THE DOLL OF ENGLISH FICTION:
HARDY, ZOLA AND THE POLITICS OF CONVENTION

By

Donald Mason

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
October 1993

McMaster University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1993) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(English) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Doll of English Fiction: Hardy, Zola and the Politics of Convention

AUTHOR: Donald Mason, B.A. (University of Victoria)
M.A. (University of Victoria)

SUPERVISOR: Professor John Ferns

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 242

THE DOLL OF ENGLISH FICTION:
HARDY, ZOLA AND THE POLITICS OF CONVENTION

Abstract

This thesis presents a detailed textual and contextual study of Thomas Hardy as reader of Emile Zola. At the centre of the discussion is George Moore's metaphor for the novel as an inanimate "doll"--a child-like object of sexless simplicity, the political and economic offspring of social convention, variously violated at the hands of its keepers and its readers (Literature at Nurse, 1885). Hardy's own attempts to demolish "the doll of English fiction" and to create a more "virile" type of novel are viewed in the context of his reading of Zola and in relation to the controversy surrounding Henry Vizetelly, Zola's English publisher, who was convicted on charges of obscene libel in 1888 and 1889.

Hardy's reading of Zola came, it is argued, at a particularly critical point in his career and was, in some respects, crucial in determining the tone, imagery and form of the later novels. Nevertheless, his reading of Zola was not, of course, an exclusive factor in determining Hardy's changing emphasis throughout the period, but rather was one of a number of determining factors. The purpose, then, is to provide a detailed context for Hardy's readership, and to

then examine the relationship between Zola and the body of Hardy's work in the decade between 1886 and 1896, or from the writing of The Woodlanders (1887) to the publication of Jude the Obscure (1896). The metaphorical doll, representing, in part, the surrounding system of the English novel, of the gendered reader and the socially, politically and economically driven construction of a prescribed morality, provides a constant framework within which to view Hardy's reading of Zola and the writing of his later fiction.

Acknowledgements

In the course of researching and writing this thesis I have had the pleasure of working with, either directly or by correspondence, the following individuals and institutions: Professor John Ferns supervised the project with patience, learning and generosity, knowing just when to offer critical direction and when to offer simple encouragement and support, and to Dr. Ferns I owe my lasting admiration and respect; Professor Maqbool Aziz has offered a wide range of useful commentary throughout the process, and I am particularly grateful to Dr. Aziz for his insistence on scholarship at an early stage of the writing; Professor Owen Morgan has given freely of his considerable expertise on matters relating to Zola, graciously supplying me with documents and information, and patiently assisting in matters of translation; Professor Michael Millgate of the University of Toronto has graciously answered my many queries, generously supplying me with documents and direction, and thereby adding greatly to the specific framework of the thesis; Mr. David Holmes supplied me with copies of the sale catalogues of Hardy's library; Professor Lennart Björk of the University of Göteburg answered queries on Hardy's reading; Professor Simon Curtis of the University of Manchester has generously supplied information and insights on the Vizetellys; Ms. Chantal Morel of the English Zola Society has been an enthusiastic supporter of the project; Mr. Roger Peers of the Dorset County Museum was most helpful in assisting my research, as were the members of staff at the Firestone Library, Princeton. Various friends and colleagues have also offered their insights and encouragement, and I would particularly like to thank Dr. Lorraine Kooistra, Anne Garton, Rob Alexander, Barbara Maclean, Lyndsay Lock, Dr. Irene Gammel and Bob and Rosemary Nielsen. Portions of the thesis have appeared in altered form in The Thomas Hardy Journal and the Bulletin of the Emile Zola Society, and I would like to thank Professor Norman Page and Mr. Graham King respectively for their editorial comments and suggestions. I would also like to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Graduate School at McMaster University, and of the Social Science and Humanities Council of Canada. Finally, I would like to thank my family, particularly my parents, for their continued encouragement and support.

Contents

Abbreviations viii

Maggie's Doll: Image and Introduction 1

History and Hardy: Reading Zola in Context 8

On Descending into Hell: The Political Positioning of the Novel in the Nineties 71

Text and Context: Colour, Texture, Symbol and Sexuality in Tess and The Woodlanders 108

On Obscurity, Dreams and Rude Awakenings: From Church Spires to Cabbage Leaves and 'Pizzles' and Pigs 149

Conclusion 184

Appendix A: Victorian Translations of Zola 188

Appendix B: Vizetelly & Co. Publications (1880-1891) 191

Appendix C: Extracts from Hardy's Notebooks 203

Appendix D: Memorial to the Right Hon. Henry Matthews 206

Appendix E: Appeal to the Royal Literary Fund on behalf of Henry Vizetelly (1891) 211

Notes 214

Works Cited or Consulted 228

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AM	Emile Zola, Abbé Mouret's Transgression (London: Vizetelly & Co., 1885).
CL	Richard L. Purdy and Michael Millgate, eds., The Collected Letters of Thomas Hardy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-88). 7 vols.
CP	James Gibson, ed., The Complete Poems of Thomas Hardy (London: Macmillan, 1976).
Colburn 1	W. E. Colburn, Zola in England, 1883-1903 (Diss. University of Illinois, 1952).
Colburn 2	W. E. Colburn, "The Vizetelly Extracts," Princeton University Library Chronicle 23 (1962): 54-9.
EZ	Ernest Alfred Vizetelly, Emile Zola. Novelist and Reformer (1904. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971).
Jauss	Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," New Directions in Literary History (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974).
JO	Thomas Hardy, Jude the Obscure (London: Osgood, McIlvaine, 1896).
LN	Lennart A. Björk, ed., The Literary Notebooks of Thomas Hardy (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985). 2 vols.
LW	Michael Millgate, ed., The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984).
Millgate 1	Michael Millgate, Thomas Hardy: A Biography (1982. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985).
Millgate 2	Michael Millgate, Thomas Hardy: His Career as a Novelist (London: Bodley Head, 1971).
Newton	William Newton, "Hardy and the Naturalists: Their Use of Physiology," Modern Philology 49 (1951): 28-41.
NF	David Baguley, Naturalist Fiction (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).
PW	Harold Orel, ed., Thomas Hardy's Personal Writings (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1966).
TD	Thomas Hardy, Tess of the d'Urbervilles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983). Ed. Juliet Grindle and Simon Gatrell.
THSR	Thomas Hardy Society Review.
WL	Thomas Hardy, The Woodlanders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981). Ed. Dale Kramer.

Maggie's Doll: Image and Introduction

In George Eliot's The Mill on the Floss (1860), Maggie Tulliver has a Fetish--not a fetish in the sexual sense, but rather a large wooden doll "defaced by a long career of vicarious suffering" (28). On wet days and on days of ill-humour, Maggie retreats to the great attic beneath the high-pitched roof, sometimes, when especially out of sorts, to drive a nail through the doll's head, but more often simply to "alternately [grind] and [beat] the wooden head against the rough brick of the great chimneys" (28). At times, the Fetish is made to represent a specific adversary, but often Maggie's anger appears to be of a more general nature, a reaction to a particular mood or incident no doubt, but emanating from a long (for so young a child) history of frustrated experience. What Maggie seems to be attacking, in the larger sense, is the convention of dollhood itself, the way in which the female is constructed by education and social upbringing. It is not, of course, the doll that provokes Maggie's anger but, more particularly, the idea of dollhood: the wearing of curls, the neatly folded linen, the doll-like education of her childhood and younger years. The Fetish, in short, represents Maggie's revolt against the conventions of her childhood, and the image of the doll, riven through with nails, and roughly defaced by the scrapes and blows, will form an important point of reference in the pages that follow. The concern, then, is not so much with Maggie Tulliver herself, but rather with Maggie's doll as an image of an inanimate object--perhaps not entirely without sexual overtones--that becomes the subject of a sometimes violent abuse.

The convention of the doll in Eliot's novel is only indirectly, but nevertheless importantly, connected to the question of readership--of what Maggie can or cannot read. Maggie, of course, reads the wrong books, and at an early point in the novel is reprimanded for having in her possession a copy of Daniel Defoe's A History of the Devil (18). Some thirty years after the publication of The Mill on the Floss, in an essay on "Candour in English Fiction," a contribution to a symposium in the New Review (January 1890: 6-21),[1] E. Lynn Linton argued in favour of the "locked bookcase" (14), of a literature for (particularly female) Young Persons and another for (particularly male) Adults:

> In olden days, and I should imagine in all well-ordered houses still, the literature which

> was meant for men was kept on certain prohibited bookshelves of the library, or in the locked bookcase for greater security. The Young Person was warned off these shelves. If her discretion was not to be trusted and her word of honour was only a shaky security, the locked bookcase made all safe. (13)

Directly related to the convention of the locked bookcase was the controlling system of novel production and distribution in Victorian England, what George Moore and Thomas Hardy would later refer to in terms of a metaphorical doll. "Literature," writes Moore, "is now rocked to an ignoble rest in the motherly arms of the librarian":[2]

> That of which he approves is fed with gold; that from which he turns the breast dies like a vagrant's child; while in and out of his voluminous skirts runs a motley and monstrous progeny, a callow, a whining, a puking brood of bastard bantlings, a race of Aztecs that disgrace the intelligence of the English nation. (Literature at Nurse, or Circulating Morals; reprinted in Greiner and Stilz 152)

Leaving aside, for the moment, the interesting inversion of sex roles, of the male librarian giving suck to the petulant child/book, Moore's satire turns on the egocentric concept of nationhood--of an England somehow lowered to a state of foreign barbarism. For Hardy, the endeavour to demolish "the doll of English fiction" ("To H. W. Massingham," 31 December 1891) also involved, though in a more positive sense, a looking outward from the domestic situation, a need

to compare the system of the novel in England to a foreign counterpart, not, as with Moore, to a race of "barbarous" Aztecs, but rather to the situation of literature in modern France.

Hardy's complex reaction to the writings of Emile Zola, particularly as mediated through the process of translation and re-presentation within the English market, provides the central focus for the present study, moving from context to text, from reading to writing. According to Hans Robert Jauss, author, community and subject, work, audience and new work, combine in "the form of a dialogue as well as a process . . . which can be understood in the relationship of message and receiver as well as in the relationship of question and answer, problem and solution" (Jauss 12). The historical moment of reception, for Jauss, is to be reconstructed from "within the definable frame of reference of the reader's [in this case Hardy's] expectations" (15), but in the present case, in the case of Hardy's reading of Zola, the process is very much a dynamic one, as both the subject (Zola) and the receiver (Hardy), as contemporaries, are, in a sense, unstable entities, continually and simultaneously involved in a process of individual evolution. Moreover, "the definable frame of reference of

the reader's expectations," governed, to some extent, by the shifting modes of literary production and distribution in the period, is complicated here by the legal and political context of debate--that Zola's English publisher was imprisoned for his translations of Zola is a consideration that affected not simply the expectations of the reader, but that also, importantly, brought into focus the socially and politically defined arena of literary discourse itself. To the English reader, Zola not only fundamentally and radically confronted the moral and aesthetic presuppositions and prescriptions of his contemporary audience, he also, through the offices of his English publisher, indirectly affected the ways in which the novel was materially produced and received by its English audience. By, then, reconstructing the historical moment of reception of Zola's work in England through the evolving literary consciousness of Hardy and a number of his contemporaries, this study will examine an important literary, legal and political context for what may be described as Hardy's major dilemma in his final years as a writer of fiction: how can the novelist attempt to describe complex moral issues with any degree of frankness when frankness is a crime punishable by imprisonment in the English courts of law?

It is important to note that in looking at Hardy in relation to Zola, this study will necessarily work within a specific framework, a type of evolving dialogue between Zola as subject and Hardy as both reader and writer. The purpose of the limited framework is not to over-emphasize Zola's importance to Hardy, or to exclude the importance of other writers to his work, but rather simply to provide a detailed examination of Zola as an important presence in the wider discussion of Hardy's evolving literary consciousness. Certainly, Hardy's reading of Zola came at a particularly critical point in his career and was, it will be argued, in some respects crucial in determining the tone, imagery and form of the later novels. Nevertheless, his reading of Zola was not, of course, an exclusive factor in determining his changing emphasis throughout the period, but was rather one of a number of determining factors. The purpose, then, is to provide a context for Hardy's readership, and to then examine the relationship between Zola and the body of Hardy's work in the decade between 1886 and 1896, or from the writing of The Woodlanders (1887) to the publication of Jude the Obscure (1896). The metaphorical dollhouse, the doll that is Maggie's Fetish, representing, in part, the surrounding system of the English novel, of the gendered reader and the socially, politically and economically driven

construction of a prescribed morality, will provide a constant framework from within which to view Hardy's reading of Zola and the writing of his later fiction.

