his knowledge of the place after the research, Harker just labels the place as “one of the wildest and least known” (2) places. To Harker, this place is where trains are never punctual and people are superstitious. Harker records his sense of frustration: “I had to sit in the carriage for more than an hour before we began to move. It seems to me that the further east you go the more unpunctual are the trains. What ought they to be in China?” (2). Imagining that he could find unpunctuality in proportion to being eastern, he dramatically reveals his Orientalism through which “European culture gained in strength
and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self,” as Said has defined it.³ Harker’s anxiety is over another culture that is conceived as not only unknown but also barbarous and idolatrous. He later identifies himself as an Englishman against those different, barbarous people. Describing one of the peoples that he meets in the new place, Harker describes the Slovaks as “more barbarian than the rest” (3) and regards their custom related to St. George’s Day as “idolatrous” (5).

Harker’s initial orientalizing of the place is, however, soon complicated through conflating the opposites of “us” and “them.” While he enjoys exotic cuisine and scenery that was “full of beauty of every kind” (2), Harker one time describes the “robber steak” to be “in the simple style of the London cat’s meat!” (6). Harker’s inconsistent estimate of the different aspects of another culture shows well that he imagines different culture simultaneously attractive and just subordinate. He first describes his client as detestable, lesser by depicting his appearance such as aquiline nose, massive eyebrows, sharp white teeth, and “extraordinary pallor” (6). In addition, the Count has very rank breath which generates “a horrible feeling of nausea” (7) in Harker. In spite of all his repulsive aspects, however, both Dracula and his castle have other elements congenial to the English at the same time. First, in a library of the castle, Harker finds “a vast number of English books” (20), including English magazines and newspapers and various kinds of books of “history, geography, politics, political economy, botany, geology, law—all relating to England and English life and customs and manners” (20). Seeing the Law List, Harker as a solicitor finds himself “gladdened” (20) even at the strange place. Dracula himself who speaks English excellently calls Harker “my friend” (21) as well. Most of all, Harker strangely feels a kind of comradeship between himself and Dracula. As he admits, he feels that “of
all the foul things that lurk in this hateful place the Count is the least dreadful to me; that
to him alone I can look for safety” (37).

That said, it becomes more significant that Harker finds his own reflection in the
mirror when he expects that of Dracula. Situating Stoker’s *Dracula* in the late Victorian
historical context of the Irish question and discourses of racial degeneration and
imperialism, I examine the racial and cultural identity politics in *Dracula* that is
complicated by Stoker’s own subject-position as an Irishman and the novel’s expansion
of the Gothic genre. *Dracula* not only blurs the common binary opposition between the
modern, scientific world of Britain and superstitious and evil force loosed by Dracula, but
Stoker’s narrative method that exploits Gothic conventions also confuses what vampirism
means and whose vampirism the novel attacks.

5.1 The Gothic and Irish Vampirism

The concepts of vampirism in *Dracula* have been discussed in various
approaches to the contexts of the late Victorian era. There has been a trend of reading
vampirism in *Dracula* as embodying subversive sexuality. Jonathan Harker’s encounter
with the three young women at the Dracula castle is erotic enough to read the novel in
this vein. Harker describes their “voluptuous lips” and how they made him feel in his
heart “a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips” (39). He
emphasizes in his journal that the described desire in him is true although he is afraid that
this journal entry about his desire could cause pain in his English fiancée, Mina. I read
this scene, however, as a part of Harker’s experience of a totally different culture and
place. The scene of the three vampire women only takes a few paragraphs in the first four chapters in which Harker spends most of the space in emphasizing unintelligible people and customs of the new place. Harker concludes the scene by depicting the three vampire women happily disappearing with a “dreadful bag” of “a half-smothered child” (40), and it emphasizes the barbarous and detestable nature of Dracula, his place and people.

Vampirism in *Dracula* is certainly aligned with other cultures that are not English. Chapter 16 depicts Lucy’s vampirism in terms of other cultures:

> The beautiful colour became livid, the eyes seemed to throw out sparks of hell-fire, the brows were wrinkled as though the folds of the flesh were the coils of Medusa’s snakes, and the lovely, blood-stained mouth grew to an open square, as in the passion masks of the Greeks and Japanese. (223)

Referring to masks used in plays, this passage shows that Victorian respectability could not admit Lucy who became a vampire and her passion and thus attributed its ugliness to foreign cultures. The binary opposition between beautiful/ugly, heaven/hell is deployed here to make the contrast between English Lucy and Vampire Lucy. Vampiric qualities that pollute the English woman Lucy are expressed through other cultures like the Greeks and Japanese. Therefore, departing from the trend of focusing on sexuality in *Dracula*, I focus on how the novel’s representation of cultural differences is interconnected with the issues of forming and questioning English identity. I particularly analyze how Stoker’s novel in its discussion of English encounter with other cultures engages with its larger cultural contexts, especially the Irish Question of how to resolve the problems of Ireland in its relationship with England in the late nineteenth-century.

In *A Geography of Victorian Gothic Fiction*, Robert Mighall notes that “From the start, the idea of the Gothic carries a (pseudo-)historical inflection, and testifies to one
culture’s views about its perceived cultural antithesis,5 and that the most famous Gothic novels in the later half of the eighteenth-century are set in Catholic countries from which their Gothic features come.6 The association of Gothic with Catholicism becomes confirmed by Linda Colley’s well-known argument that, from the eighteenth-century until the mid-nineteenth-century, Britons formed their collective identity against France, “the world’s foremost Catholic power,” through the repeated war with the nation, particularly during and immediately after the French Revolution.7 These previous studies, though on different subjects, help explain the ways in which the Gothic genre, cultural difference represented in the story of cross-cultural encounter, and the formation of English cultural identity intersect with one another in *Dracula*.

France, however, was not the Catholic antithesis to Protestant England in Stoker’s day. Rather, it was the Irish nation that was associated with Catholicism. By 1890s, the Protestant Ascendancy, that is, the political and economic domination of Ireland by Protestant landlords and Church of Ireland clergy, was gradually challenged by various historical events. The Irish Church Act of 1869 disestablished the Church of Ireland, whose clergy had been a part of the Protestant Ascendancy. The First and Second Irish Land Acts in 1870 and 1881 began to protect native Irish tenants by reducing the rights of Protestant, Anglo-Irish landlords. In addition to these events, the British Liberal Party leader Gladstone’s conversion to the cause of the Irish Home Rule increased the sense among the English that the Union between Britain and Ireland was under serious threat.

Given the political and historical context of *Dracula*, the possible depiction of the relationship between England and Ireland in the novel has become a concern of more
than one critic. For example, Stephen Arata discusses Dracula’s English-Irish politics, particularly contextualizing the novel in the late-nineteenth century debate over Home Rule. Arata notes that “not just, Dracula is to England as Ireland is to England, but, Dracula is to England as England is to Ireland.” Since he does not pay close attention to the novel’s complex discussion of English-Irish relationship, Arata concludes by arguing that Stoker only reenacts “the larger cultural pattern of English domination and Irish subservience” (120). Arata has coined the well-known phrase “reverse colonization” with which he argues that Dracula is an “occidental tourist” and inverses British colonial conquest to invade London, the metropolis of its imperialism. Arata’s argument that vampirism in Dracula reflects English culture’s own imperial practice mirrored back, however, does not consider the novel’s obvious ambivalent attitude toward the Count and his fighters and concludes that “troubling energy” (132) embodied in Dracula is drained in the Gothic form. Arata argues that the Gothic form of the novel makes the vampire story as a fantasy and thus only as an “untrue” story (132).

Dracula’s main theme of vampirism, however, goes beyond being just a fantastic and untrue story. Explored in its cultural, political context of the relationship between England and Ireland in late nineteenth-century, Dracula’s vampirism invites race issues into the geopolitical landscape that the novel depicts. David Glover’s Vampires, Mummies, and Liberals focuses on a race-related issue discussed in Dracula that Glover identifies as “the politics of racial decline and healthy breeding.” Focusing on Dracula’s engagement with various discourses of Stoker’s period such as “physiognomy, degeneration theory, mental physiology, and criminal anthropology” (19), Glover argues that the haunting image of “bad” blood embodied in Dracula is always linked with “an
anxiety about the lineaments of national identity, about the health and vigor of a race” (41). Discussing “the national-racial context” (44) of Stoker’s writing of Dracula, Glover notes that the emergent criminal anthropology of the 1890s functioned as “a disciplinary tool of national consolidation, in which the study of crime provided for the diagnosis and the cure of a nation’s moral sickness” (44). This new science, according to Glover, attempted to draw a boundary between “the eligible body of authentic citizens” and “its pathological Others” and “constituted at once a political geography, a conjectural history of civilization, an evolutionary account of organisms and races” (44).12

The fact that Dracula engages with issue of the new science’s mapping criminality onto the nation’s “pathological Others” becomes obvious by the characters’ reference to Cesare Lombroso, the contemporary Italian scholar and founder of criminal anthropology, and his follower Max Nordau. Lombroso’s theories were published under the title L’Uomo delinquente in 1876, which was translated into English as Criminal Man in 1891. Lombroso defines the criminal as “an atavistic being who reproduces in his person the ferocious instincts of primitive humanity and the inferior animals.” After his prison visits and observation of the physiognomy of criminals, Lombroso established the correlation between physical characteristics and deviations and abnormalities of the criminal type. Lombroso’s scientific positivism became popular by making visible the social threat posed by the criminal and it helped draw the boundary between “healthy, moral” citizens and the criminal. Lombroso himself explains the two fundamental ideas of his theory: first, his studies claim “as an essential point the study not of crime in the abstract, but of the criminal himself, in order adequately to deal with the evil effects of his wrongdoing”; second, his studies classify “the congenital criminal as an anomaly,
partly pathological and partly atavistic, a revival of the primitive savage.” Chapter 1 in *Criminal Man* describes in detail physical characteristics of the criminal man such as sizes of skull, shapes of ear, nose, mouth, teeth, limbs, and even feet. The criminal man’s nose is, according to Lombroso, “aquiline” (15), and “the eyebrows are bushy and tend to meet across the nose” (18). Lombroso’s depiction of the criminal man in many parts resonates with the count’s characteristics in *Dracula*. Lombroso in *Criminal Man* depicts the criminal type as follows: “love of orgies, and the irresistible craving for evil for its own sake, the desire not only to extinguish life in the victim, but to mutilate the corpse, tear its flesh, and drink its blood” (xxv).