History and Hardy: Reading Zola in Context

In his copy of F. A. Hedgcock's Thomas Hardy, penseur et artiste (1911), Hardy noted that "what was afterwards called Zolaism appeared in Desperate R. 1871, (before Zola had written) + the novel was slated on account of these features."[1] Although Zola actually published his fifth novel, La Fortune des Rougon, in 1871, Hardy's comment, though incorrect, is understandable, in that Zola did not begin to become generally known in England until after the publication of L'Assommoir in 1877. Hardy's note appears opposite the following passage:

> C'est qu'entre 1870 et 1880 le développement de l'école naturaliste française et le retentissement de ses oeuvres à l'étranger avaient enhardi les romanciers anglais à élargir leur propre cadre et à se composer une palette plus vigoureuse, avec la confiance que, par comparaison avec les tons criards du nouveau réalisme, leurs tableaux paraîtraient d'une douceur virginale. (474)
>
> * * *
>
> Between 1870 and 1880, the development of the French naturalist school and the repercussions of their works abroad had encouraged the English novelists to enlarge their own framework and to adopt a more vigorous palette for their work, with the trust that, by comparison with the garish tones of the new realism, their own work would appear to have a virginal gentleness.[2]

For the most part, Hardy's annotations to Hedgcock centre upon the more conspicuously biographical sections of the book, but there are also a number of further objections throughout to the discussions of Hardy in relation to his French contemporaries. "Mr Hardy had never read 'Mme. Bovary,' or a word of Flaubert, when he wrote the 'Return of the N.'" Hardy noted on page 122. A further annotation to page 61 reads "viz: 'Zolaism,' 'naturalism,' i.e. The book [Desperate Remedies] was trounced in some reviews, particularly The Spectator, on account of this." The Spectator review (22 April 1871; reprinted in R. G. Cox, Thomas Hardy, The Critical Heritage, 3-5) remarked on the low moral tone and coarse humour of Desperate Remedies, adding: "Here are no fine characters, no original ones to extend one's knowledge of human nature, no display of passion except of the brute kind, no pictures of Christian virtue . . . " (Cox 3). The anonymous reviewer's suggestions of brutality, immorality, coarseness and base characterization, so common to much of contemporary Zola criticism, appear to have prompted Hardy to compare the critical reception of Desperate Remedies to the reception of Zola's later work, and this seems important for two reasons: not only does Hardy's argument suggest a common critical ground between his early fiction (and it is probable that he

was also thinking of the earlier critical responses to The Poor Man and the Lady here) and what later came to be known as "Zolaism," but his argument also appears to reinforce a certain circular continuity in the critical perceptions of his work, linking the later, more openly controversial novels, which were directly criticized for their Zola-like tendencies, with his earliest attempts at fiction.

Although Hardy's first novel remained unpublished, The Poor Man and the Lady, written in 1867-8, received a fair amount of critical attention from its readers at Macmillan & Co. Alexander Macmillan's comments on The Poor Man and the Lady in his letter of August 10, 1868, though familiar enough to readers of the Hardy biographies, are nevertheless worth reviewing in terms of Hardy's comments on the Zola-like reception of Desperate Remedies:

> Your pictures of character among Londoners, and especially the upper classes, are sharp, clear, incisive, and in many respects true, but they are wholly dark--not a ray of light visible to relieve the darkness, and therefore exaggerated and untrue . . . . Your chastisement would fall harmless from its very excess . . . . You seem in grim earnest . . . . Is it within the range of likelihood that *any* gentleman would pursue his wife at midnight and *strike* her? (Morgan 88-90)

Wholly dark, exaggerated, excessive, in grim earnest, violent. Macmillan's comments, when taken individually,

seem perhaps better suited to Zola's Germinal or L'Assommoir than to any of Hardy's extant writings, with the possible exception of Jude the Obscure. John Morley, who read both The Poor Man and the Lady and Desperate Remedies for Macmillan, commented that The Poor Man and the Lady shows "a certain rawness of absurdity that is very displeasing" (Morgan 88) and that Desperate Remedies "shows power--at present of a violent and undisciplined kind" (Morgan 94). Morley added that the author "has evidently a true artistic feeling, if it is somewhat in excess the feeling of a realist" (Morgan 97).

When read in isolation, the combined effect of the Macmillan/Morley commentaries certainly seems to justify Hardy's assertion that his early fiction was criticized, to some extent, on Zola-like grounds. Later, when a reviewer came to remark that Tess of the d'Urbervilles (1891) was "coloured throughout with Zolaism" (The Guardian, 27 January 1892) or when R. Y. Tyrrell wrote that "Mr. Hardy has long been creeping nearer and nearer to the fruit which has been so profitable to [Zola]" (Fortnightly Review, June 1896; reprinted in Cox 291-9), Hardy could look back to the critical reception of his early work and remark, quite rightly, that his later work represented in part a natural development of certain strands of thought that were already

present in his early fiction, which had, to all intents and purposes, pre-dated Zola's presence on the English scene.

One of the curious things about Hardy's marginal comments to the Hedgcock book is how they seem either to ignore or to discount one of the two main objects of Hedgcock's study, clearly stated in the preface to the book, which was to correct the fallacy that Hardy was *"un romancier naturaliste, presque un disciple de Zola"* (vii). Even though Hardy seems not to have actually read the book from beginning to end, the number of notes throughout would suggest that he spent a considerable amount of time in responding to its contents. Hedgcock's argument concerning Zola seems simple enough, and describes two major similarities between the two men's work: a similarity in their treatment of sexuality--*"Naturaliste en philosophie, [Hardy] l'est . . . mais son naturalisme se concentre autour d'un seul point: la question sexuelle"* (476)--and a common insistence on the need to break down the conventional restrictions imposed upon the novelist. Although Hedgcock concludes by aligning Hardy with his *"confrères continentaux"* (474), he nevertheless insists that Hardy was effectively independent of the French naturalists, as the seeds of his opposition to the dominant conventions of the

English novel were already present in his first published work (475).

Eventually Hardy managed to effectively put a stop to a proposed English translation of Hedgcock's study,[3] although his opposition to the book's publication in England seems again to have been based primarily on the author's "misleading and invidious--and mostly incorrect" use of biographical material (annotation to page 19), and on the conjectural nature of its biographical inferences, rather than on the comments that pertained directly to Zola. Nevertheless, particularly as Hardy supplied Vere Collins, the proposed translator of the book, with a copy of his annotations, it seems fair to include the Zola material in Hardy's more general opposition to an English version of the book. In a letter to Collins, Hardy stated that he "disapproves of [the book's] publication in England as it stands" and that he could not "consider the question of your publishing a translation at all, unless on an undertaking that these pseudo-biographical analyses are omitted, and, generally speaking, most of the personal matter except a few necessary data" (24 June 1922). In a further letter the following week, Hardy reiterated his position, and reinforced his "passive" disapproval of the project (2 July 1922).

Undoubtedly, as Hardy was quick to point out, the idea of examining one author's work in relation to another's demands a close attention to the question of dating and documenting the readership. Although, as William Newton has remarked, "Hardy's career as a novelist was almost exactly contemporaneous with the rise, flowering, and fading of French naturalism" (Newton 29)--both Hardy and Zola were, in fact, born in 1840--this does not mean that Hardy was in reality conversant with either Zola's works or the major tenets of naturalism from the beginning of his career. Particularly as Hardy's reading of Zola seems to have been largely dependent upon the English translations of Zola's novels, the basic time-frame of Hardy's readership needs to be altered (in some cases by a period of five to ten years, depending upon the text) to accord with the English publication of Zola, and this is a point that has been the source of much critical confusion.

Newton himself, in his two early, important articles on "Chance as Employed by Hardy and the Naturalists" (Philological Quarterly 30 [1951]: 154-75) and "Hardy and the Naturalists: Their Use of Physiology" (Modern Philology 49 [1951]: 28-41), compares the two authors on the broad basis of their works, referring widely to the French-language texts of Zola's novels, without regard for which of

Zola's works Hardy may actually have read, and when and in what language he might have read them. In particular, because Newton is referring to naturalism in general, rather than to the specific books by Zola that Hardy is known either to have owned or to have read, there is a tendency to use Zola's name and the term naturalism interchangeably, and to treat the writers of the naturalist school as if they represented an almost completely stable and homogeneous body of work. As Newton's articles centre directly on two central thematic concerns common to much of naturalist writing, chance, an ambiguous term that conceivably includes both Hardyesque fate and naturalistic determination, and the use of physiology, "the explaining of man's behavior in terms of his bodily organization" (Newton 30), the emphasis on a stable body of naturalistic thought works well enough for Newton's purposes. As David Baguley has suggested, "the principal factor of unity in naturalist fiction . . . is thematic" (NF 7). Yet, significantly, Hardy's own collection of Zola was unusually diverse, and suggests a much broader range and treatment of subject than Newton would seem to allow. As Hardy himself argued in "The Science of Fiction" (1891), Zola's fiction is in many ways in conflict with what Hardy perceived as a unified theory of naturalistic representation, and this seems particularly

important for Hardy, who appears to have consciously and continually avoided anything that would approach a systematic and stable philosophy in his own work.

In his 1903 preface to The Dynasts, Hardy wrote that the "Spirits" or "Phantom Intelligences" in that work, which seem, on the surface, to provide the closest approximation to a consistent philosophy that Hardy would ever come to in his writing, were "intended to be taken by the reader for what they may be worth as contrivances of the fancy merely. Their doctrines are but tentative, and are advanced with little eye to a systematized philosophy . . . " (viii-ix). Hardy's emphasis as a writer, it is suggested, seems to have been continually on "instinct," an ambiguous and, in some ways, discontinuous way of seeing the world, rather than on "theory," with its tendency to formulate, to unify and to systematize, and it seems reasonable to extend this emphasis on instinct rather than theory from Hardy the writer to Hardy the reader. The present study, then, concentrates on Hardy as reader of specific individual texts, rather than attempting to place him, in any sophisticated manner, within the much broader framework of naturalist theory.

A second and very different example of the type of critical confusion that has surrounded the question of

Hardy's relation to Zola is Martin Seymour-Smith's 1978 introduction to the Penguin edition of The Mayor of Casterbridge (1886). Seymour-Smith discusses Zola at some length in relation to Hardy's novel, even going so far as to definitely state that the two men actually met, when it is doubtful that Hardy had more than the slightest familiarity with Zola's work before writing The Mayor of Casterbridge, and it is certain that Hardy and Zola never met.

The Mayor of Casterbridge was written between 1884 and 17 April 1885 (see Gatrell 231-2); although Hardy owned an 1884 French-language copy of La Joie de vivre, the first concrete evidence of him actually reading Zola comes in 1886 or 1887 (see LN 2: 57l). The only reference to Hardy and Zola meeting comes in 1893, when Hardy wrote to Florence Henniker: "My address will be here [Max Gate] till Wedny, possibly Thursday, morng when we go to London, I to meet Zola" (22 September 1893). In recognition of the completion of the Rougon-Macquart series, the Authors' Club was hosting a dinner for Zola at the Hotel Metropole in London on 28 September 1893, but in a note to the above letter (not published when Seymour-Smith wrote his introduction) the editors of Hardy's letters state that "TH did not in fact attend the Authors' Club dinner in honour of Emile Zola" (CL 2: 34). A further note in The World for 4 October 1893,

quoted in CL, "regretted TH's failure to appear at the Zola dinner in that he 'thus deprived his fellow-writers of a fine opportunity of mentally comparing the author of Tess with the author of Nana'" (CL 2: 34). Again, in 1897, regarding a proposed book on anti-vivisection, Hardy wrote to Florence Henniker: "I have thought over your request about Zola. I would not mind asking him, even though I don't know him . . . " (19 February 1897). Zola's only other stay in England was in 1898-9, when he spent eleven months in hiding following his default before arrest resulting from his conviction in connection with the publication of "J'accuse." Zola's diary for the period, later published as Pages d'exil (1964), contains no reference to Hardy. Neither does E. A. Vizetelly's With Zola in England (1899), and Vizetelly was extremely conscientious in noting the few people that Zola came into contact with--excepting, for the sake of discretion, Zola's mistress, Jeanne Rozerot, and his two children by her. In accounts of Hardy's own continental excursions, again no mention of any meeting with Zola appears. Seymour-Smith seems, then, to have taken his information from the letter of 22 September 1893, without confirming that the meeting actually took place. In Thomas Hardy: His Life and Friends (1992), F. B. Pinion suggests that Hardy's "failure to

attend the Author's Club dinner in Zola's honour . . . was probably due to [Emma Hardy's] intervention" (249), citing Emma's disapproval of the French writer in a letter to Rebekah Owen some years later (19 February 1897). While this could well have been the case--and no other alternative suggestion is offered here--there appears to be no direct evidence to substantiate Pinion's argument.

As William Newton noted as early as 1951, "it is evident that the problem of Hardy's relation to French naturalism now stands in a state of considerable confusion, owing in the main to the great number of fragmentary and unsupported assertions already on record" (Newton 28). Newton himself has done much to clarify the situation, but in so doing has also added to the confusion by his underlying assumptions about the extent and nature of Hardy's reading in Zola. The following analysis, then, provides a more detailed historical framework for the textual interpretations in the chapters that follow.

The history of Zola's publication in England is complex, and the discussion here will be confined to those points that relate directly to Hardy's reading of Zola.[4] Between 1878 and 1882, the only translations of Zola available in England were those of American origin. As E.

A. Vizetelly relates, "some American translations are ably done--that is well known--but the [Zola translations] were for the most part ridiculous, full of errors, and so defaced by excisions and alterations as to give no idea what the books might be like in French" (EZ 242-3). By 1880, there were American translations of nine of Zola's novels in print,[5] although it is unlikely that all of these were made available to the English reader at the time. It was not until 1883 that Tinsley Brothers, who also, coincidentally, were the first to introduce Hardy to the English public, published the first British translation of Zola, issuing an edition of Au Bonheur des dames (The Ladies' Paradise) in the standard three-decker form.

As Nigel Cross relates in The Common Writer (1985), Tinsley Brothers had gathered together a group of so-called Bohemian writers in the 1860s and 70s which included George Augustus Sala (who later published with Vizetelly & Co., Zola's English publisher), Edmund Yates and Blanchard Jerrold. "Their early commercial success was built upon Mary Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret (1862), and among their commercial failures were three novels [Desperate Remedies (1871), Under the Greenwood Tree (1872) and A Pair of Blue Eyes (1873)] by the young Thomas Hardy" (Cross 101). Another writer to have his first novel published with

Tinsley Brothers was George Moore, whose A Modern Lover appeared in 1883. The sales of Moore's first novel were generally poor due to the coolness of the circulating libraries and he published his next novel, A Mummer's Wife, with Vizetelly & Co. in 1884. In the same year that Tinsley Brothers published A Modern Lover (1883), they also published their translation of Zola's Au Bonheur des dames. For the firm, which appears to have been continually short of capital, 1883 seems to have been a particularly bad year --not only were Moore and Zola both poor sellers, but the firm also suffered a fire in its warehouse (Colburn 1: 14)-- and the experiment of issuing Zola in three-decker form, which "brought no profit either to Zola or to Tinsley Brothers" (Downey 269), was never repeated.

The following year (1884) Vizetelly & Co., a small London publishing firm founded by Henry Vizetelly in 1880,[6] translated and issued a cheap, single-volume edition of Nana, followed shortly by a translation of L'Assommoir (entitled The "Assommoir": The Prelude to "Nana" in the Vizetelly edition). Nana and L'Assommoir, like all the Vizetelly editions of Zola, bore the inscription "A Realistic Novel" prominently displayed on their covers and spines in large, gilt lettering, and were illustrated with a series of sensational, tinted engravings from the

illustrated French editions.[7] Each novel was originally priced at 6s., which was later dropped to 5s., and finally to 3s. 6d., in comparison to the usual price of 31s. 6d. for a novel in the standard three-volume form. The initial sale of Zola, "although not rapid, was very complete", and by 1888 Vizetelly was able to list nineteen titles by Zola, noting that "we reckon it a bad week when the sale of our Zola translations falls below a thousand volumes" (Vizetelly, Pall Mall Gazette, 24 March 1888).

Although there had been attempts to establish a less expensive alternative to the three-decker form previously, Vizetelly's attempt had originated, on the surface at least, with George Moore, whose own novel, A Mummer's Wife, following the success of Nana and L'Assommoir, was issued in single-volume form in December 1884 (although the title page to the first edition is dated 1885). Moore, it seems, was in turn acting on advice from Zola who, following the publication of A Mummer's Wife and Moore's accompanying essay on "A New Censorship in Literature" (Pall Mall Gazette, 10 December 1884), wrote to say that Moore had become "the champion of truth in England" (25 January 1885):

> C'est un beau rôle que vous tiendrez vaillamment. Et c'est aussi excellent, ce que vous me racontez sur votre prompte

> victoire, au sujet de vos librairies circulantes; car je suis persuadé que ce mode de publication avait un effet considérable sur la douce niaiserie où était tombé le roman anglais. Maintenant que les auteurs sont libres de s'adresser au grand public, sans passer par les familles, vous allez voir les oeuvres prendre des audaces d'analyse.--C'est à vous que l'Angleterre devra son roman viril de demain.
>
> * * *
>
> It's a handsome role that you will play valiantly. And what you tell me about your swift victory on the subject of your circulating libraries is also excellent; because I am persuaded that this mode of publication has had a considerable effect in fostering the inanity that has fallen on the English novel. Now that authors are free to address the general public, without having to submit to the family, you will see works of original analysis.--It's to you that England will owe its virile novel of tomorrow.

Despite the early interest that Zola evidently took in Moore's career, and their common interest in the current means of publication and distribution of the novel in England, Moore's relationship with Zola never seems to have been more than that of disciple to master. On 12 January 1885, Moore wrote to Zola: *"Selon vos conseils j'ai attaqué notre système de librairie . . . . Le système est fini. Alors c'est à Médan qu'on arrange les choses littéraires du monde!"* ("According to your advice I have attacked our system of circulating libraries . . . . The system is finished. It's at Médan that the literary things of the world are arranged!"; quoted in Correspondance de Zola 5:

227n). Moore's deference to Zola and Zola's interest in the English system of publication and distribution are equally evident in an earlier letter from Moore to Zola in September of the previous year: "My novel [A Mummer's Wife] is finished . . . [and] it will be printed as a single volume, as you advised" (translated text quoted in Hone 105-6). As Madame Zola related to Barrett Clark in 1922, "There was never any real intimacy between my husband and Mr. Moore . . . . They had merely agreed to make each other's work known, the one in England, the other in France" (Hone 143).

The break between Moore and Zola began with the French publication of Moore's Confessions of a Young Man (1888) in which Moore satirizes and criticizes Zola (among others) and makes mock of naturalist principles, before beginning to align himself with the emerging symbolist movement. Speaking of Zola to Barrett Clark in 1922, Moore related:

> A clever man, but too damned thorough. I remember one evening he came to dinner at the home of La Valtesse, a famous cocotte . . . . Zola was collecting notes (my God, what masses of notes!) preparing to write Nana. He was in search of local colour. I don't think he felt at ease there, and evidently he had come for strictly scientific purposes; at any rate he scarcely looked at the woman, but asked at once to see her bedroom; and what do you think he wanted there? To measure it, get its exact dimensions! Good God! Art is a coquette, and Zola never knew it! (Hone 144)

Despite their later differences, both Moore and Zola did much to establish the single-volume novel in England and to lessen the moral and economic stranglehold of the circulating libraries, though Moore, in his initial enthusiasm, failed to recognize how deeply embedded the established conventions of production and distribution actually were. The system was not finished in 1885, as Moore had so boldy asserted, and the three-decker would continue to dominate the literary market-place for the next decade.

In Victorian Novelists and Publishers (1976), J. S. Sutherland details the various attempts to establish a viable alternative to the three-decker system throughout the century. In the end, relates Sutherland, "the three-decker seems to have been kept going all those years for the dullest of literary reasons--because it was commercially safe. The English publisher, as the Westminster noted (disapprovingly) in 1852, 'finds it easier and more profitable to sell 500 copies of a work at a guinea and a half per copy, than 5,000 at half a crown, or 50,000 at a shilling'. As well as being easier and profitable the system was also surer. Much of an edition's sale was cut and dried even before publication day" (15).

The three-decker novel was, then, according to Sutherland, "not only stable in itself but a source of general stability" (13). The prohibitive cost to the reader insured the continuance of the circulating libraries, which provided a source of economic stability, while the libraries in turn maintained a guardian-like role over the choice and treatment of subject, primarily through the imposition of economic pressure on the publishers, thereby providing a source of social, moral and artistic stability. Economics, morality and artistry seem, then, inevitably entwined in the Victorian system of book production and distribution--a point of which George Moore, for one, was distinctly aware. In Literature at Nurse, an expanded version of the earlier argument in "A New Censorship of Literature," Moore begins by consciously echoing the rhetorical invective of Zola's Mes Haines (1866):

> Although I am willing to laugh at you, Mr. Mudie,[8] to speak candidly, I hate you; and I love and am proud of my hate of you. It is the best thing about me. I hate you because you dare question the sacred right of the artist to obey the impulses of his temperament; I hate you because you are the great purveyor of the worthless, the false and the commonplace; I hate you because you are a fetter about the ankles of those who would press forward towards the light of truth . . . . (Greiner 149)

Moore continues to argue that English literature's traditional characteristics of "strength, virility, and purpose . . . [are] being gradually obliterated to suit the commercial needs of a narrow-minded tradesman [Mudie]" (150).

What is especially interesting about Moore's argument, and particularly pertinent to Hardy, is the central metaphor of the text as an inanimate doll, which seems to be the object of a strangely perverse sexual curiosity. In the following passage the library setting has been transformed into a nursery where the (male) nursery-maid/librarian first determines the sex of the doll/text before deciding if the "doll" is fit to be circulated in the family:

> Into this nursery none can enter except in baby clothes; and the task of discriminating between a divided skirt and a pair of trousers is performed by the librarian. Deftly his fingers lift skirt and under-skirt, and if the examination prove satisfactory the sometimes decently attired dolls are packed in tin-cornered boxes, and scattered through every drawing-room in the kingdom, to be in rocking-chairs fingered and fondled by the 'young person' until she longs for some newer fashion in literary frills and furbelows. (150)

The sex of the doll/text, as determined by the librarian, in turn determines its suitability to the reader. If the text is found to be "masculine," and therefore "virile," it is

presumably rejected, while if the text is considered "feminine," and therefore "innocent," it is free to be "fingered and fondled" by the (female) reader. The unmistakable undertones of paedophilia on the part of the librarian, and the lesbian-like relationship of reader and text, suggest a situation in which the restriction or denial of sexuality in literature appears to cultivate the growth of, what are, in Moore's terms, a series of seemingly darker and socially less desirable sexual interests. The situation, as Moore would have it, is perverse, and his sexual/textual metaphor is fraught with an underlying sense of personal frustration, as Moore, the male writer of supposedly virile texts, is made impotent by his inability to reach his intended audience. The doll, as Moore again suggests, seems doomed to perversity on either side of the library-counter.

Although it would take until 1890 for Hardy to publish his essay on "Candour in English Fiction," his response to the circulating libraries and to the system of periodical publication, Moore's essay, with its emphasis on "strength, virility, and purpose," and its central image of the "doll," seems, either directly or indirectly, to have provided Hardy with a familiar framework for developing his own argument. As Moore argues, and as Henry Vizetelly and Hardy himself

would later argue, "if the same test by which modern writers are judged were applied to their forefathers, three-fourths of the contents of our libraries would have to be considered as immoral publications" (Greiner 150-1).

Hardy's relationship with Moore, even more than that of Moore and Zola, was difficult at best, and almost hateful at worst. As Michael Millgate relates, "Moore's literary antagonism towards Hardy seems to have dated back at least as far as the publication of Esther Waters, just a year or two after that of Tess . . . . The more specifically personal enmity seems to have originated with Gosse telling Moore, some years previously, that Hardy had expressed a hope that he would not again encounter him at Gosse's house" (Millgate 1: 553n). Like Zola, Hardy had also suffered the sting of Moore's ridicule in The Confessions of a Young Man (1888), where Moore refers to Hardy's writing as "more pudding than . . . language" (196). The situation was no doubt further exacerbated in 1910 when Hardy suggested to John Lane that, in Lane's position, Hardy would withdraw Lane's translation of Hermann Sudermann's Das hohe Lied (The Song of Songs) rather than risk its suppression on grounds of obscenity. Moore then wrote to Hardy to argue in defense of the book's publication, and Hardy's rather careful response on the question of defending a book of dubious

merit on the grounds of literary freedom must have been particularly irksome to the often querulous Moore.[9]

Moore was later to refer to Hardy as "George Eliot's miscarriage" and to Tess of the d'Urbervilles as "that Tess book" (Hone 376). Moore's overtly hostile remarks on Hardy in Conversations in Ebury Street (1924), which Hardy looked upon as "obviously personal" ("To John Middleton Murry," 24 March 1924), presumably prompted Hardy to compose his "Epitaph for George Moore," inscribed on its envelope as having been "dictated by Hardy on his death-bed" (CP 971n).

Epitaph for George Moore

On one who thought no other could write such English as himself

> 'No mortal man beneath the sky
> Can write such English as I
> They say it holds no thought my own
> What then, such beauty (perfection) is not known.'
>
> Heap dustbins on him:
> They'll not meet
> The apex of his self conceit.

In August 1888, following a debate in the House of Commons on the subject of "pernicious literature," a police-court summons was issued against Henry Vizetelly in

connection with his publications of Zola's Nana, The Soil (La Terre) and Piping Hot! (Pot-Bouille). Criminal Court proceedings commenced in September, but the case against Vizetelly was postponed in order to allow the government, under the office of the Solicitor of the Treasury, to assume the prosecuting role from the National Vigilance Association, who had initiated the charge against Vizetelly, and the trial did not actually take place until 31 October 1888. Vizetelly was eventually fined £100 and was directed "to keep the peace and be of good behaviour for 12 months" (The Times, 1 November 1888). After his trial Vizetelly withdrew his entire list of Zola translations from publication and undertook a hurried revision of those titles not implicated in the first trial, deleting or modifying any passages that might be considered offensive. Some of the Zola volumes were then re-issued in their newly expurgated form (or rather further expurgated form, as the original translations had already been subject to varying degrees of editorial caution) in 1889. Summons were again issued, and Vizetelly was tried for a second time on 30 May 1889 on a charge of obscene libel with respect to his editions of Zola's Abbé Mouret's Transgression (La Faute de l'abbé Mouret), The Rush for the Spoil (La Curée), Fat and Thin (Le Ventre de Paris), His Excellency Eugène Rougon (Son

Excellence Eugène Rougon), How Jolly Life Is (La Joie de vivre), Paul Bourget's Love Crime (Un Crime d'amour) and Maupassant's Ladies' Man (Bel-Ami). This time the results were much more serious, and Vizetelly, now seventy years of age, was sentenced to three-months' imprisonment as a first-class misdemeanant. Although Vizetelly & Co. continued to issue new publications after Henry Vizetelly's release from prison at the end of August 1889, by the spring of 1891 Vizetelly was in "a state not merely of privation but of absolute destitution" (G. A. Sala, "To the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund," May 1891). Vizetelly himself clearly states his position in a second letter of appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1893:

> I am now 74 years of age & a permanent sufferer from an incurable internal complaint which periodically confines me to the house & necessitates my seeking medical advice. I have exhausted all my means & am behind hand with my rent & am unable to pay my doctor. My age & impaired eye-sight but more particularly the complaint from which I suffer interferes seriously with my obtaining literary or any other kind of employment . . . . (30 October 1893)

Vizetelly died, "after a final distressing illness" (EZ 299), on 1 January 1894.[10]

Following the imprisonment of Henry Vizetelly in the spring of 1889, English publishers were understandably wary

of Zola, and no new translations appeared until the fall of 1892. An article in The Times, which had appeared after the first Vizetelly trial, warned that in future, "any one who publishes translations of Zola's novels and works of similar character will do so at his peril, and must not expect to escape so easily as Mr. Vizetelly":

> The publication of cheap translations of the worst of Zola's novels is a grave offense against public morals . . . . After all, there is such a thing as public decency, and unquestionably the publication of a cheap English translation of La Terre is an outrage upon it. We cannot but rejoice, therefore, that Mr. Vizetelly has acknowledged his offense and been punished for it. (The Times, 1 November 1888)

Finally, in September 1892, William Heinemann issued a small volume of short stories, entitled The Attack on the Mill and other sketches of war, with an introductory essay by Edmund Gosse. Ironically, war seems to have been considered a safe subject for the English reader (La Débâcle was to be translated by E. A. Vizetelly the following year) and Gosse was careful to emphasize that the Zola of the present volume was "a much more optimistic, romantic, and gentle writer"--a Zola, in short, "on his best behaviour" (2). "Whenever M. Zola writes of war," Gosse adds, "he writes seriously and well" (28).