Mina Harker explicitly mentions Lombroso and Nordau in the novel as well: “The Count is a criminal and of criminal type. Nordau and Lombroso would so classify him, and qua criminal he is of imperfectly formed mind” (361). Van Helsing makes comments on the connection between criminality and positivism by using Lombroso’s terms as well: “There is this peculiarity in criminals. It is so constant, in all countries and at all times, that even police, who know not much from philosophy, come to know it empirically, that it is. That is to be empiric. The criminal always work at one crime—that is the true criminal who seems predestinate to crime, and who will of none other” (360). Jonathan Harker already in the beginning of the novel describes the Count thus: “His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion” (18). Here Harker also uses Lombroso’s terms such as “bushy” eyebrows that “meet over the nose,” and this description must have impressed contemporary readers to interpret Dracula to be of the criminal type. The Count is, therefore, strongly suggested to be of the criminal type according to Lombroso’s
contemporary theory of criminology.

Dracula, however, depicts not only Dracula but also some other characters, especially Van Helsing, as having the same “criminal” eyebrows: “Van Helsing’s face grew set as marble, and his eyebrows converged till they almost touched over his nose” (127). Given that the Dracula hunters including Van Helsing and Mina know and refer to Lombroso’s ideas on identifying criminality by visible markers, they show inconsistency of applying the knowledge. Dracula’s “criminal” eyebrows help them define the Count as a “criminal type” (361), but Van Helsing’s same eyebrows do not function in the same way. Rather, Van Helsing’s bushy eyebrows are interpreted as expressing his stern will to restore Lucy from vampirism: “Van Helsing rose up and said with all his sternness, his iron jaw set and his bushy eyebrows meeting” (138). By depicting Dracula’s fighters resemble their enemy in their appearance, Dracula narrative suggests that the visible markers of degeneracy inhabit the “civilized” characters as well. This is one of the ways in which the peculiar narrative of Dracula critiques English racial attitudes toward its “criminal” others, because the depicted physical resemblance between Dracula and his fighters questions the degeneration theory’s primary racial assumption that the criminal was another, lesser race reverted to a distant, primitive species.

Just as Jonathan Harker’s mirror scene in the beginning of the novel shows dramatically, Dracula’s narrative represents the vampire not always as his fighters’enemy but sometimes as their ally. This peculiar narrative method of Dracula leads us to see the novel’s engagement with issues of the relationship between England and Ireland in late nineteenth century. The English nation’s pathological others that Dracula’s vampirism embodies can be said to be Irish people on the following grounds.
First, Victorians regarded the Irish people as a different race from themselves and they frequently depicted Irish people in images of apes or monsters. L. Perry Curtis Jr. notes that “Most respectable Victorians believed in a natural opposition between an Anglo-Saxon “Us” and a Gaelic or Celtic “Them,” which was reinforced by the great religious divide between Protestantism and (Roman) Catholicism.”19 English images of the Irish people as dangerous monsters or criminals can be explained by the sense of threat that Victorians felt over Irish movements to free their country from English rule such as Home Rule for Ireland and Irish National League. As Curtis Jr. notes, Irishmen became so simian suddenly in the 1860s and after, even though Irishmen had been plotting rebellions for centuries under the rule of English oppression.20 Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871) might affect English people’s understanding of the Irish in two different ways. First, since Darwin in *Origins of Species* argues that favored races or species that are more suited to the environment are more likely to survive, English people considered themselves stronger or fitter race than the Irish people. Second, Irishmen depicted in simian-like images might be attributed to Darwin’s idea in *The Descent of Man* that “man is descended from a hairy quadruped.”21 Darwin’s idea that all animals and plants are descended from one species and that species are mutable ironically blurred the boundaries between “civilized” and “uncivilized” peoples and led to cultural anxieties about degeneration. The birth of the image of Irishmen as the ape-man in Victorian minds during this period can, therefore, be attributed to the ambivalent anxieties over degeneration provoked by Darwin’s ideas. The Irish people were categorized by English people as dangerous criminals who showed the decline to a primitive species but, at the same time, the English and the Irish are
descended from one species according to Darwin’s theory.

Although two Home Rule bills were rejected in 1886 and in 1893, the Irish determination to free their country from the rule of London provoked the image of Irish people in English mind as rebellious and ferocious. The Phoenix Park murders of Lord Cavendish and Thomas Burke, the British secretaries of Ireland, by an Irish nationalist in 1882 shocked Victorian society much more, and after which English depictions of Irish nationalist liberators as vampire bats or monsters appeared frequently.22 *Punch* published on May 20, 1882 a cartoon of Charles Stewart Parnell as Frankenstein (see figure 1.1). This cartoon’s association of the Irish nationalist leader with Frankenstein conveys the political message that English people conceived Irish people as savage monsters created by their leader, a fierce critic of English empire rule in Ireland. The cartoon vividly depicts the Irish monster as a simianized one with a blood-dripping knife in one hand and a pistol in the other hand. On October 24, 1885, *Punch* published a cartoon titled “The Irish Vampire” in which we see a vampire bat with the phrase “National League” inscribed on his wings (see figure 1.2). With the face of Parnell, the bat is hovering over an unconscious woman who symbolizes Ireland with a traditional Irish harp next to her. This cartoon again colors Irish nationalist movement like Nation League as vampirism that taints Ireland. While Victorians conceived Irish nationalist movements as malicious threat as these cartoons show, Victorian political cartoons often featured very comical Irish stereotypes as well. This coexistence of comic and grotesque images in Irish stereotypes in Victorian cartoons demonstrates that “Physiognomy is as inseparable from caricature as the stereotype is indispensable to any form of prejudice” as Curtis Jr. puts it.23 The coexistence also shows Victorian sympathy for “genuine Irish sentiment and
Figure 1.1 "The Irish Frankenstein," *Punch*, May 20, 1882
Figure 1.2 "The Irish Vampire," *Punch*, October 24, 1885
suffering”\textsuperscript{24} and therefore reveals the ambivalent attitude of Victorians toward its other, the Irish nation.

In addition to the political tension between England and Ireland due to the latter’s movement to free its nation from English rule, we can find another dimension of the intersection between Transylvania in \textit{Dracula} and Ireland. Transylvania literally means “beyond the forest” and it suggests “beyond the Pale,” which historically refers to the parts of Ireland that remained outside of the English rule since the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{25} Reflecting Victorian image of Ireland, \textit{Dracula} describes Transylvania, the Gothic place of Dracula as a different place from England in terms of religion and customs. Among those sources, Jonathan Harker’s journal entries show well that Dracula and his place and people are conceived as a threat or danger because they are different from the English code.\textsuperscript{26} Harker defines himself as “an English Churchman” (5) against local religious customs aligned with Catholic rituals such as wearing a crucifix and calls “ghostly traditions” (5) their different religious customs. Moreover, the Dracula hunters frequently identify their cause as God’s will and compare themselves as “the old knights of the Cross” (338). The depicted enmity between Protestantism and Catholicism in the minds of Dracula fighters suggests again that the novel implies the relations between England and Ireland in its discussion of the relationship between Dracula and his fighters. The simultaneous sameness and difference that \textit{Dracula} narrative represents in its depiction of the relationship between the vampire and his fighters can be explained by the novel’s particular narrative method that reworks its cultural, political contexts. The peculiar narrative structure of \textit{Dracula} must be examined in its use of Gothic conventions.
5.2. The Gothic and Its Strategy of Ambivalence

*Dracula* in its opening makes prominent several features of the Gothic by depicting Jonathan Harker imprisoned in the large and old castle of Dracula in a foreign country. Harker characterizes Dracula Among the structural devices of the Gothic such as repetition, multiple narrators, and thematic obsessions with the supernatural, the unspeakable, and dreamlike states, Without examining the Gothic conventions that suggest complicated and reversed cultural, racial identity in *Dracula*, we cannot appreciate fully the disturbed binary logic of West and East, good and evil, self and other, which shapes the primary structure of the novel. The interconnection between literary Gothic conventions and ideas of other cultures and people in *Dracula* demonstrates that this particular literary genre became one of the cultural and political sites through which racial and cultural difference was discussed in late Victorian era. If the literary Gothic is known as a form that often celebrates the irrational and the socially and culturally deprived, it is due to one of the Gothic characteristics that conflates the opposites of the rational/the irrational and self/other and thus blurs the boundaries between the opposites through its doubling. Gothic’s major strategy of doubles is particularly linked with the genre’s ambivalence as to the issues of identity and difference. While the seeming difference between self and other asserts an often unchanging and hierarchical order between them, it reveals at the same time the anxiety over the self’s sameness with the other as well.

Stoker furthers the novel’s concerns of the relationship between self and its otherness in his characterization of Dracula. In addition to the fact that the Count is from the East, he is also from a long feudal past. Harker finds that the curtains and upholstery
of furniture in Dracula’s Castle are centuries old. The count himself tells Harker about his old family: “I myself am of an old family, and to live in a new house would kill me” (24). This is why the Count is so glad to hear that Harker purchased an old house in London for the Count. Another thing that Stoker makes more gothic Dracula’s new house in London is that only “a private lunatic asylum” (24) is close to the house. This closeness between the lunatic asylum and Dracula’s purchased house later enables Renfield who is imprisoned at the asylum to open the door so that Dracula may access Mina.