The Heinemann edition of The Attack on the Mill represents the first attempt in England to present Zola under an established imprint, introduced by a respected critic. In place of the sensational engravings that illustrated the covers of the Vizetelly editions of Zola, the cover of The Attack on the Mill was simply decorated with a pattern of feathered quills against a tan background, suggesting a combined effect of lightness and seriousness, an innocent (or non-brutal) treatment of the serious subject of war.

Some years later, in 1899, when Gosse was editing a popular series of translations from various authors under the general title "A Century of French Romance" (often reprinted as "A Library of French Masterpieces") for William Heinemann, Gosse was to suggest to Hardy that he write an essay on Zola, presumably as an introduction to La Débâcle, the Zola novel selected for the series. Hardy's response, characteristic for him at the time, is recorded below:

> My dear Gosse:
> I am much interested in your undertaking, & charmed by your way of telling me about it. But the question of my doing the essay devoted to Zola is disposed of without disturbing the belief I hope you cherish of my willingness to render you any personal service that lies in my power. On account of what I already have on hand, & am pledged to, I cannot possibly give the necessary time to the labour of such an essay--

> even if short--a labour which would be a serious one to me--absolutely inexperienced in criticism, & constitutionally uncritical. Indeed I question if I could do it, even if I had the time, & overcame my strong opinion that one novelist should not write on another except in eulogy--a tone I could not adopt towards Zola as a novelist--believing him no artist, but at bottom a man of affairs, who would just as soon have written twenty volumes of, say, the statistics of crime, or commerce, as of fiction--a passionate reformer, who has latterly found his vocation. (1 October 1899)

Although Hardy wrote a number of similar statements concerning Zola in the years following the publication of Jude the Obscure (1896), his comments here must certainly be read in the context of Zola's role in the Dreyfus affair ("J'accuse" had been published the previous year, in January 1898). A few months earlier, in July 1899, Hardy was asked by the editor of La Vogue to comment on the Dreyfus case (CL 2: 223), but declined, as he always did when asked to comment on a particular political situation. Hardy's apolitical position, which remained consistent throughout his career, is perhaps best summed up in a letter to Robert Pearce Edgcumbe in 1891: "The pursuit of what people are pleased to call Art so as to win unbiassed attention to it as such, absolutely forbids political action" (23 April 1891). As Michael Millgate notes, Hardy always felt that "he had to remain politically neutral and in a position to 'approach all classes of thinkers from an absolutely

unpledged point of view'" (Millgate 2: 181). Hardy's inclination, then, was "to disclaim any personal commitment to a particular viewpoint" (2: 177-8), whether philosophical or political, and given this position, it seems reasonable to suggest that Zola's role in the Dreyfus case, and the prominent position that he commanded in the press at the time, did much to lower Zola's standing as an artist in the eyes of the consistently apolitical Hardy. Hardy's anti-Zola statements, and the importance of their dates, will be discussed in greater detail in the pages to follow, but it is as well to introduce them here, to give a sense of Hardy's evolving understanding of Zola, both as an artist and as an activist.

Shortly after the appearance of the Heinemann edition of The Attack on the Mill, The Downfall (La Débâcle), the first of the Chatto & Windus translations of Zola, appeared, as translated and introduced by E. A. Vizetelly, Henry Vizetelly's son. Again, the emphasis was on establishing Zola as a serious author writing on a serious subject with a strong moral intent. The preface to The Downfall included passages from an interview with the author by Robert Sherard (who was also commissioned by Chatto & Windus to write a critical biography of Zola, which appeared the following

year) and was bound in an inoffensively decorated dark brown cloth cover (this time showing a pair of leafy branches, with the leaves presumably about to fall). La Débâcle was certainly an appropriate choice of novels to re-introduce Zola to an English audience, and Zola's critique of the French political and military authorities in La Débâcle suggests that there may well have been a marked political component to the favourable reception of the book abroad, both in England and in Germany.

In Emile Zola: A Bourgeois Rebel (1987), Alan Schom cites an interesting incident concerning a German edition of La Débâcle which was published in installments in 1900 and was being circulated, according to Maurice Barrès, "'to an extraordinarily large number of German readers. The work has appeared in twenty-five installments, each of them showing a German soldier throwing down a French flag-bearer, rolling him in the mud and about to bayonet him'" (247). When Zola was made aware of the illustration that was accompanying his book, he objected strenuously to the publishers that they were misrepresenting his work, and the illustration was eventually withdrawn. Although, of course, there is no direct correlation between the relationship of Germany and France in 1900 and that of England and France in 1892, this episode nevertheless underlines how distinctly

political a book La Débâcle actually was, and suggests that the favourable reception of Zola's novel abroad might well have been augmented by a form of national antagonism, especially in Germany and England, where anti-French sentiments, particularly directed against the French military and political authorities, were never quite unknown.

In England, the re-introduction of Zola to an English reading public was complicated by a number of issues, some political, some moral, some literary, and the situation was in some ways brought to a head with Zola's visit to England in 1893. As Hubert Crackanthorpe noted, "it is not so long since a publisher [Vizetelly] was sent to prison for issuing English translations of celebrated specimens of French realism; yet, only the other day, we vied with each other in doing honour to the chief figure-head of that tendency across the Channel . . ." ("Reticence in Literature," The Yellow Book, a selection 97). Although Clarence Decker has argued that there remained a strong element of anti-Zola criticism in the English press well after 1893 ("Zola's Literary Reputation in England," PMLA 49 [1934]: 1140-53), the positive reception of Zola in England in 1893 seems to have been favoured by three distinct factors: the completion of the Rougon-Macquart series (the last volume, Le Docteur

Pascal, was issued in English translation just shortly before Zola's visit) undoubtedly did much to solidify Zola's reputation by at last bringing the full scope of his undertaking clearly into view; the change of publishers from Vizetelly & Co. to Chatto & Windus appears to have brought Zola much more firmly within the realm of literary respectability; and the presentation and subject of La Débâcle, with its particular importance as an historical and political document, as well as its wide-spread acceptance in England, did much to distance the Zola of La Débâcle from the Zola of Nana, and to cast Zola's visit in something of the light of a visiting foreign dignitary. As Graham King has reported in his Garden of Zola (1978), the English edition of La Débâcle outsold even that of Nana, selling 229,000 copies by 1911 (King 427).

The movement towards respectability, towards presenting Zola in a form that would be more readily acceptable to his English audience, was not accomplished, however, by a simple change of cover and imprint. The content, too, had to change, or, at the very least, the expression of that content had to be modified to limit the risk of further controversy. As the son of a publisher who had been imprisoned just three years before for his English editions of Zola, E. A. Vizetelly was necessarily and acutely aware

of the limits that needed to be imposed upon his work. Like Hardy, Vizetelly, in the process of preparing his material for his particular audience, was often forced to suggest rather than to state, to blur the lines rather than to define them sharply, and his language, like Hardy's, often betrays an underlying tension between the description given and the situation or subject described. As Steven Marcus suggests in The Other Victorians (1966), "having accepted censorship on explicit sexual statements . . . the Victorian novelists had to find less direct means of communicating the sexual component" of their work (109). Vizetelly's dilemma, then, in presenting Zola to an English audience, though not strictly confined to the sexual elements of Zola's work, was largely to make indirect what was already directly present in the original text; conversely, Hardy, in his later novels was seeking to increase the directness of the elements that were already indirectly present in his earlier work, and somehow to do this without overstepping the bounds of public acceptability.

In the preface to his translation of La Débâcle E. A. Vizetelly wrote, "I have always tried to give the sense and substance of M. Zola's narrative, though at times I have found myself unable to use his actual words" (xii). In Le Docteur Pascal (1893), the next of Zola's novels to be

translated by Vizetelly, it was necessary to impose still greater restraint upon the narrative, and Vizetelly seems to have felt it necessary to explain his position as translator/editor more fully in his preface to the final book of the Rougon-Macquart series:

> Circumstances have constrained me to omit from this English version of 'Doctor Pascal' certain passages which will be found in the French original. These passages, however, are not numerous, and I do not think that their omission will in any wise prevent the reader from understanding the drift of M. Zola's narrative. I may add that the suppressions in question have been made with the author's cordial consent. (vii)

In his introduction to the correspondence of Zola and E. A. Vizetelly (Les Cahiers naturalistes [62]: 61-96), Colin Burns explains Vizetelly's position more precisely:

> Pour Ernest Vizetelly la cause de Zola en Angleterre était intimement liée à la sienne et à celle de son père, dont il tenait, plus ou moins consciemment, à rétablir la réputation. La passion de Vizetelly et son acharnement au travail en faveur de Zola s'expliquent, d'une part, par ce besoin de justifier la vie et les efforts de son père, et d'autre part, par sa conviction intime qu'il fallait à tout prix défendre les valeurs libérales, implicites dans l'oeuvre de Zola, devant la société anglaise qui se montrait parfois hostile aux doctrines humanitaires et réformatrices exposées par l'auteur des Rougon-Macquart . . . . Le dévouement de Vizetelly à la cause de Zola en Angleterre était absolu, total, et totalement

> sincère. (63)
>
> * * *
>
> For Ernest Vizetelly the cause of Zola in England was intimately connected to his own situation and to that of his father, whose reputation Ernest was seeking, more or less consciously, to re-establish. The passion of Vizetelly, and his tenacious ability to work on Zola's behalf is explained, in part, by this need to justify the life and efforts of his father, and also by his intense conviction that it was necessary, at any cost, to defend the liberal values, implicit in Zola's work, before an English society that had sometimes shown itself hostile to the humanitarian doctrines and reforms put forth by the author of the Rougon-Macquart . . . . The devotion of Vizetelly to the cause of Zola in England was absolute, total, and totally sincere.

Some years later, E. A. Vizetelly was once again placed in the difficult position of having to decide whether to risk possible prosecution in connection with his proposed translation of Zola's Fécondité (1899). In a series of letters to The Macmillan Company in New York, Zola's American publisher (although Fécondité was eventually issued by Doubleday, Page & Co. in the U.S.), Vizetelly, clearly traumatized at the prospect of further legal battles, wrote that "the work is of so outspoken a nature that I find my task an impossibility":

> I have no desire to go to prison for six months [a clear exaggeration] as my father did with respect to his bowdlerised version of Zola's 'La Terre' . . . . I do not say that this matter is indecent. There is indeed no passage of real

> vice in the book, but scene follows scene of women at midwives' establishments, of operations of all sorts performed on them, of some of them dying from the effects thereof in *lakes of blood*, of others being unsexed by surgical operations, of others taking every precaution possible to prevent childbirth; the whole described *so boldly, so vividly, at such length, in such detail* . . . . At all events I could not, *I would not*, whatever might be the price offered me, say £1000, undertake to produce any adaptation even, of the work in the English language . . . . I am not prepared single handed, to face even for [Zola] millions of English and American hypocrites. My father attempted to do so (so far as England was concerned) and was *imprisoned, ruined & hounded to death for his pains*. (5 October 1899)[11]

Despite Vizetelly's very real concern, his much bowdlerized translation of Fécondité (Fruitfulness) was finally published by Chatto & Windus in England in 1900. Nevertheless, as the above excerpt from his letter to Macmillan shows, Vizetelly continued to feel the effects of his father's imprisonment in the years that followed, and was well aware of the need to safeguard himself against the possibility of further prosecution.

After the publication of The Downfall (1892) and Doctor Pascal (1893), Chatto & Windus continued to issue translations of each of Zola's new novels as they appeared in France, and also began to re-issue the old Vizetelly translations, often heavily bowdlerized, as re-edited or, in some cases, re-translated by E. A. Vizetelly. The 1890s, then, saw a considerable resurgence of Zola publications in

English translation, and the Chatto & Windus editions were widely circulated without substantial evidence of actual offense, despite Vizetelly's dilemma over the English publication of Fécondité.

Although the discussion of Zola's English publishers and publications has been limited to date to those of which Hardy had some knowledge, it is also necessary to mention the Lutetian Society translations, particularly as Hardy was, to varying degrees, familiar with some of the more important members of the Society. In 1894-5 the Lutetian Society (Lutetia being an ancient name for Paris) issued translations of six of Zola's novels, printed "for private distribution amongst its members" as translated by Alexander de Mattos, Arthur Symons, Victor Plarr, Havelock Ellis, Ernest Dowson and Percy Pinkerton. The Lutetian Society translations were to be the only truly unexpurgated English translations of Zola to be issued in Zola's lifetime, or in Hardy's for that matter.

Although it is unclear exactly who the Society members were or what their activities actually were, as the above translators were all part of a circle of writers and artists who had gathered about Leonard Smithers, later publisher of Beardsley and Wilde, and as all of the above were soon to contribute to Smithers' journal, The Savoy (1896), it seems

increasingly likely that Smithers had something to do with both the formation of the Society and with the Zola translations. As the only other Lutetian Society publications, translations of Voltaire's La Pucelle d'Orléans (1899), Count Hamilton's Les Quatre Facardins (1899) and Barbey d'Aurevilly's Les Diaboliques (1900), all appear to have involved Smithers as publisher, it seems probable that he was to some degree responsible for the Zola translations, though Teixeira de Mattos served as general editor for the series. Although there is no indication that Hardy himself had anything to do with Smithers, his connection with what may be termed the Smithers's circle is nevertheless intriguing, especially as so many of the group were involved, in various ways, in re-shaping the contemporary understanding and representation of sexuality, as well as being involved in promoting the cause of literary frankness. Havelock Ellis, in addition to translating Zola's Germinal for the Lutetian Society, also wrote extensive critical essays on both Hardy and Zola, and contributed what was almost certainly the most important early article on Hardy to the Westminster Review in April 1883 (reprinted in Cox 103-32). Hardy himself was asked by Arthur Symons to contribute to The Savoy, and responded that he liked everything he heard about the magazine except the

name ("To Arthur Symons," 28 October 1895). Hardy also stated that he hoped to contribute something to the journal, but he did not, in fact, manage to submit anything before The Savoy folded in the following year. Ellis, who had earlier acted as general editor for Vizetelly & Co.'s Mermaid Series of old English dramatists (1887-90), also wrote an early and important defense of Jude the Obscure in The Savoy (October 1896). Symons, who throughout his career did editorial work for both Vizetelly and Smithers, also wrote A Study of Thomas Hardy (1927) in which he discusses Hardy primarily in relation to his French contemporaries.