The various forms of estrangement from “healthy” Englishness are represented in an ancient foreigner, Dracula, and the insane, Renfield. The symbolical proximity between feudal past, foreignness, and insanity here becomes the site in which an anxiety over degeneration is represented in the novel. If the hierarchical order between “civilized” and “primitive” people is the primary base on which imperial hegemonic conceptualization of other cultures depended, this hegemony disguised cultural anxiety over a decline from a higher, civilized to a lower level of being. The anxiety over degeneration was linked with contemporary discussion of criminology that defined the criminal as “a slave eternally chained to his instincts.” Degenerative accounts in criminology are the sites where it was defined who the normal and thus moral are and who the pathological are according to the visible markers of degeneracy. This “scientific” positivism of degeneration theory could explain why Jonathan Harker and other vampire fighters in Dracula regard other people of different cultures as barbarous or demonic based on readable signs such as their clothes, custom, and physiognomy. The cultural anxiety over degeneration also sheds light on why the nineteenth-century Gothic fiction tended to become connected with “the primitive, the barbaric, the tabooed” and
represented “excess and exaggeration, the product of the wild and the uncivilized.”

Therefore, racial discourse in Gothic literature is deeply linked with cultural fear of
degeneration of the supposedly healthy and moral self by the demonic forces of primitive
beings. Dracula himself embodies the demonic, pathological forces that English hunters
are threatened by. Along with this, Dracula is depicted in images of animals of lower
level such as a lizard, an eagle, and a dog. The Count is also associated with “old
centuries” (37), which resonates with Lombroso’s idea of the criminal to be “eternally”
bound with his base instincts.

The formal complexity of Dracula, however, makes more ambivalent the
seemingly obvious racist accounts of other culture of Dracula’s place as I discussed
earlier. For example, the novel depicts Dracula as a lesser race since he has rank breath
and threatens English people with his vampirism, but Dracula’s narrative makes this
point ambivalent by depicting Mina as strengthened after her “contamination” by Dracula.
Van Helsing notes that Mina’s brain after her drinking of Dracula’s blood comes to have
“a special power which the Count give her” (359). Although he is depicted as animal-like
and monstrous most of the time in the novel, Dracula simultaneously possesses the power
to invigorate the English people as well. In addition, the English fighters against Dracula
become gradually like their enemy. In his stern will to destroy Dracula, Van Helsing
ironically advises the vampire fighters that “we become like him” (362) in their pursuit of
the Count. As the story develops, Van Helsing begins to describe his work of destroying
Dracula with such phrases as “my horrid task” (391), “my awful work,” “my terrible
task,” and “butcher work” (392), which could also be used in describing their enemy,
Dracula’s work.
Doubling in the Gothic conventions facilitates these kinds of ambivalence. As Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* shows in the depiction of the relationship between Frankenstein and his creature, the boundary between victim and victimizer is often blurred through the Gothic convention of doubling. The apparent monstrosity of the creature is gradually shown more as the result of the lack of Frankenstein’s care of his creature than as the creature’s inherent quality. Judith Halberstam explains how the duality of the genre functions to generate ambivalence: “even as Gothic style creates the monster, it calls attention to the plasticity or constructed nature of the monster and, therefore, calls into question all scientific and rational attempts to classify and quantify agents of disorder.” As seen here, the duality of the Gothic genre is closely related with its discussion of identity and labeling of difference.

Stoker’s *Dracula* is filled with various doublings through which many characters become linked with Dracula who embodies the evilness of non-Westerners as its gothic narrative develops. Therefore, doublings in *Dracula* remarkably question the hierarchies of order and values set between the two antithetical worlds or cultures of the vampire and his fighters, both of which are also defined by class, gender, nationality, and race. In the scenes of blood transfusion in order to save Lucy who became a vampire, the novel’s narrative shows well how the vampire’s fighters conceive their identity. First, all the fighters are male. Second, they are not of the lower classes. Van Helsing has praised once Arthur Holmwood: “He is so young and strong and of blood so pure” (130). But Van Helsing reveals deep suspicion about women servants as blood donors for Lucy: “What are we to do now? Where are we to turn for help? We must have another transfusion of blood, and that soon, or that poor girl’s life won’t be worth an hour’s purchase. You are
exhausted already; I am exhausted too. I fear to trust those women, even if they would have courage to submit” (156). Given that Irish immigrants often consisted of servants group in late Victorian London, Van Helsing’s statement again demonstrates cultural construction of Irish people as England’s pathological Other who cannot be included in the English nation. Van Helsing’s suspicion reveals his thought that those Irish female servants’ “bad” blood could contaminate the purity of English people. In this way, those female servants are aligned with both English stereotyping of Irish people and Dracula’s “bad” blood.

*Dracula’s* narrative, however, critiques the constructed “purity” and “health” of English nation by depicting that the transfusion of the “pure” and “strong” blood fails to restore Lucy from vampirism. The novel’s attack on the cultural construction of Englishness and its subordinate otherness becomes strengthened through its doublings through which the boundaries between savage/civilized, Western/Eastern are blurred and even reversed. The close links between English characters and the Count and their doublings are set as the main structure of the novel’s narrative from the beginning of the novel. In Dracula’s Castle, Harker finds that Dracula disguises himself as Harker by wearing his clothes. This shows symbolically the continuing doublings between Dracula and his fighters throughout the novel. Harker interprets Dracula’s disguise as “his new scheme of evil”: “he will allow other to see me, as they think, so that he may both leave evidence that I have been seen in the towns or villages posting my own letters, and that any wickedness which he may do shall by the local people be attributed to me” (46). Then Harker continues to talk about the injustice of his being treated in the Castle of Dracula “without that protection of the law which is even a criminal’s right and
Harker’s sense of injustice is a parody of his nation’s imperial practices, as Arata argues.34

This young English solicitor feels himself in a position inferior to that of the Count. Just before leaving for Transylvania, Harker learns that he passed the solicitor examination, which characterizes his meeting with the Count as his first task as an English legal authority. Jonathan’s position as an English legal authority, however, gets complicated in the whole course of the novel’s narrative. Harker includes Dracula’s story of his race in his journal: “We Szekelys have a right to be proud, for in our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights for lordship. . . Is it a wonder that we were a conquering race?” (29-30). The Count is in a higher social class than Harker as well. Harker depicts the Count and himself as rivals or antagonists, which is followed his admitting of the sense of inferiority: “I am . . . writing in my diary in shorthand all that has happened since I closed it last. It is nineteenth century up-to-date with a vengeance. And yet, unless my senses deceive me, the old centuries had, and have, powers of their own which mere “modernity’ cannot kill” (37). In these words, Jonathan Harker reveals his desperate effort to counter his sense of uneasiness or inferiority before Dracula by resorting to his “modern” skill of writing in short-hand. The Count’s statement that his race was a conquering race who fought like “the lion” suggests strongly the parallel between what Dracula’s race and the English people are doing, given that a lion is a frequent symbol of England.

Another doubling of Dracula with Mina Murray, later Mina Harker, also serves well the novel’s ambivalent attitude toward the Count and his fighters. Mina becomes one of Dracula’s disciples after she is “tainted” with “that Vampire baptism” (386) as Van
Helsing says. The so-called “Vampire baptism” is one of the most memorable scenes in *Dracula*.

On the bed beside the window lay Jonathan Harker, his face flushed and breathing heavily as though in a stupor. Kneeling on the near edge of the bed facing outward was the white-clad in black. His face was turned from us, but the instant we saw we all recognized the Count—in every way, even to the scar on his forehead. With his left hand he held both Mrs. Harker’s hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension; his right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. Her white nightdress was smeared with blood, and a thin stream trickled down the man’s bare breast which was shown by his torn-open dress. The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten’s nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink. (298)

This passage is included in Dr. Seward’s diary, and Mina herself adds more details of what Dracula actually said to her before the “Vampire baptism”: “you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh; blood of my blood; kin of my kin; my bountiful winepress for a while; and shall be later on my companion and my helper” (304).

Echoing what Adam said to Eve on their wedding day in the book of Genesis in the Bible, Dracula’s words force us to interpret that Dracula makes Mina as his wife and thus his baptism of Mina is almost a kind of wedding ceremony between him and Mina. This scene of Dracula’s feeding Mina with his own blood becomes a remarkable scene in which several boundaries become unsettled. As Riquelme notes, female Mina is fed by male Dracula; Mina who is English and has a “man’s brain” and a caring “woman’s heart” (248) is now depicted here as a little animal; and Dracula who is known as having child brain appears now as a nursing mother. This wedding scene makes a vivid contrast with the wedding of Mina and Jonathan before. While Dracula calls Mina “flesh of my flesh” echoing Adam’s words to Eve, Jonathan at their wedding day can only sit up “in bed, propped up with pillows” (112) and draw Mina to him “with his poor weak
hands” (112) to kiss. The English husband Jonathan is depicted as too weak to stand himself on his wedding day. Even later on her wife’s “wedding” with Dracula, Jonathan Harker lies on the bed “in a stupor” (298) and cannot protect Mina from being attacked by the vampire.

The mock wedding of Dracula and Mina provides us with another hint at the novel’s critique of racial distinction between Dracula and his fighters. The difference between the terms that Adam and Dracula use is that the Count adds more phrases such as “kin of my kin” and “blood of my blood.” These words like “kin” and “blood” strongly suggests how Dracula locates himself in Mina’s group to refuse the racial distinction between him and the English people that those Dracula fighters assume. In addition, Mina actually contains Dracula’s blood in her body because the Count fed her with his own blood, as Dr. Seward notes in his diary. Mina herself painfully implies that she swallowed Dracula’s blood: “he pulled open his shirt, and with his long sharp nails opened a vein in his breast. When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow of the—Oh my God! My God! What have I done?” (304).