Although Hardy himself claimed to be "read in Zola very little" ("To Edmund Gosse," 20 November 1895), the contents of the Max Gate library at the time of the second Mrs. Hardy's death would suggest, as Lennart Björk has pointed out, that "Hardy's appreciation of the French writer may well have been more pronounced than he cared to confide" (LN 1: 385). The sale catalogues of those portions of Hardy's library that were sold off at auction in 1938, though in many cases inadequate in terms of bibliographical detail, combined with Hardy's notebook entries, allow at least a partial reconstruction of Hardy's Zola collection. The following list, then, though making no claim to

completeness, nevertheless provides an adequate framework for the discussion to follow. In each case it should be remembered that ownership does not necessarily equate with readership, except in those cases where further evidence of Hardy's reading exists: it is, of course, quite possible that Hardy read more of Zola's works than the catalogued listings of his library reveal, or indeed, it is equally possible that he may not have read all that his library contained. In those cases where the sale catalogues have provided only a title and a date of publication, and where it has been possible to determine the publisher's imprint from the above data, I have duly provided the corresponding information. The following titles are listed in the chronological order of their issue:[12]

1. La Joie de vivre (Charpentier, 1884)
2. Germinal (Vizetelly, 1885)
3. Abbé Mouret's Transgression (Vizetelly, 1886)
4. His Masterpiece (Vizetelly, 1886)
5. La Débâcle (Charpentier, 1892)
6. The Dream (Chatto & Windus, 1893)
7. Le Docteur Pascal (Charpentier, 1893)
8. Rome (Chatto & Windus, 1896)
9. The Downfall (Chatto & Windus, 1896)

In addition to the above works, Hardy also recorded a fairly lengthy extract from an unidentified French-language copy of La Terre (LN 1: 208), and referred both to Le Roman

expérimental in "The Science of Fiction" (1891) and to contemporary criticism of L'Assommoir in his literary notebooks (LN 1: 201). If Hardy did, in fact, read La Terre (1887) in the original French, and the extract from Zola's novel in his Literary Notebook I makes this seem likely, his choice of the French over the English text in this instance may well have been because the Vizetelly translation, The Soil (1888), was only available for sale in England for a relatively brief period between February and October 1888. Hardy was also presented with a copy of E. A. Vizetelly's 1904 biography of Zola, inscribed "To Thomas Hardy, Esq., in respectful recognition of various acts of kindness, Ernest Vizetelly, Nov. 1904."[13]

Having determined a list of specific texts on the basis of ownership, it is now necessary to consider the nature of that ownership, and how ownership, in Hardy's case, relates to readership. From the example of the Hedgcock book, it is evident that, when necessary, Hardy was certainly able to make his way through a lengthy piece of French prose, though even here he had to admit to Vere Collins that he had "not examined the book through" (24 June 1922), and significantly, most of the marginalia in Hardy's copy of Hedgcock is concentrated in the opening biographical chapter

and the conclusion--those sections of the book that Hardy appears to have felt most in need of his attention.

In addition, throughout the 1880s, Hardy appears to have been a fairly regular reader of the Revue des deux mondes, and a number of lengthy extracts from the Revue were either transcribed straight into his notebooks or were translated and transcribed in English. Hardy's extracts from the Revue des deux mondes also attest to his growing interest in various aspects of French literature throughout the period, and are particularly interesting in terms of his reading of Zola.

Nevertheless, when presented with a choice between reading in the original French or in an English translation, Hardy seems to have preferred the translation, as appears to have been the case with his reading of Thiers' Histoire du consulat et de l'empire de Napoléon in connection with his research for The Dynasts (1903-8). As Michael Millgate notes in Testamentary Acts (1992), Hardy owned both a French and an English edition of Thiers, but "seems almost exclusively to have used" the English translation (172). Significantly, though not actually by Hardy's doing, it was the French edition of Thiers that was preserved for display in Hardy's reconstructed study in the Dorset County Museum.

On the basis of the Thiers example, though a single example, of course, does not necessarily indicate a repeated pattern, it seems possible to suggest a practical distinction between "reading" or, in the instance of Thiers, "working" copies, and "non-reading" or "shelf" copies. For the moment, posing this simply as a theoretical distinction, the two copies of La Débâcle, the one in French and the other in English, would seem to confirm a possible pattern and, like Thiers' History of Napoleon, La Débâcle may well have been of some interest to Hardy in relation to The Dynasts. Of the other two French editions of Zola in Hardy's possession, Le Docteur Pascal and La Joie de vivre, the copy of Pascal is now held in the Colby College Library at Waterville, Maine, and appears to contain no obvious evidence of having been read by Hardy,[14] while the early date of Hardy's copy of La Joie de vivre (1884) suggests that the book may well have been purchased before the English translations of Zola became widely available, which would make La Joie de vivre the most likely of the three to have been read. In any case, it seems reasonable to regard Hardy's reading of these three French texts of Zola as either doubtful or cursory, and to concentrate instead on the English texts, for which a more definite case can be made.

Before moving on to consider the English-language texts of Zola, one further point about the French-language texts should be made. Although Hardy's copy of Le Docteur Pascal appears to be unmarked, this does not, of course, completely negate the possibility of his having read it. Certainly, the completed Rougon-Macquart genealogical tree that appeared in the Charpentier edition of Pascal for the first time would have been of considerable interest to Hardy, who maintained a long-standing interest in genealogy and issues of heredity. As the Rougon-Macquart tree was undoubtedly the most famous instance of attaching a genealogical chart to a series of novels in the period, Zola's example may well have prompted Hardy to suggest to John Galsworthy that he provide a similar chart for his Forsyte series of novels (7 February 1921), which Galsworthy later did.

Hardy's own tendency to view his novels as a sort of series, and his attempt to classify them in 1912 under the three general headings of "Novels of Character and Environment," "Romances and Fantasies" and "Novels of Ingenuity" or "Experiments" may perhaps seem as much Balzacian as Zolaesque, though it would be difficult to over-estimate Zola's example, especially as the Rougon-Macquart series represents, in part, a completed edifice, a lengthy series of novels over and done with. The final

symmetry and order of Zola's series may well have appealed to the post-novelist Hardy, who seems to have wished to impose a similar type of order on his own work by classifying the Wessex novels into various groups.

Of the three Vizetelly titles in Hardy's library, Germinal (1885), Abbé Mouret's Transgression (1886) and His Masterpiece (1886), it is evident that Hardy read all three with at least a fair degree of attention: Hardy's copy of His Masterpiece is listed in the Wreden catalogue as containing "markings by Hardy scattered throughout"; and in addition to referring to both Abbé Mouret and Germinal in "The Science of Fiction," Hardy also recorded a series of extracts from the two novels in his "1867" notebook (LN 2: 473-5).

Of the three Chatto & Windus titles, The Dream (1893; trans. of Le Rêve), Rome (1896) and The Downfall (1896), it seems reasonable to suggest that these three novels appear to fit most clearly into a theoretical category of "reading" copies, though all were listed in the miscellaneous section of the Wreden catalogue, which was comprised of books that evidently did not contain Hardy's markings. Nevertheless, the argument for Hardy's having read these volumes seems sound enough, aside from any intertextual evidence that might arise from a reading of Hardy's later work: none of

the three Chatto & Windus titles were presentation copies, of which Hardy received a great many throughout his career, many of which must have gone unread; nor were any of the three in any sense "display" or "shelf" copies--they were cheap, cloth-bound translations of a contemporary author; nor is it at all likely that any of the three was purchased to be read solely by either of the Mrs. Hardys, as neither Emma nor Florence appear to have expressed any great sympathy for Zola. Emma, though disapproving, appears familiar enough with the general scheme of Zola's work, as is evident in a letter to Rebekah Owen, written not long after the critical controversy over the publication of Jude the Obscure in which Hardy's name was repeatedly linked with that of his French contemporary:

> As I get older I am more interested in ameliorations & schemes for banishing the thickening clouds of evil advancing. I do not care for art for art's sake alone. Yet a friend [presumably Florence Henniker] cannot persuade me to get T. H. to write to Zola to bring out a book on antivivisection. I will not because I know that he wouldn't do it--& I do not want T. H. to be hand in glove with Zola. (19 February 1897)[15]

Emma, then, though apparently familiar with Zola's work, is, as would be expected, distrustful of his reputation, and seems an unlikely candidate to have been responsible for the purchase of his novels.

In short, there seems to be no reason to suspect that it was not Hardy who purchased the three Chatto & Windus titles and, equally, it is difficult to think of a reason to purchase these particular books other than to read them. Nevertheless, for the moment, it seems prudent to maintain a degree of uncertainty in connection with Hardy's possible reading of these three titles and, where appropriate, to re-consider them further on intertextual grounds in relation to Hardy's own work with the understanding that, on historical grounds, Hardy's reading of these three novels must be considered uncertain.

There, based on historical evidence, is the extent of Hardy's reading of Zola: three books that were certainly read, three that were probably read, three that were probably not, and three more that were in various ways referred to in Hardy's notes and writings. It should be noted before continuing that the above analysis of the number of individual Zola titles contained in Hardy's library, and the evidence for which of these titles he may actually have read, is based on the scattered information that history has chanced to record. No complete listing of the library's contents was made at the time, and the information provided by the individual sale catalogues is sketchy at best, and completely inadequate at worst. For

instance, the description of one lot in the Hodgson & Co. catalogue (lot no. 278) lists only two titles--Tolstoi's Anna Karenina (Vizetelly, n.d.) and Zola's His Masterpiece (Vizetelly, 1886)--out of the twenty volumes that made up the lot, simply referring to the rest as, "and others by Anatole France, etc." It seems reasonable to suggest, therefore, that the above estimate of the extent of Hardy's reading in Zola errs, in all probability, on the conservative side, but that this has been made necessary by the incompleteness of the information preserved. It is strange, for instance, to consider that someone who was sufficiently interested in Zola to own nine volumes of his work, including the relatively obscure La Joie de vivre, Le Rève and Rome, did not at some point read either Nana, L'Assommoir or La Terre. This said, the present study has been conceived to consider only those books for which it can be established with a reasonable degree of certainty that Hardy can actually be said to have read.

Yet, despite the incompleteness of the information provided, the historical and textual evidence seems adequate to suggest, as will be argued, that Hardy's reading of Zola was of substantial importance to his development as a novelist in the decade between 1886 and 1896, or from the writing of The Woodlanders (1887) to the publication of Jude

the Obscure (1896). In addition, on the larger scale, Zola seems in many ways to have provided Hardy with a type of sounding-board against which to develop his own method and understanding of artistic representation and, in the context of the debate surrounding the legal proceedings against Henry Vizetelly, Zola indirectly provided Hardy with a larger social and political framework against which to develop his own sense of the relationship between writer, publisher and audience.

Hardy's characteristically uncritical, though far from simplistic, reaction to his reading of Zola is recorded in four forms: his extracts from Abbé Mouret and Germinal, recorded in 1886 or 1887;[16] his article on "The Science of Fiction" (1891), Hardy's most complete response to Zola; his notes and extracts from contemporary criticism of Zola, particularly from the Revue des deux mondes; and his later, post-Jude comments, particularly in his letters between 1897 and 1900.

The 1886-7 extracts (reproduced in Appendix C), whatever their relation to Hardy's developing sensibilities at the time, certainly seem to cast suspicion upon his later assertion that Zola was "no artist, & too material" ("To Florence Henniker," 31 March 1897). If, for instance, it

can be suggested that Hardy's distinction between artistic and material representation is primarily a distinction between a subjective and an objective rendering of the existents and events that make up a story, the extracts from Abbé Mouret and Germinal consistently, and almost exclusively, reveal a marked preoccupation with the interpretive process of subjective representation. "All the hues, all the emotions of the sky" appears, for example, to bear as little relation to any sense of an external, objective reality as "the pebbles in the valley seemed animated with a throbbing life." Hardy's extracts from the two Zola novels are almost uniformly descriptive, with a strong emphasis upon sensory perceptions: colours, smells, textures, sounds. There is also an exaggerated sense of animated Nature: a landscape "dying of its thirst," stones that "seem to tell you tales," thatched roofs that "bulged like bosoms," an "intoxicated" Nature that hiccupped "verbenas & pinks," lichens that "gnawed away at the rough plaster," a mine shaft "like some giant belly, capable of digesting a whole people." One excerpt in particular seems to have attracted Hardy's attention as an "[Examp . . . of more-true-than-truth:-]"

> A warm odour of woman arose from the trodden grass: the loud sound of the men's voices was

> deadened as it were by the draperies of the room & the hot-house atmosphere.

Hardy's concept of the "more-true-than-truth," or what he later referred to as the *"vérité vraie"* (in "The Science of Fiction"; reprinted in PW 134-8), appears to work both within and against the general framework of Zola's argument in Le Roman expérimental. That Hardy had only a basic understanding of Zola's theory of the novel seems evident by his inference that Zola was seeking in Le Roman expérimental "to advance realism as complete copyism" (PW 136), even though Hardy appears, at times, to question if this is really Zola's intention or a basic misrepresentation of his argument. "Realism," Hardy states, "is an unfortunate, an ambiguous word, which has been taken up by literary society like a view-halloo, and has been assumed in some places to mean copyism, and in others pruriency, and has led to two classes of delineators being included in one condemnation" (PW 136).

In Le Roman expérimental, Zola distinguishes quite clearly between "copyism," the observation of the material phenomenon, and what he refers to as "experimentation," the process of interpreting the observed material. The novelist proceeds from a basic observation of material reality, which

is then interpreted and modified through the creative process of "experimentation":

> Un reproche bête qu'on nous fait, à nous autres écrivains naturalistes, c'est de vouloir être uniquement des photographes. Nous avons beau déclarer que nous acceptons le tempérament, l'expression personnelle, [illegible] n'en continue pas moins à nous répondre par des arguments imbéciles sur l'impossibilité d'être strictement vrai, sur le besoin d'arranger les faits pour constituer une oeuvre d'art quelconque. Eh bien! avec l'application de la méthode expérimentale au roman, toute querelle cesse. L'idée d'expérience entraîne avec elle l'idée de modification. Nous partons bien des faits vrais, qui sont notre base indestructible; mais, pour montrer le mécanisme des faits, il faut que nous produisions et que nous dirigions les phénomènes; c'est là notre part d'invention, de génie dans l'oeuvre. (X: 1180)
>
> * * *
>
> One stupid reproach that they make against us naturalist writers is the desire to be simply photographers. Even though we have declared that we accept the individual temperament, the personal expression of the writer, they continue to respond to us with the same imbecilic arguments on the impossibility of being strictly true, on the need to arrange the facts to constitute a work of art of any kind. Well, with the application of the experimental method to the novel, all quarrel ceases. The idea of experimentation carries with it the idea of modification. We start, indeed, from the true facts, which are our indestructible base; but, to show how these facts function and combine, it is necessary that we produce and direct the phenomena; that is where the role of our invention, of our genius, lies.

The physical reality, the external object, is, then, the "true fact" (*"des faits vrais"*), which forms the basis for the novelist's interpretation. The novelist then "modifies" nature (*"nous devons modifier la nature"*) through the interpretive process in order to come to what would seem to be primarily an essential understanding of the object/subject.

The terms "more-true-than-truth" and *"vérité vraie,"* which Hardy seems to use interchangeably, appear, then, to be working within the general context of Zola's argument, and refer to what might be called the essential subject behind the material object. In addition, though Hardy does not appear to be aware of it, his insistence on "the intuitive power that supplies the would-be storywriter" (PW 137) is really very similar to Zola's earlier statement that *"une oeuvre n'est que le produit d'une individualité"* (X: 795) or that *"chaque oeil a ainsi une vision particulière"* (X: 1287). As Pierre d'Exideuil noted as early as 1928 in his book on The Human Pair in the Works of Thomas Hardy, "no formula more aptly expresses [Hardy's] art than the phrase of Zola: 'A work of art is a corner of creation, seen through a temperament' [*'Une oeuvre d'art est un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament'*]" (d'Exideuil 32-3). Both insist on the ultimate primacy of the artist's

imagination in shaping the fictional world, though Zola is not always credited with allowing for this amount of individual artistic flexibility.

To return to "The Science of Fiction," the title of Hardy's article suggests a probable awareness of Henry James' earlier essay on "The Art of Fiction" (1884; reprinted in The Art of Criticism 165-83), in which James, like Hardy, argues that Zola "reasons less powerfully than he represents" (177). James, who also wrote reviews of Une Page d'amour (The Nation 26 [30 May 1878]: 361-3) and Nana (The Parisian 48 [26 February 1880]: 9), as well as a more extensive essay on Zola in the Atlantic Monthly (August 1903; reprinted in The Art of Criticism 425-48), was certainly one of the most important and influential of Zola's early English critics, and it is interesting to note that Henry Vizetelly later chose an excerpt from James's review of Nana to introduce his Extracts Principally from English Classics (1888), which was prepared as part of his defence of Zola before the first Vizetelly trial. James's position towards Zola is perhaps best summed up in his article on "The Art of Fiction":

> In France to-day we see a prodigious effort (that of Emile Zola, to whose solid and serious work no explorer of the capacity of the novel can allude to without respect), we see an

> extraordinary effort vitiated by a spirit of pessimism on a narrow basis. M. Zola is magnificent, but he strikes an English reader as ignorant; he has an air of working in the dark; if he had as much light as energy, his results would be of the highest value. (182-3)

Curiously, James's famous remark in "The Art of Fiction" on "the power to guess the unseen from the seen, to trace the implications of things, to judge the whole piece by the pattern" (172) is strangely reminiscent of an earlier note made by Hardy in 1882, and recorded in The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy:

> As, in looking at a carpet, by following one colour a certain pattern is suggested, by following another colour, another; so in life the seer should watch that pattern among general things which his idiosyncrasy moves him to observe, and describe that alone. This is, quite accurately, a going to Nature; yet the result is no mere photograph, but purely the product of the writer's own mind. (158)

In his 1896 tale, "The Figure in the Carpet," James also uses the image of the carpet as a metaphor for patterns of narrative--in this case, for patterns that conceal a secret intent. In responding to Zola, both James and Hardy appear, then, to have been thinking along similar lines: both have their reservations and their admirations, and both, interestingly enough, appear to have used Zola as a common

point-of-departure for an exploration of their own methodologies and ideas.

Coincidentally, Walter Besant, who provided the official point-of-departure for James's "The Art of Fiction," also wrote one of the articles that preceded Hardy's essay on "Candour in English Fiction" in a symposium on the novel in the New Review (January 1890). Besant, a founding member of the Rabelais Club (1879-89) and Chairman of the Society of Authors (1889-92), was particularly well-positioned to compare historical and contemporary literary trends in France and England. In 1879, Besant wrote to Hardy to invite him to join the Rabelais Club, as "the creator of the Native--the author of the most original the most virile and most humorous of all modern novels" (7 March 1879; quoted in CL 1: 63n). Later, in a "Letter from Paris" in The Author (1895), which Besant edited for the Society of Authors, Robert Sherard reported that "there is . . . great curiosity about Thomas Hardy [in France], and at the Authors' Club dinner last year, Zola told me that he should advise Charpentier [Zola's publisher] to arrange for a French translation of Hardy's works" (150). Zola's suggestion, if seriously acted upon, never came to fruition and, according to F. A. Hedgcock (Hardy, penseur et artiste 497), the only French translations of Hardy to appear before

1900 were of The Trumpet-Major (Hachette, 1882) and Far from the Madding Crowd (Soc. du "Mercure de France," 1891).

For his part, Hardy, writing in 1891, appears both generally and genuinely sympathetic to what he terms "the theories of the scientific realists" (PW 136), though his reservations are, for the most part, clearly and absolutely defined:

> Every friend of the novel should and must be in sympathy with their error, even while distinctly perceiving it. Though not true, it is well founded. To advance realism as complete copyism, to call the idle trade of story-telling a science, is the hyperbolic flight of an admirable enthusiasm, the exaggerated cry of an honest reaction from the false, in which the truth has been impetuously approached and overleapt in fault of lighted on. (PW 136)

Importantly, though Hardy often adopts the plural form of address throughout his argument, it is clear that Zola forms the major, if not quite the single, focus for his observations, particularly as Zola is the only author named, aside from a passing reference to Dumas *père* and Mrs. Radcliffe, and the single author whose works are directly referred to. It seems helpful here to quote a lengthy passage from "The Science of Fiction," especially as Hardy at times argues in a peculiarly elliptical fashion,

apparently self-consciously aware that criticism is not his usual forum, and also because his insights into what Harold Orel refers to as "the disparity between theory and practice in Zola's case" (PW 138n) seem particularly relevant to the argument to follow:

> The most devoted apostle of realism, the sheerest naturalist, cannot escape, any more than the withered old gossip over her fire, the exercise of Art in his labour or pleasure of telling a tale. Not until he becomes an automatic reproducer of all impressions whatsoever can he be called purely scientific, or even a manufacturer on scientific principles. If in the exercise of his reason he select or omit, with an eye to being more truthful than truth (the just aim of Art), he transforms himself into a technicist at a move. (PW 134)

It will be remembered that Hardy applied the term, "more-true-than-truth," which, as he states it, is "the just aim of Art," to a passage from Zola's Germinal in his "1867" notebook. Also, as already discussed, Zola readily admits the need to modify, to select and omit, as part of the experimental process.

> As this theory of the need for the exercise of the Daedalian faculty for selection and cunning manipulation has been disputed, it may be worth while to examine the contrary position. That it should ever have been maintained by such a romancer as M. Zola in his work on the Roman Expérimental, seems to reveal an obtuseness to the disproof conveyed in his own novels which, in a French writer, is singular indeed. To be sure

> that author--whose powers in story-telling, rightfully and wrongfully exercised, may be partly owing to the fact that he is not a critic --does in a measure concede something in the qualified counsel that the novel should keep as close to reality *as it can*; a remark which may be interpreted with infinite latitude, and would no doubt have been cheerfully accepted by Dumas *père* or Mrs. Radcliffe. It implies discriminative choice; and if we grant that we grant all. But to maintain in theory what he abandons in practice, to subscribe to rules and to work by instinct, is a proceeding not confined to the author of Germinal and La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret. (PW 134-5)

In the course of drawing up his response to the current controversy on realism, on the relationship between material observation and artistic representation, Hardy undoubtedly had occasion to refer back to a number of notes that he had taken on the subject, both in the early eighties (see LN 1: 153; 157-8) and, more particularly, in the years following the publication of The Mayor of Casterbridge (1886; see LN 1: 201; 219-223; LN 2: 14-17). In Havelock Ellis's The New Spirit (1890), which Hardy read and took extensive notes from in May 1890, Ellis argues that "Whatever is really fine in Zola's work--La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret, or the last chapters of Nana or Germinal--is fine because the man of formula is for awhile subordinated to the artist" (214). A more important source for Hardy's argument appears to have been an article by Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé in the Revue des deux mondes (15 May 1886; reprinted in Becker 310-43) in

which de Vogüé argues that Zola's romanticism far outweighs his realistic intent:

> If M. Zola impresses us with indisputable power, it is owing to epic qualities which he cannot do away with in himself. In his novels the realist part is frail: he subjugates us by the old means of romanticism, in creating a synthetic monster, animated with formidable instincts, who feeds its own life upon the real--a garden, a hall, a cabaret, a mine. I was going to add, a cathedral, (in Notre Dame) so much is this work of idealization identical with that of V. Hugo. The realistic apparel seems rather to hamper the epic poet, to be a concession to the tastes of the epoch. (Hardy's abridged translation, LN 1: 221-2)

Whatever the relationship between the two broad terms of realism and romanticism in Zola's work, it is important that Hardy, writing in 1891, saw Zola primarily as a "romancer,"[17] particularly as the two novels to be considered most extensively here in relation to Hardy's own work, La Faute de l'abbé Mouret and Le Rêve, are undoubtedly the most overtly romantic of Zola's works. In a review of Le Rêve written in 1889, George Moore, always one to overstate a case, remarked that "Zola's novels are poems, and have nothing to do with realism. If you seek a synthesis, you pass from observation into poetry and philosophy, and Zola's work is as obviously and as wholly

synthetical as Victor Hugo's" (Moore, Impressions and Opinions 122-3).

Guy de Maupassant, writing in 1883, places Zola much more firmly within the Romantic tradition, suggesting his debt to Gautier, to de Musset and Hugo, and referring to L'Assommoir as *"le poème du vin, de l'alcool et des soûleries"* and to Nana as *"le poème du vice"* (Chroniques 2: 315):

> Fils des romantiques, romantique lui-même dans tous ses procédés, il porte en lui une tendance au poème, un besoin de grandir, de grossir, de faire des symboles avec les êtres et les choses . . . . Ses enseignements et ses oeuvres sont éternellement en désaccord. (Chroniques 2: 314)

* * *

> Son of the Romantics, Romantic himself in all his techniques, [Zola] carries in himself a tendency to the poetic, a need to enlarge, to expand, to make symbols of beings and things . . . . His teachings and his works are eternally in disagreement.

Hardy, then, was not alone in discerning the Romantic elements in Zola's fiction, the combining of poetic and realistic modes, the epic struggle and structure of much of his work, but, importantly, much of Hardy's early impression of Zola must have been shaped by the order of his reading. The three Vizetelly titles which Hardy read around 1886-7,

Germinal, Abbé Mouret's Transgression and His Masterpiece (L'Oeuvre), not only reveal much about what David Baguley refers to as Zola's "deep-seated Romantic belief in individual genius" (NF 57), they also suggest how the blending of various modes of representation could constitute "an attack on generic conventions themselves" (NF 53):

> The naturalist age was a time of crisis when generic distinctions were seemingly no longer in effect. The dominance of the novel, a kind of omni-generic form, looked to be making such distinctions, whether rudimentary or fine, totally irrelevant. Thus, naturalist fiction was not only *non*-generic, in theory at least, . . . it was also *multi*-generic in being at once narrative, dramatic and poetic, thereby rendering generic distinctions redundant. (NF 53)

As the character Sandoz is made to remark in His Masterpiece, "our generation has soaked up to the stomach in romanticism, and we have remained impregnated with it. It is in vain that we wash ourselves and take baths of reality, the stain is obstinate, and all the scrubbing in the world won't take its smell away" (365).[18]

For Hardy, always torn between various generic modes of representation, the merging of genres in Zola's work, his heavy use of coloration and symbolism, the blending of past and present histories, past and present discursive modes--realism, romanticism, journalism, the epic, the poetic and

the rhetorical--his early reading of Zola appears to have suggested a number of specific ways to, in Hardy's words, "intensify the expression of things, . . . so that the heart and inner meaning is made vividly visible" (LW 183).

On Descending into Hell: The Political Positioning of the Novel in the Nineties

On 31 December 1891, Thomas Hardy wrote to H. W. Massingham, then literary editor of the Daily Chronicle, thanking him for his favourable review of Tess of the d'Urbervilles (28 December 1891) and praising the Daily Chronicle for "making literature as important a topic for a newspaper as, say, the latest farce or burlesque":

> For the article itself I thank you warmly. Ever since I began to write--certainly ever since I wrote 'Two on a Tower' in 1881--I have felt that the doll of English fiction must be demolished, if England is to have a school of fiction at all: & I think great honour is due to the D: Chronicle for frankly recognizing that the development of a more virile type of novel is not incompatible with sound morality . . . .