The fact that Dracula’s blood that came into Mina’s body through this moment keeps running through the body of Mina and is later given to her son affects the identity of the son of Mina and Jonathan Harker. Although Harker’s concluding note tells that Mina “holds, I know, the secret belief that some of our brave friend’s spirit has passed into him [their son]” (400), her “secret” belief becomes undermined by her awareness that their enemy Dracula’s blood that was mixed with her own blood and it is now
circulating through her son’s body. When Jonathan notes that his son’s “bundle of names links all our little band of men together; but we call him Quincey” (400), he tries to celebrate and emphasize that the “little band” of Dracula’s fighters destroyed the Count in their collaboration and their next generation can now live without the threat of their enemy. But Mina and Jonathan’s child “preserves something from Dracula in a living form that has a future” as John Paul Riquelme notes. Stoker does not depict the future of English nation without any threat of its enemy by making Mina’s son, who synecdochically represents the future of English nation, be mixed with its enemy.

If Mina and Jonathan Harker’s son represents the nation’s future, the narrative of Dracula complicates the national identity by associating Mina with Irishness. Her birth name Murray was from the native Celtic name O’Muireadhaigh, which became anglicized to Murray later. Her anglicized Celtic name positions her in the history of Irish nation’s colonization. In addition, Mina writes to Lucy that Jonathan called her full name “Wilhelmina” (111) when he gave her his journal at the hospital in Budapest. Wilhelmina is the Dutch feminine form of William and the name could allude to a Dutch William, William of Orange, who was from an estate in the Orange region of Holland. Given that William of Orange’s battle with James’s Jacobites in Ireland in 1690 is one of most famous events in Ireland and it dramatically shows the Catholic-Protestant confrontation in Ireland, Mina is again located in the cultural, political context of Irish history and therefore represents in a way the Irish nation in her figure. Then Mina in Dracula resembles Glorvina in The Wild Irish Girl and Grace in The Absentee that I examined in the first chapter in that the three female characters represent, though in different ways, the Irish nation. Their marriage with English male characters reflects each
text’s perspectives on the nature of the relationship between England and Ireland. The nature of Mina and Jonathan’s marriage is closer to that of Grace and Colambre than to that of Glorvina and Horatio. While Glorvina personifies essentialized Irishness distinct from Englishness and *The Wild Irish Girl*, therefore, establishes a connection between race and nationality, Mina and Grace defy the connection between race and nationality in their hybrid Anglo-Irish heritages.

Along with Ireland-Transylvania analogy, the dualistic relationship between Dracula and Mina promotes the novel’s political impetus of critiquing the vampire fighters’ construction of Irishness as English racial other. On one hand, Mina is one of the Dracula hunters, but, on the other hand, she is collaborating with the Count. Dracula himself one time identifies Mina both with his side and his enemies: “You have aided in thwarting me; now you shall come to my call. When my brain says “Come!” to you, you shall cross land or sea to do my bidding” (304). After the baptism of blood, the Count would send Mina his spirit to read her mind. In her telepathic contact with Dracula, Mina becomes his partner who corresponds with the Count and obeys him. Since Mina is a member of the vampire’s fighters and helps them chase Dracula through her telepathic contact with him, it defies the vampire fighters’ belief in the correlation between blood and ethical stature. Mina once expresses her acceptance of the vampire’s racialized alterity in herself by confessing that “strangely enough, I did not want to hinder him” (304), when Dracula tried to bite her neck to appease his thirst with her blood.40

*Dracula* narrative shows that Mina’s connection with the vampire continues by depicting that there is some advantage in the Vampire baptism, and this connection between Mina and Dracula critiques the racial imperialism that asserts racial gradation.
Van Helsing sees that Mina has “a special power which the Count give her” (359). Mina Harker becomes a more active member of the vampire hunters and even directs their vampire pursuit after the vampire baptism. The vampire baptism suggests that the “special power” that the Count has given her is something great that the English culture could not offer her. Invigorating effect of vampirism becomes more significant when it is remembered that *Dracula* associates Mina with the Irish nation. *Dracula* in this way attacks the exclusionary identity politics of English imperialism that constructs the Irish as its pathological others. The novel’s particular focus on the relationship between England and Ireland and its critique of English construction of Ireland as its lesser other may be partly attributed to Stoker’s own subject-position as an Irishman.

Mina’s connection with Dracula that serves as a critique of English fighters’ racial attitude is emphasized in *Dracula* through the depiction of Mina and the Vampire’s sharing a red scar on their face. Jonathan Harker leaves a red scar on the Count’s forehead by striking him, and Van Helsing who is one of the vampire hunters makes a similar red scar on Mina’s forehead by placing a sacramental wafer on it. The red scar on Mina and the Count’s foreheads parallels their telepathic contact. After Jonathan’s Ghoorka or “Kukri” knife and Morris’s bowie knife have killed the Count and Dracula’s whole body turns into dust and completely disappears from sight, the red scar on Mina’s forehead also disappears. The red scars on their foreheads symbolically become a mark of Mina and the Count’s belonging to a same group. Viewed in the doubled relationship between the Count and Mina, the meaning of her seemingly obnoxious mark of “the tainted” becomes complicated. On the one hand, Mina’s scar signifies her sacrificial contribution to the vampire hunting, but, on the other hand, it depicts Mina as belonging
to Dracula, the enemy of vampire hunters. This episode also implies that Roman Catholicism is valid although it is aligned with Ireland at that time by depicting Van Helsing, one of the vampire fighters, resort to the Roman Catholic rite.

Joseph Valente notes that Dracula’s ambiguous relationships with various characters represent the vampire’s “psychosymbolic role as doppelganger of the apparently virtuous and heroic protagonists of the novel, a secret sharer at once dangerous and desirable, repudiated and irresistible.” In other words, Dracula’s narrative suggests that there is an obvious resemblance between the vampire fighters and the vampire. The novel’s narrative makes us see the vampire fighters in their racialized other Dracula. The vampire fighters are depicted as involved with imperialist adventures in the novel’s narrative. Chapter V provides with details about the relationships between Dr. Seward, Arthur Holmwood, and Quincey Morris, the three main members of Dracula hunters. Morris’ letter describes them as having traveled abroad together. The foreign places that they went to are “Marquesas,” “Titicaca,” and possibly “Korea” (65). The Marquesas islands are located in the Southern Pacific ocean and possessed by France in 1842, and Titicaca is a South American lake in the Andes. Morris could mean by “Korea” (65) either the country Korea located in the Far East or a club with that name where they used to get together. We can, therefore, see that the three men were already involved in “globetrotting imperialist adventures” in Valente’s words even before their vampire hunting. Dr. Seward’s diary depicts their “adventures” as well: “In all our hunting parties and adventures in different parts of the world, Quincey Morris had always been the one to arrange the plan of action, and Arthur and I had been accustomed to obey him implicitly” (323).
Another dual relationship between Dr. Seward and his patient, Renfield shows one of the groups who are disenfranchised in the nation by critiquing the vampire fighters. Renfield is an imprisoned mad man under Dr. Seward’s supervision in his mental asylum. In Lucy’s letter to Mina, Dr. Seward is introduced ambiguously as “the lunatic-asylum man” (60), which could mean both an imprisoned man and a supervisor in a mental asylum. Lucy continues to describe Dr. Seward that “He was very cool outwardly, but was nervous all the same” (60). The hinted closeness between Dr. Seward and his patient Renfield, or possible reversal of their categorized relationship becomes clearer through the narrative’s strategy of duality throughout the novel.

After Lucy’s introduction of Dr. Seward to the text, we hear the doctor’s actual voice kept in phonograph. Dr. Seward introduces himself together with one of his patient, R. M. Renfield. In order to escape from “a sort of empty feeling” (64), Dr. Seward went to see his patients because he “knew that the only cure for this sort of thing was work” (64). Dr. Seward describes his motive for approaching Renfield and his own attitude toward the patient:

I picked out one who has afforded me a study of much interest. He is so quaint that I am determined to understand him as well as I can. To-day I seemed to get nearer than ever before to the heart of his mystery. I questioned him more fully than I had ever done, with a view to making myself master of the facts of his hallucination. In my manner of doing it there was, I now see, something of cruelty. I seemed to wish to keep him to the point of his madness—a thing which I avoid with the patients as I would the mouth of hell. (64)

After this passage, Dr. Seward depicts his patient Renfield as “sanguine temperament; great physical strength; morbidly excitable; periods of gloom, ending in some fixed idea
which I cannot make out . . . a possibly dangerous man” (64). The juxtaposition of his own frustration and cruelty in his work as a doctor and the possible danger of his patient forces us to weigh who could be more dangerous between the doctor and his asylum patient. Dr. Seward and Renfield resemble each other in that both are depicted as restless. The doctor, however, has intellectual strength to analyze and supervise his patient whose physical strength appears dangerous to the doctor. Dr. Seward’s diary ends with very intriguing sentences that shed another light on the ambivalent relationship between him and his patient: “when self is the fixed point the centripetal force is balanced with the centrifugal; when duty, a cause, etc., is the fixed point, the latter force is paramount, and only accident or a series of accidents can balance it” (64).

Renfield is a man to whom self is the fixed point and thus he is a “mystery” (64) to the doctor, because there is no access to the center of the “mad” man’s self that other people can understand. Dr. Seward can be identified with the man who is fixed on “duty” or “a cause” in his own words. According to Dr. Seward’s own words, the insane man can be “balanced” by moving away from his center of self, but the professional doctor himself could be more dangerous, because the force of “duty and a cause” of his work could be balanced only with “a series of accidents.” The word “accidents” emphasizes that the force of duty cannot be checked with rational plans and therefore it can be more dangerous than a mad man. I find in this passage the powerful moments of the novel’s resistance to contemporary discourses on reason and rationality. Given that Renfield is associated with Dracula, these moments of resistance provoke endorsement of Dracula over his hunters.
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The vampire fighters’ cause of defending their people from the evil Dracula, therefore, gets profoundly critiqued in the course of the novel’s narrative through their own attack on their enemy shown as unacknowledged sides of themselves. *Dracula* in its Gothic feature of doublings blurs the boundaries between the two cultures/categories of healthy/pathological, savage/civilization, England/Transylvania (Ireland). This blurring challenges the logic of English identity formation itself that is based on the antithetical images of its other, who is coded in racial, national, and gender terms. By aligning Dracula more with women, foreigners, and the insane and by depicting Harker’s son, the future of the nation, as mixed with Dracula’s blood, the novel shows that Englishness of the nation’s next generation admits of Otherness and the nation becomes a very different one from the nation that, as the fighters imagine, does not enfranchise those estranged groups in it. The representation of the relationship between Dracula and his fighters, England and Ireland in *Dracula* is, therefore, more complicated than Dracula’s fighters assume and the complicated connection between those two antagonistic parties are suggested by the whole course of the novel’s narrative and its Gothic features that I have shown so far. *Dracula* apparently restores and endorses the status quo of English superiority to the other culture embodied in Dracula in that Dracula fighters eventually destroy the count. The novel’s thematic concerns with estranged groups and its Gothic strategy of doubling, however, allows moments of disturbance or subversion to this story. *Dracula* in its exploit of Gothic conventions makes ambivalent the hierarchies of values set between the two antithetical cultures of England and Transylvania/Ireland.

---

1 Bram Stoker, *Dracula*, 26. Subsequent page number references will be cited parenthetically in the text.
Many critics have discussed the mirror episode in various ways. For example, focusing on the “doppelganger relationship” between Harker and Dracula, Joseph Valente notes that “Harker’s speculative encounter with Dracula establishes the novel’s general paradigm of vampiric intercourse as a densely mediated and mystified mode of self-relation.”


For example, see Christopher Craft’s “‘Kiss Me with Those Red Lips’: Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker’s Dracula.” New Casebooks: Dracula, 93-118. Craft argues that Stoker’s text discusses homoeroticism and contemporary anxiety over subversion of gender roles.

See, A Geography of Victorian Gothic Fiction: Mapping History’s Nightmares, xv.

Ibid, xvi.

See, Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837, 5.

Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin De Siecle, 120.

Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siecle, 107-32.


The last quote is originally from Daniel Pick’s Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c. 1848-c. 1918, 141.

See William Greenslade, Degeneration, Culture and the Novel 1880-1940. 92. Greenslade notes that the influence of Lombroso’s theories among criminologists peaked at the First International Congress of Criminal Anthropology held in Rome in 1885. Though Lombroso’s theories provoked controversy among criminologists, his influence after the conference spread over the next two decades. See ibid, 95-6

Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso. With an Introduction by Cesare Lombroso. This book was published by Lombroso’s daughter in 1911. p. XXV

See Roger, Luckhurst, The Invention of Telepathy, 1870-1901. Luckhurst notes that “Lombroso combined moralism with simplistic positivism (pointing to visible markers of degeneracy) typical of the discourse when transferred to the human sciences” (183). Greenslade also notes that “by the turn of the century not just the criminal, but the genius, the artist, the political revolutionary, the prostitute were all branded with notorious physical stigmata of degeneracy” (92).

Criminal Man, xxii.


My use of Lombroso’s idea in reading the inconsistency involved in interpreting “criminal” markers is from Joseph Valente’s reading of Dracula. Valente argues that “the detection of embodied criminality in Dracula is referred to the eye of the beholder.” Dracula’s Crypt, 102.

See Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature, xi-xii.


Apes and Angels, 24.


Joseph Valente, Dracula’s Crypt, 51.

See, Franco Moretti, “Dracula and Capitalism.” New Casebooks: Dracula, 43-54. Moretti notes that “It is those cultural categories, those moral values, those forms of expression that are endangered by the vampire” (50).
H. L. Malchow also argues that the Gothic genre provided nationalism with “a language of panic, of unreasoning anxiety, blind revulsion and distancing sensationalism.” *Gothic Images of Race in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 4.

M. H. Abrams defines Gothic novels that they “opened up to fiction the realm of the irrational and the perverse impulses and the nightmarish terrors that lie beneath the orderly surface of the civilized mind.” *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fifth Edition, 74.

Many critics have discussed the politics of the Gothic genre. For example, Andrew Smith and William Hughes note that “Gothic tales, their contradictions, ambiguities and ambivalences, provide a dense and complex blend of assertion and doubt, acceptance and defiance, and truth and falsity and in this way they provide a space in which key elements of the dominant culture become debated, affirmed and questioned.” “Introduction,” *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*, 3.

Cesare Lombroso, *The Criminal Man* (1911), xxix.


Stephen Arata focuses on this scene to argue that Dracula’s action is actually a parody of British imperial practices. Arata notes that “In the Gothic mirror that Stoker holds up to late-Victorian culture, that culture, like Harker peering into the glass at Castle Dracula, cannot see, but is nevertheless intensely aware of, its monstrous double peering over its shoulder.” *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin De Siecle*, 125.

A number of critics have discussed the significance of this scene, particularly focusing on how this scene serves as a site where various distinctions become deconstructed. John Paul Riquelme notes that “The sentence in which Seward compares the scene to a kitten’s nose being forced into a saucer of milk captures the simultaneous crossing of several boundaries in a way that undoes the distinctions necessary for realistic narration of intelligible events and for maintaining hierarchies of power.” “Deconstruction and Dracula.” *Dracula: Complete, Authoritative Text with Biographical, Historical, and Cultural Contexts, Critical History, and Essays from Contemporary Critical Perspectives*, 570.

Paul Riquelme notes that “Animal and human, male and female, child and adult, perverse sexuality and breastfeeding have simultaneously exchanged place, as if they were interchangeable rather than different and distinct,” Ibid, 570.


Therefore, I do not agree with critics who interpret Mina’s trance-states as working only for the Dracula hunters. For example, Roger Luckhurst notes that Mina’s telepathic connection with Dracula works for the powers of the modern Dracula hunters and promotes their communication systems that catch Dracula. Although Luckhurst mentions that hypnosis in *Dracula* is considered as “a potentially curative force” (213), he does not explain how the point works in the novel. See *The Invention of Telepathy, 1870-1901*, 213.

John Allen Stevenson notes that “the scars on the vampires serve a dense semiotic function, marking Dracula and Mina (potentially, anyway) as simultaneously untouchable, defiled, and damned—above all, different.” “A Vampire in the Mirror: The Sexuality of *Dracula*,” 141.

*Dracula’s Crypt*, 50.


“I WANT TO SEE THE REAL INDIA”: MODERNISM, POINT OF VIEW, AND CROSS-CULTURAL FRIENDSHIP IN E. M. FORSTER’S *A PASSAGE TO INDIA*

E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* deals with another cross-cultural encounter between English and Indian peoples. Similarly to the novels that I examine in the previous chapters, English characters in Forster’s novel also experience transformations in their views of who they are after their encounter with India and the Indians. If the novels that I analyze in the previous chapters represent cross-cultural encounter in order to question and critique English stereotypes and prejudices of its cultural others, Forster’s *A Passage to India* not only continues the question but it also goes beyond it to discuss the difficulty of a harmonious relationship between Indian and English people. The novel’s modernist form and concerns with the conflicts of interpretations facilitate its discussion of cultural difference and conflicts between England and India.

The novel identifies the desirable relationship between Indian and English people as friendship. *A Passage to India* opens by depicting a scene in which a few Indians are discussing “as to whether or no it is possible to be friends with an Englishman” (6-7). In the conclusion of the discussion, a Moslem doctor Aziz agrees that “all Englishwomen
are haughty and venal” (9). Aziz’s concluding statement implies that English people’s arrogant and materialistic attitude impedes the friendship between Indian and English people. The narrator uses net as the image of both the network of English rule in India and the oppressive perspectives of the Anglo-Indians—the English who lived in India—on Indian people and culture. The narrator depicts Dr. Aziz annoyed by the tidy roads built by the Great Britain: “As he [Aziz] entered their [civil lines] arid tidiness, depression suddenly seized him. The roads, named after victorious generals and intersecting at right angles, were symbolic of the net Great Britain had thrown over India. He felt caught in their meshes” (13). The Bridge Party that attempts “to bridge the gulf between East and West” (26) rather betrays the fact that the barrier between East and West grows “impenetrable” (47). This barrier is symbolically shown through the tennis courts that are “monopolized by the usual club couples” (47). The narrator emphasizes the futility of human effort to unite beyond social and cultural boundaries by saying that “All invitations must proceed from heaven perhaps; perhaps it is futile for men to initiate their own unity, they do but widen the gulf between them by the attempt” (37).

If the net symbolizes the network of English power on and knowledge of India, Indian geography including the Marabar Caves and the echo in them symbolizes uncertainty of India that escapes the net of English domination. The uncertainty of the caves is depicted as follows: “Having seen one such cave, having seen two, having seen three, four, fourteen, twenty-four, the visitor returns to Chandrapore uncertain whether he had had an interesting experience or a dull one or any experience at all” (Emphasis added; 137). The echoing of the Marabar Caves also indicates the uncertainty of the other world of India. If the bewildering geography of the Marabar Caves is increased by
travelers’ geographic displacement from home, uninterpretable utterances of the echoing sound of “ou-boum” are partly caused by English people’s cultural alienation in India in spite of their claim to be civilization bringers.¹ This is why the same geography and echo of the Marabar Caves seem to trouble only English people in the novel. For example, Fielding expresses his sense of alienation and doubt about what the Anglo-Indians do with the name of “civilization” in Chadrapore by reflecting on the echo: “We all build upon sand; and the more modern the country gets, the worse’ll be the crash. . . Everything echoes now; there’s no stopping the echo. The original sound may be harmless, but the echo is always evil. . . It belonged to the universe that he had missed or rejected” (307). Forster reveals his modernist awareness throughout *A Passage to India* of how English people’s India is conceived as the effect of the echo in English people’s inner selves.