However much Hardy's "doll" might or might not owe to George Moore's argument in Literature at Nurse (1885), it is clear that Hardy is working within much the same framework as Moore, but that the doll as metaphor appears to have shifted in meaning somewhat, to have taken on a larger and more comprehensive significance. Where, for Moore, the doll had stood directly for the text, a metaphor within the larger metaphorical nursery, for Hardy, particularly when

read in the context of his argument in "Candour in English Fiction," published the previous year, the doll now appears to refer as much to the system of the novel, to encompassing considerations of textual production, distribution and readership, as to the text of the novel itself.

Additionally, Hardy's doll is referred to directly in terms of a national literary consciousness, and this seems important, particularly as much of the discussion concerning obscenity in the popular press of the preceding few years, often argued in the specific context of the Vizetelly case, tended to emphasize the need to protect a ruling sense of national identity and well-being. As Frank Kermode indirectly suggests in his essay on "Obscenity and the Public Interest" (Modern Essays 71-89), issues of obscenity, particularly when they enter into a public court of law, are almost always linked to considerations of political and national interests.

Finally, where Moore's doll was previously the object of the various sexual curiosities of its handlers, suggesting a metaphorical form of sexual violation, Hardy's doll is more directly the object of the author's frustration, vented now not simply in terms of violation, but in terms of actual violence. Again, there is a sexual component to the argument, and again it is the masculinity

or virility of the (male) artist that has been frustrated by the doll. In Moore's terms, the lesbian-like relationship of reader and text--the female reader and the feminine text--has left little room for the metaphorical male, either as reader or writer. Henry James explains the situation clearly, though in an ironic, bantering tone, in his review of Zola's novel Nana (The Parisian, 26 February 1880; reprinted in part in Vizetelly, Extracts Principally from English Classics, 6-7):

> A novelist with a system, a passionate conviction, a great plan--incontestable attributes of M. Zola--is not now to be easily found in England or the United States, where the story-teller's art is almost exclusively feminine, is mainly in the hands of timid (even when very accomplished) women, whose acquaintance with life is severely restricted, and who are not conspicuous for general views. The novel, moreover, among ourselves, is almost always addressed to young unmarried ladies, or at least always assumes them to be a large part of the novelist's public.
>
> This fact, to a French story-teller, appears, of course, a damnable restriction, and M. Zola would probably decline to take *au sérieux* any work produced under such unnatural conditions. Half of life is a sealed book to young unmarried ladies, and how can a novel be worth anything that deals only with half of life? How can a portrait be painted (in any way to be recognizable) of half a face? . . . These objections are perfectly valid, and it may be said that our English system is a good thing for virgins and boys, and a bad thing for the novel itself . . . . (Vizetelly 6-7)

By the late 1880s and early 90s the situation had changed dramatically. In 1894, to take a single example, George Egerton (Mary Chavelita Dunne)[1] published her second volume of stories, Discords, the follow-up to her earlier volume, Keynotes (1893), making it abundantly clear that the female writer need not be timid, but could, in fact, draw more frankly from experience than the majority of her male contemporaries. Significantly, in that same year the circulating libraries were already taking serious steps toward dismantling the three-decker system. Arthur Mudie, who had taken over the management of his father's firm in 1884, wrote in July 1894 to George Bentley, the publisher, that the three-volume novel "serves no useful purpose whatever in our business and I shall be heartily glad and much relieved if the gods (i.e. the publishers) will give us the one volume novel from the first. In every way it suits us better and I very long ago ventured to think that it would benefit English fiction" (13 July 1894; quoted in Griest 173). By this time, then, the situation has been reversed, and it is no longer the libraries that are the controlling agents, but the publishers, and the following year, in 1895, both Mudie's and Smith's officially renounced the three-decker system.

Again in the same year, when Hardy was already engaged in writing what would become Jude the Obscure, the Daily Chronicle carried a debate in its columns under the general heading of "Literary Freedom" (11-18 January 1894), evidently prompted by the death of Henry Vizetelly ten days earlier on 1 January 1894, and as much of the argument focuses on either Hardy or Zola or both, it may be worthwhile to follow the course of this exchange in its initial stages. Robert Buchanan, one of Henry Vizetelly's strongest supporters in the debate surrounding the earlier court trials of 1888-9, opens the discussion with his letter of 11 January 1894:

> If authors are persecuted, tormented, pestered, it is not by the public, but by the Flamboyant Journalist, who cries, 'Be real! be true! be dirty! or I will proclaim that you are sacrificing your birthright!' Poor Mr. Hardy, pricked on by said Journalist, wrote 'Tess of the d'Urbervilles.' The occasion was apt, the time ripe, and the book sold by the thousands. Even the Times applauded. But those who knew and understood the true genius of Mr. Hardy, those who had read 'The Woodlanders' and 'The Return of the Native,' sat still and wondered. To them, I fancy, the book must have seemed the very quintessence of vulgarity, banality, ineptitude. Zola himself is a literary certainty, but Zola's smutty finger smudged over the fair face of Mr. Hardy's rustic Muse was a sight too sad for contemplation.

The following day, on 12 January 1894, a contribution simply signed "Tristram" gives voice to a fairly familiar brand of popular morality, this time citing not the young female reader but the young male reader as the source of his concern:

> 'Filth' is the only term that fittingly designates such literature as Zola's and I think parents and guardians ought to be warned against it. I have reason to know of what I speak of, for I have seen the pernicious influence of Zola's works in more than one instance. I could tell you of a young man who cursed the day when he was induced to read them.

By far the more interesting contribution comes from Dorothy Leighton the following day on 13 January 1894:

> As a woman I feel it due to my sex to protest against Mr. Buchanan's view of such realistic studies of character as that of 'Tess of the D'Urbervilles.' Mr. Hardy himself gives as a sub-title to his book this phrase, 'A study of a pure woman.' And to any woman who has not lived in a convent or in a puritanical atmosphere, the treatment of 'Tess' by the two men who protest to love her must appear brutal. Surely, if Mr. Buchanan wished to trace what he is pleased to call 'the smutty finger of M. Zola, smudged over the fair face of Mr. Hardy's rustic muse,' he should have looked on the faces of the d'Urberville cousin and Angel Clare, where he would have seen not M. Zola's smutty finger, nor Mr. Hardy's smudgy touch, but the impress of a natural cruel selfishness . . . . Realists in fiction are at present in the same position with regard to their art as Anarchists with regard to their aims, and it is not the realists' nor the Anarchists' fault that their methods are

> necessarily violent and distasteful . . . .
> 'Civilisation is rotten, society is corrupt,' cry they.
> 'No! no!' retort civilisation and society. 'We are pure, we are clean, it is you who put your dirty fingers upon us and besmirch us.'

All this, of course, is very much in the vein of a popular public debate, but even "Tristram's" views were not restricted to the realm of the popular moralist. In one of the earliest substantial notices of Zola in England, Swinburne's "Note on a Question of the Hour" in the Athenaeum (16 June 1877; reprinted in Baguley, Critical Essays on Emile Zola, 30-33),[2] Swinburne gives voice to much the same misgivings, though in a more articulate manner. Swinburne was responding, as he stated it, to "a subject of late so hotly and so loudly debated in the Parisian world of letters that some echoes of the wrangle have crossed over to the borderland of our own" (Baguley 30). The subject in question was the publication of L'Assommoir (1877), and Swinburne objected to two particular aspects of Zola's work:

> Under the one head I rank such passages as deal with physical matters which might almost have turned the stomach of Dean Swift. The other class consists of those which contain such details of brutality and atrocity practised on a little girl as would necessitate the interpolation of such a line as follows in the police report of any and every newspaper in London--'The further details given in support of the charge of cruelty were too revolting for publication in our columns.' (31)

In an earlier letter to Norman MacColl, Swinburne referred to "Mr. Zola's ultra-Sadique horrors" and somewhat playfully re-titled L'Assommoir, Vomitoire. Zola, he continued, has "more nearly succeeded in making at least one reader (perhaps a too squeamish and soft-hearted one) literally and actually sick with pure physical horror and loathing than I could have believed it possible for any mere literary bestiality and brutality to do" (3 February 1877). Curiously, Robert Buchanan, who opened the debate on "Literary Freedom" in the Daily Chronicle, and who had been extremely active in support of Henry Vizetelly, had also earlier been one of the most vocal attackers of Swinburne's Poems and Ballads (1866).

The reactions of the press to Swinburne's book, though pre-dating the events in question by more than twenty years, nevertheless form a fairly important historical context for the situation facing Henry Vizetelly in 1888, particularly as Robert Buchanan played such a key role in both cases. On 4 August 1866, two anonymous reviews had appeared in the Saturday Review and the Athenaeum, both broadly, though for different reasons, condemning the Poems and Ballads, specifically on charges of "sensuality and immorality, [and] sometimes of paganism and blasphemy" (Hyder 1). The first

article in the Saturday Review was written by John Morley, who, it will be remembered, read both The Poor Man and the Lady and Desperate Remedies for Alexander Macmillan in 1868 and 1870. The second article in the Athenaeum was contributed by Robert Buchanan, who, in particular, charged Swinburne with being "unclean for the sake of uncleanness" (137), with being "untrue, insincere, and therefore unpoetical" both in thought and in style of expression, and who in a later essay entitled "The Fleshly School of Poetry" (1871; reprinted in Victorian Poetry and Poetics 888-98), would refer to Swinburne simply as "a little mad boy letting off squibs" (890). As was often the case with Victorian criticism, particularly in the form of the review, the controversy surrounding the Poems and Ballads, like the later debate concerning the Vizetelly editions of Zola, often resorted to name-calling, seemingly based as much upon personal antagonism--often couched in sexual innuendo--as upon the relative merit of the publication in question itself.[3]

Buchanan, then, after attacking Swinburne so vigorously in 1866, particularly for his puerility, his excessive colouring and his drunkardly vision (138), seems a peculiar figure to be publicly defending the publisher of a writer "whose mind is solely exercised on questions of moral

drainage and social sewerage" (5), as Buchanan was to refer to Zola in his pamphlet On Descending into Hell (1889). Importantly, it is not Zola who Buchanan is defending in On Descending into Hell, but rather "the right of free deliverance, free speech, free thought, . . . the right to attack and to defend" (35). In his preface to The Coming Terror, a collection of essays published in 1891, Buchanan fully acknowledges the paradoxical nature of his position:

> From the first moment I began to write I have been endeavouring to vindicate the freedom of human Personality, the equality of the sexes, and the right of Revolt against arbitrary social laws conflicting with the happiness of human nature. Had I paused there, I might have secured the suffrages of a friendly minority. But, unfortunately, while defending Freedom on the one hand, I have been defending Society on the other, under the impression that social organization is not always, and not necessarily, tyrannical . . . . I am, therefore, out of harmony with the minority as well as with the majority. (v)

Before discussing the various aspects of the argument put forth by Buchanan and others in support of Vizetelly, and in turn considering the extent and implications of Hardy's involvement on Vizetelly's behalf, it seems appropriate to first examine the nature of the opposing body, the National Vigilance Association (NVA), and to consider both the direction and scope of the argument put

forth by the association, primarily as presented in the NVA pamphlet on Pernicious Literature (1889; reprinted in Becker 350-82).

Although the inner workings of the NVA have been inevitably obscured by time and the apparently secretive nature of the Association's activities, there remain suggestions that the NVA itself was not above various practices of questionable or less than questionable legality in its effort to rid the country of "the circulation of immoral literature and obscene pictures" (Becker 351). E. A. Vizetelly, though not, of course, unbiased, provides perhaps the fullest account of the Association's various members and activities:

> [The Association's] secretary, the person usually representing it in public, was a man named Coote; the agent for its publications was a Protestant fanatic named Kensit; among those who gave it countenance was W. T. Stead, then . . . editor of 'The Pall Mall Gazette.' The publications of Kensit on 'The High Church Confessional,' and those of Stead on 'The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon,' would have seemed to indicate that both Kensit and Stead favoured the doctrine of outspokenness or publicity to which Zola gave effect in his novels . . . .
>
> Among the members of the so-called 'National Vigilance Association' were various parsons and priests who naturally abominated such an infidel as Zola . . . [but], generally speaking, they represented the doctrine of reticence and secrecy as opposed to that of publicity. Theirs was the policy, pursued through the ages, of wrapping everything up, cloaking everything over, and they

> were lost in anger, horror, and amazement when they found a different course being pursued. (EZ 258)

George Moore, though again not unbiased, and always of questionable reliability, seems nevertheless to have been fairly rigorous in his investigations of the various activities of the NVA. Moore writes in the "Literary Freedom" column of the Daily Chronicle that the NVA publication, "The Confessional Uncovered," referred to above, was "an exceedingly indecent pamphlet" that had to be "withdrawn from sale at the street corner" (12 January 1894). Of the other pamphlet referred to by Vizetelly, Moore states that "until the 'Daily Telegraph' took the matter in hand, the sale of 'The Maiden Tribute' converted London into pandemonium. None who lived in the vicinity of the Strand at the time will forget the shouting of the vendors of the obscenity--often children only twelve years of age" (quoted in EZ 258n). Moore also refers to the case of a certain Captain Verney, "a prominent member of the Vigilance Association, . . . [who] was himself prosecuted for laying elaborate schemes for the seduction of a young girl, and suffered a year's imprisonment for that offence" (Daily Chronicle, 12 January 1894). Moore goes on to list other allegations against the various members of the Association, including "the atrocious Leamington case,"

where two women members coerced "a little girl to confess crimes which she afterwards had to admit she did not know the meaning of, in order to procure a conviction against a little boy of fifteen" (12 January 1894). Moore's account of this last case does seem accurate, as he was able to produce the court records for the trial, which confirm his allegations, in the columns of the Daily Chronicle for 16 January 1894.