6.1 Modernism and Point of View

As Fielding’s reflection about the echo implies, Forster deploys a critique of the imperial world order and his critique is interwoven with the novel’s modernist concerns with knowing and interpreting other cultures. Forster’s depiction of India as a vast and uncertain place allows his challenge of colonial expansion by showing India to be a culture that English dominance cannot conquer.² Forster furthers his doubt about the claimed justice of English rulers’ mission and its noble purpose in India by depicting that English do not live up to their high-minded calling in India. If *A Passage to India* represents a crisis in the colonial assumption of English superiority by depicting the self-conceit of the Anglo-Indians, this crisis is well represented in the novel’s concerns about
the issue of point of view.

Paul B. Armstrong’s “Reading India: E. M. Forster and the Politics of Interpretation” discusses how “the conflict of interpretations is portrayed as a conflict between cultures” (365) in Forster’s dealing with point of view in *A Passage to India*. The point of view of Forster’s third-person narrator is different from the traditional omniscient point of view in that the narrator does not know everything that needs to be known about events and motives of the characters. Forster’s narrator’s point of view is, however, different from the limited point of view that is usually experienced and told by a single character in the story. What is noticeable about Forster’s experimentation with point of view is that the issue of point of view is mainly focused on conflicts between cultures and different interpretations of other cultures. For example, the encounter between Mrs. Moore and Dr. Aziz at a mosque in Chapter II of the “Mosque” part in the novel is interpreted differently according to interpreter’s point of view. The narrator depicts Dr. Aziz excited at her sympathy: “She [Mrs. Moore] had proved her sympathy by criticizing her fellow-countrywoman to him” (21). Aziz himself cries to Mrs. Moore that “You understand me, you know what others feel. Oh, if others resembled you!” (21).

Mrs. Moore’s son Ronny Heaslop, who is the city magistrate in Chandrapore, however, interprets the nature of the encounter between his mother and Aziz as revealing a totally different perspective. Ronny interprets Aziz’s conversation with his mother that “He [Aziz] had some motive in what he said. My personal belief is that the remark wasn’t true” (32). Mrs. Moore reconsiders her meeting with Aziz at the mosque according to her son’s comment in order to evaluate whose impression is correct. She finds that in the light of her son’s interpretation, Aziz was “unreliable, inquisitive, vain” (34) in his
conversation with her. Mrs. Moore, however, realizes that “it was all true, but how false as a summary of the man; the essential life of him had been slain” (34). The novel here attempts to bring readers two different ways of Anglo-Indians’ understanding of Indian people and culture by depicting the different perspectives of Mrs. Moore and her son.

Mrs. Moore’s statement that it is true and false at the same time that Aziz can be interpreted differently according to different perspectives also shows the ambivalence involved in knowing others. As I have discussed, the difficulty of understanding other cultures is exemplified by inexplicable aspects of India such as the uncertain geography of the Marabar Caves and the echoing ou-boum of the caves. Another incident that is inexplicable in the novel is what really happened to Adela Quested in one of the Marabar Caves. The difficulty of representing India is expressed in Forster’s use of different perspectives such as perspectives of the Muslims, the Hindus, and the subalterns. If Dr. Aziz and Godbole represent elites of India, the punkah wallah represents the subaltern groups. The difficulty of representing the various Indian perspectives makes noticeable the naivety of Adela Quested’s desire to “see the real India.” These mysterious aspects of India only prelude the series of misunderstanding of cultural difference that follows.

The narrator describes the sense of frustration that Adela feels at the Bridge Party: “Miss Quested now had her desired opportunity; friendly Indians were before her, and she tried to make them talk, but she failed, she strove in vain against the echoing walls of their civility” (43). Mrs. Bhattacharya’s civility only produces confusion in Mrs. Moore when the Indian lady replies to Mrs. Moore’s question: “I wonder whether you would allow us to call on you some day” (43). Although Mr. and Mrs. Bhattacharya have their already scheduled travel to Calcutta to leave that day, Mrs. Bhattacharya replies to
Mrs. Moore that “Whenever is convenient” (43). Benita Parry interprets the invitation of the Bhattacharyas as “an expedient which permitted them [Mr. and Mrs. Bhattacharya] to adhere to English etiquette while also ignoring it.”

Mrs. Moore out of confusion cries that “it distresses me beyond words” (44). These confusions and misunderstandings become the cause of the visit to the Marabar Caves. Adela Quested does not understand the implication of Mrs. Bhattacharya’s invitation, and Aziz thus invites them to visit his home. Adela misunderstands Aziz’s polite gesture again: “He [Aziz] thought again of his bungalow with horror. Good heavens, the stupid girl [Adela Quested] had taken him at his word! What was he to do?” (79). The trip to the caves is thus hastily arranged by Aziz’s attempt not to have those English ladies at his poor bungalow. In other words, the series of cultural misunderstandings in the novel culminates in the incident that happens in the Marabar Caves.

Forster connects this series of misunderstandings with the novel’s concern with point of view. In particular, the novel focuses on the question of what Anglo-Indians do and who they are in its discussion of point of view. Ronny Heaslop, the city magistrate in Chandrapore, states that “We’re here to do justice and keep the peace. . . I am out here to work, mind, to hold this wretched country by force” (51, 52). While Ronny Heaslop perpetuates civilization mission discourse by aligning values like justice and peace with Englishness, Forster suggests alternative voices to the Anglo-Indians’ belief in the justice of their mission in India. The narrator of the novel depicts Anglo-Indians as “exiles” who eat food “cooked by servants who did not understand it” (49). It is the English colonizers in their exclusive community in India that are sick and troubled in India: “How can the mind take hold of such a country? Generations of invaders have tried, but they remain in
exile. The important towns they build are only retreats, their quarrels the malaise of men who cannot find their way home. India knows of their trouble” (150).

The narrative of the novel highlights the trouble of the Anglo-Indians and the delusion of their high-minded purpose in India. This way of depicting the Anglo-Indians is noticeable, given their claim to be legitimate rulers of Indian people as Ronny Heaslop does. Their being in “exile” means that the Anglo-Indians are ultimately outsiders in India, although they assume a ruling role there. The alienation and exile of the Anglo-Indians in the novel challenge the status of their imperial practice in India. They claim that they are in the “wretched country” to “keep the peace” (51), but it is not India but the Anglo-Indians who are in trouble.

This reversal of the Anglo-Indians’ claim then attacks the “Oriental Pathology” (243) that Mr. McBryde, the District Superintendent of Police, has developed as a theory about Indians. According to the theory, “all unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, for the simple reason that they live south of latitude 30” (184). This theory is actually an extension of the Mutiny discourse that attributes depravity to Indian natives. E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* plots the relationship between England and India that continues around the Indian Mutiny in 1857 as Collins’s *The Moonstone* does. Whereas the Indian Mutiny is present almost invisibly in Collins’s narrative, there are several explicit references to the same event in Forster’s *A Passage to India*. English people’s memory of the Mutiny in the novel situates the alleged rape of Adela Quested in the discourse of the native assault of English women in 1857.

Revealing this hysterical reaction to Aziz’s alleged attack on Adela Quested, McBryde advises Fielding: “When you think of crime you think of English crime. The
psychology here is different. . . . Read any of the Mutiny records; which, rather than the Bhagavad Gita, should be your Bible in this country” (187). McBryde’s statement shows well that the Mutiny has become the decisive event in England-India history that defines every subsequent act of crime as evidence for the Indian criminality that was related to the Mutiny. McBryde’s words imply that Aziz’s attack on Adela is not a case to be tried according to English law, but it should be understood as another case that continues the native attack of English women and children in 1857. This is why an English young mother with her baby child at the English club in Chandrapore becomes “a symbol” after Adela event:

One young mother—a brainless but most beautiful girl—sat on a low ottoman in the smoking-room with her baby in her arms; her husband was away in the district, and she dared not return to her bungalow in case the “niggers attacked.” The wife of a small railway official, she was generally snubbed; but this evening, with her abundant figure and masses of corn-gold hair, she symbolized all that is worth fighting and dying for; more permanent a symbol, perhaps, than poor Adela. (200)

The English young mother and her baby as the icon of the myth of imperial martyrdom reflect the Anglo-Indians’ tendency to interpret the 1857 Mutiny as the event that demonstrated Indian criminality and ingratitude toward English rule.

Forster, however, subtly deals with the 1857 event’s double status. Jenny Sharpe eloquently discusses the double meaning of the Mutiny in Allegories of Empire. Sharpe notes that “Eighteen fifty-seven may have been remembered by the British as the savage attack by rebels on defenseless women and children, but it was known to Indians as the First War of Independence” (113). By having Adela Quested withdraw her accusation of Aziz by claiming that she is mistaken, Forster makes obvious his critical comment on the
Anglo-Indians’ interpretation of the Mutiny. In addition to Adela Quested’s withdrawal of her rape charge against Aziz, the court scene presents moments of disrupting the racially motivated assumptions. When Mr. McBryde remarks out of his belief in “Oriental Pathology” that “the darker races are physically attracted by the fairer, but not vice versa,” the narrator inserts “Even when the lady is so uglier than the gentleman?,” a comment that, as the narrator puts it, “fell from nowhere, from the ceiling perhaps” (243). Out of responsibility of censuring those interruption, the Magistrate has “a man who said nothing” (243) turned out roughly.

The historical context of the 1857 Mutiny sheds lights on the meaning of rape in *A Passage to India.* The Anglo-Indians relate Aziz’s alleged rape of Adela to their memory of the Mutiny reports of native rape of English women and consider Aziz’s crime as another evidence of the Indian criminal mind. Forster, however, suggests “the role of a discourse of rape in the management of anticolonial demonstrations” (124), as Sharpe writes. While English historiography tended to interpret Indian anticolonial rebellion as confirming the racial stereotype of Indian depravity that justified their colonial mission in India, the series of events involved in Adela’s charge and withdrawal of it in the novel shows both the colonial construction of the Indian men as rapists and Forster’s critique of it. Anglo-Indians’ responses to Adela’s declaration “Dr. Aziz never followed me into the cave” (255) show that her withdrawal interrupts colonial representation of Indian men’s sexual desire for white women as the nature of anticolonial rebellion. When Adela declares that “I’m afraid I have made a mistake” (255), “The Superintendent slammed down his papers” (255), saying to her “Are you mad?” (256).
At Adela’s withdrawal of her charge of rape against Aziz, he “is released without one stain on his character” (256). Her withdrawal symbolically indicates her abandonment of cultural self-definition of the Anglo-Indian community that is deceptive and relies on stereotypes of Indians. The phrase “stain on his character” reminds us of Collins’s comparison of national character of England and India in *The Moonstone*, and it here shows again that the crime lies in the colonial relations that produced the category of rape as racial stereotype of Indian men desiring white women. This revelation challenges the premises of colonial relations that attribute criminality and depravity to Indians. Forster depicts Adela being harassed by the echo when she perpetuates the illusion of Anglo-Indians’ communal perspectives, while the echo becomes less or disappears when she turns to the perspectives of Mrs. Moore and Fielding who believe that Aziz is innocent.

Because of their deviating from communal mechanism of cultural self-definition, both Mrs. Moore and Cyril Fielding are told by Anglo-Indians to have done “a very grave disservice to the whole community” (218). The narrator hints at Mrs. Moore’s difference from the Anglo-Indian community by stating that Mrs. Moore has achieved “the double vision” that enables her to see “the horror of the universe and its smallness” (230). Fielding, who believes that “The world . . . is a globe of men who are trying to reach one another” (65), is also outside of the communal solipsism of the Anglo-Indians: “He [Fielding] had no racial feeling—not because he was superior to his brother civilians, but because he had matured in a different atmosphere, where the herd-instinct does not flourish” (65). Fielding already confronts moments of self-examination and self-knowledge that disrupts his English subjectivity:
It was the last moment of the light, and as he gazed at the Marabar Hills they seemed to move graciously towards him like a queen, and their charm became the sky’s. At the moment they vanished they were everywhere, the cool benediction of the night descended, the stars sparkled, and the whole universe was a hill. Lovely, exquisite moment—but passing the Englishman with averted face and on swift wings. He experienced nothing himself; it was as if someone had told him there was such a moment, and he was obliged to believe. And he felt dubious and discontented suddenly, and wondered whether he was really and truly successful as a human being. After forty years’ experience, he had learnt to manage his life and make the best of it on advanced European lines, had developed his personality, explored his limitations, controlled his passions—and he had done it all without becoming either pedantic or worldly. A creditable achievement, but as the moment passed, he felt he ought to have been working at something else the whole time,--he didn’t know at what, never would know, never could know, and that was why he felt sad. (211-12)

Fielding’s deep sense of doubt, discontent, and sadness about what he has been doing as an English educator in India reflects his overcoming the communal solipsism of the Anglo-Indians in Chandrapore. Fielding’s position is thus very different from the position of “Anglicization” policy that Thomas Babington Macaulay’s “Minute on Indian Education” asserts:

I am quite ready to take the Oriental learning at the valuation of the Orientalists themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is, indeed, fully admitted by those members of the Committee who support the Oriental plan of education. It will hardly disputed, I suppose, that the department of literature in which the Eastern writers stand highest is poetry. And I certainly never met with any Orientalist who ventured to maintain that the Arabic and Sanscrit poetry could be compared to that of the great European nations.11

If Fielding can be called an Orientalist, he is a different kind from the Orientalists who Macaulay here defines. While Orientalists in Macaulay’s idea represent the cultural solipsism and superiority of Englishness, Fielding’s engagement with Indian culture
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expands his self-knowledge as well as his understanding the other culture. This is why Fielding is “a celebrated student of Persian poetry” (67) which Macaulay attempted to replace with English poetry.

In addition to English characters like Mrs. Moore and Fielding, the series of Adela Quested’s transformations that leads to her final withdrawal of the charge well shows how the novel registers its critique of communal solipsism and imperial rule of Anglo-Indians in its modernist concerns with point of view. All these show that the novel endorses the ideal of knowledge of other cultures based on mutual, empathetic understanding. Although the whole series of her transformations eventually leads to her withdrawal, the novel makes her retraction remarkable by having her to declare it after the moment of epiphany in which she encounters with the punkah wallah. The courtroom where Adela sees the punkah wallah is divided into English and Indian peoples. The special chairs for English ladies and Adela upon the platform one foot high and ordinary chairs for Indian people in the hall so that they could “look dignified” (241). The “renegade Mr. Fielding” (246) is “the only European who remained in the body of the hall” (244).

In the courtroom which is a microcosm of the colonial relations between Indian and English people in Chandrapore, Adela notices “the humblest of all who were present” (241), a punkah wallah. The significance of the punkah puller in the court scene is implied in the passage that follows his description: “When that strange race nears the dust and is condemned as untouchable, then nature remembers the physical perfection that she accomplished elsewhere, and throws out a god—not many, but one here and there, to prove to society how little its categories impress her” (241). The punkah wallah is
categorized as “untouchable” in his society, but his “strength and beauty,” as the narrator puts it, ironically indicates the futility of those categories. Rather he is depicted as a god that nature offers as evidence of the meaninglessness of caste categories. The punkah wallah is distinguished from other human beings: “Pulling the rope towards him, relaxing it rhythmically, sending swirls of air over others, receiving none himself, he seemed apart from human destinies, a male fate, a winnower of souls” (241).

Adela’s transformation is dramatically depicted through her encounter with the punkah puller: “Something in his aloofness impressed the girl from middle-class England, and rebuked the narrowness of her sufferings” (242). Her changing self-perception extends to her questioning what the English people are doing in India with the name of civilization: “Her particular brand of opinions, and the suburban Jehovah who sanctified them—by what right did they claim so much importance in the world, and assume the title of civilization?” (242). Adela’s encounter with the punkah wallah is a moment of epiphany in the novel that provokes her into questioning the ethics of colonialism. Forster uses epiphany that is one of modernist aesthetic techniques toward an ethical aim of interrogating English colonialism in India. Epiphany is a term for the description of the sudden manifestation of an ordinary object, common in modernist texts, and the revelation of the punkah wallah as vision of “strength and beauty” (241) makes Adela’s encounter with him a noticeable epiphany in the novel. His vision provokes Adela into critique of “the narrowness of her suffering” and English rule in India with “the title of civilization” (242).

Adela begins to realize “all the wreckage of her silly attempt to see India” (244), which has elevated Aziz into “a principle of evil, but now he seemed to be what he had
always been—a slight acquaintance” (244). Adela’s changed point of view enables her to see Aziz as a real human not as “a principle of evil.” Most of all, her transformation is found in the change in her attitude: “she was no longer examining life, but being examined by it; she had become a real person” (272). Although Adela is female, she hence assumes the position of the typical European male subject whose “imperial eyes” attempt to possess the object of his gaze, in her case India. In Mary Louise Pratt’s study Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation, “contact zone” refers to “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radically inequality, and intractable conflict” (6). Pratt notes that colonial appropriation is underscored and the “enlightened man of the metropolis” and his “essential superiority” are accepted in the contact zone (53). When the novel opens, Adela Quested resembles the typical European male travelers in her frequent statement that “I want to see the real India” (emphasis in original, 22). If European bourgeois subjects in Pratt’s study seek to assert European hegemony by using the “strategies of innocence” (9) whereby they secure their innocence while involved in colonial practices, Adela is transformed through her experience in India.15

Whereas Horatio’s same position as the seeing man with the “imperial eyes” is comically reversed by becoming himself an object of Irish female gaze in The Wild Irish Girl, Adela in A Passage to India realizes the futility of her attempt to see India through the lens of English superiority. Her encounter with the epiphany of the punkah wallah crystallizes the disruption in her hierarchical world order and categories that have been in gradual transformation after her coming to India. What she learns in India is that “Truth
is not truth in that exacting land unless there go with it kindness and more kindness again” (272). Adela Quested is transformed by her encounter with the punkah wallah to develop a better understanding of herself and she is brought into a wider world where she questions the validity of English claim of civilization and begins to go beyond “the narrowness of her sufferings” (242). Critics have paid attention to the punkah wallah and to the question of his meaning in the novel. For example, both Jenny Sharpe and Sara Suleri read the punkah wallah as an embodiment of homosexual desire by focusing on the English gaze, either female or male, that feminizes the beautiful Indian male body.16 These critics’ interpretation of the punkah wallah only perpetuates English hegemonic perspectives of the Indian other by making the untouchable man as the object of Western desire.

I see, however, that Forster critiques the English-centered perspective by depicting Adela Quested rebuking herself for being narrow and assuming “the title of civilization” (242). Emmanuel Levinas’s discussion of the alterity of the other as “the exteriority of the infinite” that “manifests itself in the absolute resistance which—through its appearance, its epiphany—it opposes to all my powers” (Peperzak 62)17 better explains the function of the punkah wallah in Forster’s novel. The description of punkah wallah’s “aloofness” in the novel that rebukes Adela Quested self-centeredness well shows the absolute otherness that “refutes the pretension of the I, which appropriates everything that stands in its way” (Peperzak 62). Her last name “Quested” that Forster chooses well reflects the fact that her imperial world view is broken down through her encounter with the “face” of the punkah wallah. Levinas chooses the word “face” to point out “the alterity of the Other forbidding me to exercise my narcissistic violence”
Forster further depicts the defeat of English civilization in India: “Civilization strays about like a ghost here, revisiting the ruins of empire, and is to be found not in great works of art or mighty deeds” (279). Fielding finds “a civilization which the West can disturb but will never acquire” (280) in Indian leisure at the “Victory Banquet” (278). Aziz at the dinner looks “full of civilization . . . complete, dignified, rather hard” (280). The colonial stereotypes that present the depravity of Indian male desire for English women are now reversed. Forster furthers the reversal by inserting “An avowed European scandal” of the relationship between Mr. McBryde and Miss Derek. When Mr. McBryde is caught in Miss Derek’s room, Aziz expects that “he [Mr. McBryde] will blame the Indian climate. Everything is our fault really” (302). This eloquently shows the falsity and self-deceit of Mr. McBryde’s theory of “Indian Pathology.”

Whereas the stories of cross-cultural encounter examined in the previous chapters focus on the changes that mainly occur in English characters after their encounter with England’s cultural others, Forster’s *A Passage to India* depicts the change that occurs in the Indian characters like Aziz after his traumatic encounter with English people in addition to the novel’s focus on the changes in English characters such as Adela Quested and Cyril Fielding. At the end of the novel, the narrator writes that “This pose of “seeing India” was only a form of ruling India; no sympathy lay behind it” (343). This is what Aziz has realized after all the events and sufferings, which transform him to state that “the two nations cannot be friends” (349). The long history of English rule in India is depicted as one of the obstacles that make friendship between Indians and English people impossible. Aziz thinks about the fine of twenty thousand rupees that Adela did not pay.
after Fielding’s persuasion. The narrator writes that “these rupees haunted his mind, because he had been tricked about them, and allowed them to escape overseas, like so much of the wealth of India” (313).

Aziz’s nationalism that develops after the ordeal of being charged by Anglo-Indians is differentiated from Anglo-Indians’ chauvinistic patriotism in that he achieves expanded understanding who Indians are by overcoming his prejudices against other groups in India such as Hindus. Forster reveals his modernist awareness of the epistemological dilemmas by casting doubt on the ideal of knowing other cultures based on empathetic understanding which his novel endorses. As Armstrong notes, Forster shows this dilemma by depicting the Muslim Aziz who is himself a victim of Anglo-Indian prejudice affected by prejudice against Hindus (372). The sight of an English boat in “their work of patrolling India” (343) endears “the Hindus by comparison” to Aziz, because that English pose of seeing India is “a form of ruling India” with “no sympathy” behind it. The Hindus, however, does not “pry into other people’s lives” (343). When Aziz achieves this understanding of the different group of the Hindus, although Aziz is an outsider at the Hindu festival, he finds the Hindu rites “charming” (341). Aziz can now talk with Godbole about the cultural difference between Muslim and Hinduism “without moral heat” (342), which he expresses against Hindus in the early parts of the novel. If The Moonstone depicts a Hindu festival witnessed and reported by the English traveler Mr. Murthwaite, Forster’s novel leads us to see the Muslim doctor’s change in his perspectives of the relationship between the Hindus and the Muslims.

Based on this understanding of his mother land India and its relation with England, Aziz also achieves a wider knowledge of who Indians are, accepting the Hindus
and thus admitting the heterogeneity of the Indian nation. Because of this attained greater self-knowledge, Aziz starts another cycle of his encounter with English people. Although the narrator depicts Aziz meeting with Mrs. Moore’s son as repeating the traumatic cycle of the novel’s “Mosque, caves, mosque, caves” (349), the novel brings readers to a hint at his new relationship with the English. In spite of the narrator’s insertion of the statement “Never be friends with the English!” (349), Aziz hands “the magic ointment” (349) to Ralph Moore to treat his bee-stings. In spite of Aziz’s first unkindness to Ralph Moore, he brings new dimensions to his contact with the English, “focusing his heart on something more distant than the caves, something beautiful” (349). Forster symbolically represents the new dimension of Aziz’s relationship with the English by adding the last section entitled “Temple.” If Aziz’s previous experience revolves around the cycle of mosque and caves as the novel’s early two sections of the same names show, the Hindu festival in the last section “Temple” symbolizes the reconciliation between Aziz and his English friends. Both Aziz and Fielding are declaring that “the Marabar is wiped out” (356), and Aziz expresses his forgiving Adela by writing in his letter to her that he connects Adela with “the name that is very sacred in my mind, namely, Mrs. Moore” (359), who he calls his “best friend in all the world” (350). A Passage to India shares with other novels that I examine in previous chapters its question of how English national identity is recounted in its relation to its cultural others, and Forster adds his emphasis of the ideal of pursuing knowledge of others without suppressing different perspectives.

1 Kieran Dolin in Fiction and the Law writes that “Sensory perceptions are distorted in the cave, and, deprived of this basis of knowledge, the foreign visitors are assailed by latent fears and repressed doubts” (188).

2 Sara Suleri notes that in A Passage to India both sublime and picturesque representations of the colonial encounter are collapsed into a revision in which “geography assumes the characteristics of a hollow
symbolic space upon which the limits of imperial intimacy can both be identified and articulated” (*The Rhetoric of English India* 144).

3 Armstrong writes on the novel’s ambivalence that “*A Passage to India* presents a clear, unequivocal image of its ideal of knowledge, but it does so negatively, in a way those questions it even while affirming it. The ideal is a respectful understanding of others which acknowledges their right to speak for themselves and which does not subordinate them to one’s own interests and purposes.” Reading India: E. M. Forster and the Politics of Interpretation.” *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Winter, 1992), 367.


5 Brantlinger notes that “Awareness of the ultimate result of the Mutiny—perhaps “an eternity of division and mutual hate” or perhaps, as Marx thought, the bonding together of forces that would eventually overthrow British rule—lies at the center of E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924). Following Miss Quested’s charge of sexual assault against Dr. Aziz, the Mutiny becomes the touchstone by which several of Forster’s English characters try to comprehend what they see as a new revelation of Indian criminality.” *Rule of Darkness*, 223.

6 Sharpe discusses the British army’s massacre of unarmed Indians at Amritsar in 1919 and notes that opposing interpretations of the Amritsar Massacre reflect the struggle over the meaning of the 1857 Mutiny. As Sharpe puts it, “For Indians, the name of Amritsar was synonymous with massacre much in the same way that Cawnpore resonated among Europeans with the slaughter of innocents” (114). In other words, while British historiography tends to treat General Dyer’s order to fire on unarmed Indian protesters as “singular and sinister” (114), for Indians, the Amritsar Massacre demonstrates barbarism of the English colonizers and thus betrays the falsity of their civilization mission discourse.

7 Sharpe points out that feminist criticism of the novel fail to “address the historical production of the category of rape within a system of colonial relations” (Allegories of Empire 120). Shape finds “Forster’s presentation of the alleged rape within the frame of 1857” as “the license to read his novel as a critical intervention in a discourse that codes anticolonial struggle as the violation of white women” (130), and she therefore take the frame of the 1857 Mutiny as “the license to read [Forster’s] novel as a critical intervention in a discourse that codes anticolonial rebellion as the assault of English women” (123).

8 Sharpe also notes that colonial relations between England and India made it possible to code “anticolonial struggle as the violation of white women” (130), and she therefore take the frame of the 1857 Mutiny as “the license to read [Forster’s] novel as a critical intervention in a discourse that codes anticolonial rebellion as the assault of English women” (123).

9 Brantlinger also sees the Mutiny not as the cause of but as a realization of the gulf between England and India: “As Forster knew, it was not just the Mutiny that fixed the great gulf between Aziz and Fielding. The Mutiny itself, like Miss Quested’s hysteria in the Marabar Cave, was only a revelation that the gulf existed. Forster was sadly conscious that imperialism, economic exploitation, racism, and religious prejudice made friendship between nations as between individuals impossible” (*Rule of Darkness* 223-4).

10 Paul B. Armstrong finds in Fielding “the moral and political norm implied by intersubjectivity.” Armstrong writes that this “ideal of justice based on consensus” is embodied in “Fielding’s exemplary courage, compassion, and commitment to truth in allying himself with Aziz and his Indian friends against the prejudices of British authority” (376).

11 “Minute on Indian Education” in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Eight Edition. Volume E. p. 1610. As this anthology provides in its footnote, “the Arabic” is actually Persian, “the language (written in Arabic script) of the Mogul dynasty that had ruled much of India since the 16th century” (1610).

12 Mahatma Gandhi gave the untouchable the name of harijans (meaning “children of God”) in his attempt to bring them under the Indian nation. See Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire*, 131.


15 Adela and Ronny remind us of Kurtz and his Intended in Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* who symbolizes the dark knowledge of European self that the darkness lies not in Africa but in the heart of the Europeans. Adela is, however, different from Kurtz’s fiancée in that Adela unlearns English myth of superiority and their noble mission in India. While Kurtz’s intended remains in European delusions of their
noble calling of colonialism, Adela sees for herself what the Anglo-Indians do in India in the name of civilization and she becomes disillusioned about colonial mission. Adela at least sees “sides of [Ronny’s] character that she had never admired such as “his self-complacency, his censoriousness, his lack of subtlety” (85).

16 Jenny Sharpe points out the colonial relations as the primary context of the novel’s discourse of rape: “the loving glance that fixes the punkah wallah as a figure of truth and beauty is itself in place because of colonialism. And it is a sign of the vast distance between the European and the lowly untouchable that the latter can only be the object of a Western gaze.” Allegories of Empire, 134. Sara Suleri notes that “in Forster’s narrative, the untouchable no longer refers to caste alone, but is extended to include an embodiment of homosexual desire,” by reading the punkah wallah “as a synecdoche for the troubling aesthetic posed by the colonized male racial body” (The Rhetoric of English India 135).

17 Peperzak quotes Emmanuel Levinas’s En Decouvrant l’existence avec Husserl et Heidegger, 173.

18 Benita Parry, a postcolonial critic, in Delusions and Discoveries also reads A Passage to India by focusing on the Anglo-Indians’ delusion that their mission in India is a noble calling. Parry notes that “The climactic passages of A Passage to India are those where the modes of cognition to which the British protagonists adhere are challenged by visitations of mystical illumination or startled into a state of pathological fear, both induced by their displacement in India and nescience of India” (227).

19 Paul B. Armstrong’s “Reading India: E. M. Forster and the Politics of Interpretation” discusses this epistemological ambiguities in A Passage to India by focusing on the novel’s concerns with point of view and the conflicts of interpretation of different cultures.

20 Kieran Dolin also reads the Hindu festival in the last section “Temple” as “a rite of passage, to the Otherworld of communion with infinite love” that “catalyses the reconciliation of Aziz and Fielding and restores to the plot the hope of change” (190-191).
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