Between Henry Vizetelly's conviction in October 1888 and the second Vizetelly trial in May 1889, the NVA issued their pamphlet on Pernicious Literature, sub-titled Debate in the House of Commons. Trial and Conviction for sale of Zola's Novels. With Opinions of the Press. The pamphlet consists of three separate parts: the Hansard record for a debate in the House on the question of pernicious literature (8 May 1888); a partial transcript of the Criminal Court proceedings for the trial of 31 October 1888; and some extracts from the various newspaper reports following Vizetelly's conviction. A notice dated 1 January 1889, and signed Wm. Alex. Coote, secretary, introduces the subject of pernicious literature, and refers to "the dreadful havoc which is being caused by the dissemination of this vile stuff" (Becker 351). Coote adds that "this pamphlet is sent forward in the strong hope that it may sound as a note of

alarm, and rouse the manhood of England to action in relation to the growth of this evil, which is to-day a menace to our religious, social and national life" (351).

Coote's militaristic and nationalistic tone is also reflected in much of the House of Commons debate of May 1888. Mr. Samuel Smith, M. P. for Flintshire, who introduced the topic before the House by raising the example of the Vizetelly translations of Zola, asked if the House was "to stand still while the country was wholly corrupted by literature of this kind":

> Were they to wait until the moral fibre of the English race was eaten out, as that of the French was almost? Look what such literature had done for France. It overspread that country like a torrent, and its poison was destroying the whole national life. France, to-day, was rapidly approaching the condition of Rome in the time of the Caesars. (355)

Mr. de Lisle, representing Leicestershire, supported Smith's position, stating that "he believed that the greatness and the happiness of the nation depended chiefly upon the purity of its morals," before continuing to argue primarily along class lines, emphasizing the need to "safeguard the morals of the people," while suggesting that "there was no system of government which could be erected which would long stave off the threatening clouds of revolution":

> Unfortunately the evil affected the class of persons who were least able to resist it. Those who were rich and had comfortable homes might keep the evil from their doors; but the poor, who had little scope for the higher enjoyments of life, naturally picked up the literature which was nearest at hand. (362)

In addition to the clear recognition of a definite political context for a particular form of literature, there is the added fear that a translated literature, directly available to all classes of English-speaking citizens, offers a much stronger threat to public morality than a foreign literature that is only available in the language of its origin. How a comfortable house was to protect the moral integrity of the reader is a question that the honourable M. P. for Leicestershire fails to address. What is at stake, then, in the eyes of Mr. Coote, and in the parliamentary addresses of Mr. Smith and Mr. de Lisle, is, in essence, the moral and political stability and integrity of the nation. Mr. Smith's motion, "That this House deplores the rapid spread of demoralizing literature in this country, and is of opinion that the law against obscene publications and indecent pictures and prints should be vigorously enforced, and, if necessary, strengthened" (352), was unanimously carried, and within three months a police-court summons had been issued against Henry Vizetelly.

Following the debate in the House of Commons, and the mounting pressure in the public press, Henry Vizetelly issued his Extracts Principally from English Classics: showing that the legal suppression of M. Zola's novels would logically involve the bowdlerizing of some of the greatest works in English literature. Vizetelly's volume was prefaced by a letter from Vizetelly to Sir A. K. Stephenson, Solicitor to the Treasury, dated 18 September 1888, and was printed for private circulation, without acknowledging either the publisher or the compiler of the Extracts on its title page or in the body of its text.[4] The essentially private nature of the Extracts, the anonymity of its publication and the small number of copies printed, ironically appears to have insured its failure as a public document. Although the Extracts were apparently circulated to various government officials and to the leading London newspapers (EZ 271), the anonymous presentation of the publication suggests a partial attempt on Vizetelly's part to either disown or to disguise the origin of the Extracts, almost as if the Extracts, in themselves, constituted an obscene publication printed for the private reader only. In part, then, by issuing his Extracts privately and anonymously, Vizetelly unconsciously appears to align himself with the anonymous underworld of Victorian

obscenity, to adopt the spurious, self-effacing mode of the contemporary pornographer.

The complex relationship between the public and the private domains, between public authority and private conduct, is certainly a central question here, and undoubtedly far more obscene material than either the Vizetelly Extracts or his translations of Zola circulated freely but, for the most part, privately, in the late eighties and early nineties, particularly through the offices of private societies and sundry unofficial presses.[5] For example, in 1888, the year of the first Vizetelly trial, Leonard Smithers, who appears to have been at least partially responsible for the later Lutetian Society editions of Zola, published Priapeia or the Sportive epigrams of divers poets on Priapus as translated by "Outidanos" (Sir Richard Burton) and introduced by "Neaniskos" (Smithers) under the imprint of the Erotika Biblion Society. Priapeia, like many of Smithers's publications, was printed in a limited edition "for private subscribers only," and the title page falsely states the place of publication as Athens instead of London. The use of pseudonyms, the false imprint and the private nature of the publication ensured the anonymity of the translator, editor and publisher, and Priapeia, along with other works

of a similar nature, largely escaped public notice, although the NVA did take "occasion to thunder against Sir Richard Burton and his 'Arabian Nights'" (EZ 267), also published by Smithers between 1885 and 1888.

In his introduction to Priapeia, "Neaniskos" (Smithers) notes that some of the epigrams presented and translated into verse and prose "shew a degree of pornography difficult to parallel" (x). Nevertheless, it is in the notes to the epigrams, rather than in the epigrams themselves, which are often more lewd than overtly pornographic, that most of the really explicit material is found. To give some idea of the nature of the work, and why it was able to circulate unchallenged, it will be helpful to quote "Neaniskos" at length:

> With a view of making the work an explanatory guide to the erotic dicta of the authors above-mentioned [Catullus, Petronius, Martial, Juvenal, and Ausonius] the bulk of the notes and the excursus explaining and illustrating the text and exceeding its length by some five times, is devoted to articles on paederasty with both sexes, irrumation, the *cunnilingus*, masturbation, bestiality, various figurae Veneris (modes and postures of coition, particularly that in which the man lies supine under the woman); excerpts from the Latin erotic vocabulary, including exhaustive lists of Latin terms designating the sexual organs male and female; a list of classical amatory writers, and a host of miscellaneous matters, *e. g.* the habits of the Roman dancing girls, eunuchism, tribadism of the Roman matrons, the use of phalli, religious prostitution,

> aphrodisiacs, the 'infamous' finger, *tabellae* or licentious paintings, the *fibula* as a preventive of coition, the *crepitus ventris*, &c., &c. (x-xi; I am quoting from the 1890 edition of Priapeia published by "The Translators" at "Cosmopoli." The imprint is again false.)

While Priapeia would generally be considered pornographic, it is, if such a term can be allowed, "learned" pornography, in that Smithers was both a pornographer and a scholar of considerable abilities. Indeed, Smithers's scholarship, like his interest in all manners of obscenity, was obsessive, and Priapeia contains no less than four separate indices, as well as the extensive essays and notes that accompany the epigrams. In short, though Smithers was a pornographer, his publications, particularly at this early point in his career, represent what might be termed the "top-end" of the pornographic market, and are presumably to be differentiated from "the sealed-up books sold sometimes in Holywell Street" that Robert Buchanan refers to in On Descending into Hell (14).

Some of the works, then, either published or circulated through booksellers' catalogues by Smithers in the late 1880s and early 90s, would generally be categorized as pornographic, and were certainly far more obscene than anything published by Vizetelly during the same period. Vizetelly's offence, in a sense determined by the very

nature of Zola's writings, was to force the issue of "obscenity"--often a covertly and sometimes an overtly disruptive form of social aggression--inevitably and unerringly into the public eye. Where Vizetelly had transgressed, then, was not so much in publishing material that might be considered obscene, but in publishing material that was inherently antagonistic to the public's ruling ideal of social stability, to an increasingly fragile sense of collective complacency, and in publishing his material in an aggressively open and public manner. To retreat now into the private domain, to issue the Extracts anonymously, unofficially, for submission to an official and public body, however necessary Vizetelly's anonymity might have seemed, was to fail to recognize the very public nature of his situation.

The Extracts, however ineffectual they proved in Vizetelly's defence, nevertheless represent what W. E. Colburn calls "an impressive collection of bawdry" (Colburn 2: 55), ranging from passages from Shakespeare and various other sixteenth and seventeenth-century dramatists--ironically drawn largely from Vizetelly's own Mermaid Series of old dramatists--through to Swift, Smollett, Fielding and Sterne, and extending as far as the 1880s, to D. G. Rossetti and Swinburne, all of which, according to Vizetelly, were

"far more objectionable than any that can be picked out from the Zola translations published by me" (Extracts 1). Vizetelly adds that the works referred to "are to be found in any average library," and that the extracts could "be multiplied almost indefinitely without difficulty" (10).

In compiling his Extracts as part of his defence of a foreign literature that was, according to the honourable M. P. for Flintshire, posing "a gigantic national danger" (Becker 352), Vizetelly appears, then, to have recognized that it was, in part, the idea of a national literature, a socially and politically constructed literary heritage, that was being protected. The nation's nursing doll, to return to George Moore's metaphor, the social, political and economic offspring of sexless simplicity--of female sex, but passive, inanimate, immaculate--was to remain, for the moment, at least outwardly intact, untouched by "Zola's smutty finger" or by the sullied fingers of England's literary past.

Following his imprisonment in June 1889, a number of attempts were made to draw attention to the severity of Vizetelly's situation: a failed attempt to secure the prisoner's release was followed by further attempts to publicly clear Vizetelly's name of wrongdoing and then,

finally, to secure him some relief from the difficult financial situation which awaited him. E. A. Vizetelly first drew up a memorial (reproduced in appendix D) petitioning for his father's release, which was signed by Hardy, Edmund Gosse, Walter Besant, Frank Harris,[6] Havelock Ellis and many others, and submitted to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

One of the more interesting responses to Vizetelly's memorial came from Lord Lytton,[7] son of Edward Bulwer-Lytton, the novelist. Lytton, who published under the name of "Owen Meredith," was then British Ambassador in Paris. Torn between his public, political position and his personal position as an author, Lytton's dilemma is evident in the careful and formal wording of his letter. His response, written on the official letterhead of the British Embassy in Paris and evidently penned by his personal secretary, is clearly marked "Private" in bold underlining in the upper left-hand corner of the page. Across the top of the page, above the imprint of the British Embassy, is written Lytton's full title, "His Excellency the Earl of Lytton." The letter continues: "Sir, I am desired by Lord Lytton to express to you his regret that official etiquette prevents him from signing the memorial . . . though it would give him much pleasure to learn that it has met with success" (14

July 1889). What is interesting about Lytton's response which, incidentally, quite pleased E. A. Vizetelly (EZ 298), is the conflict between the private and the public response: for a letter that clearly seeks to convey privately the personal support of the writer for the imprisoned publisher, Lytton's response is notable for the ways in which the conventions of personal, social and political authority are established and impressed upon the reader. The secretary-scribe effectively divides the writer from the reader, and this division is further emphasized by the prominent display of Lytton's social title and political position. Although the private self may certainly sympathize, the public self remains detached, and the distance between the official Lord Lytton and the unofficial "Owen Meredith" suggests the larger social division between outward condemnation and inward sympathy that marked much of the debate surrounding Vizetelly's trial and imprisonment.

As the Memorial circulated by E. A. Vizetelly failed to have the desired effect, Henry Vizetelly served his full sentence and was released from prison at the end of August, 1889. Although Vizetelly & Co. continued to issue new titles until as late as 1891 (see Appendix B), by late 1889 the company was already in the hands of its creditors. In November 1889, Robert Buchanan attempted to raise a

subscription for Vizetelly, and though it is not clear if Buchanan's subscription ever got off the ground, a rough proof of his private letter to prospective contributors still exists,[8] in which Buchanan remarks on "a general dread on the part of the trade to order any books (no matter how harmless may be their character), that bear the imprint of the firm":

> Recently a number of such books were seized at the Melbourne Custom House, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the bookseller who had ordered them, and a keen controversy in the Melbourne newspapers strongly condemning the proceedings, these books were destroyed, apparently for no other reason than that the name of Mr. Vizetelly appeared on the title pages. (15 November 1889)

About the same time Buchanan also issued his pamphlet On Descending into Hell: A Letter addressed to the Right Hon. Henry Matthews. Q. C., Home Secretary concerning the proposed suppression of literature (1889),[9] written while Vizetelly was still in prison, in which Buchanan argues that Zola's "zeal may be mistaken, but it is self-evident; his information may be horrible, but it is certainly given in all good faith; and an honest man being the rarest of phenomena in all literature, this man has my sympathy,--though my instinct is to get as far away from him as possible" (7):

> [Zola] goes so far as to assert that Modern Society is full of disease germs scattered through the air from the social deposits; and to prove his case, he takes us . . . right down into the sewers and catacombs. I went there lately with him; and held my nose. The very raiment of my guide, when we emerged into the daylight, was redolent of offal; it looked and smelt unclean, and I got away from it as soon as possible, not before I had recognised, however, that the man was right in some measure, and that the drains were bad. (5-6)

On Descending into Hell is undoubtedly an ill-conceived argument, relying more on banter than on logic, but it is nevertheless remarkable for the sheer bravado that Buchanan manages to bring to his subject. The argument itself, derived partly from Milton's Areopagitica (1644) and partly from Mill's On Liberty (1859) appeals, at the same time, to a peculiar idea of a contemporary Catholicism liberated from the need for censorship and "shorn of many of its imperfections" (3). It should be noted that Buchanan and Henry Matthews, the Home Secretary to whom Buchanan's letter is addressed, were both Catholics, though Buchanan's self-proclaimed eclecticism (3) in the end far outweighs any real interest he might have in considering the actual specifics of Catholic reform.

> An opportunity [for church reform] occurs now in England. A new Inquisition, with which the Roman Church has fortunately nothing to do, proposes to shut all carnal books, and to punish

> all men who write, read, and sell them. For issuing to the public the writings of an able Advocate on the Devil's side, an unfortunate Publisher of Books lies now in prison . . . . Now, then, I believe is the time for the Church Catholic, the Church persecuted and purified, to confess her sin, and cast in her lot with the Humanity she once hated . . . . (4)

Buchanan's argument, that "'even the Literature of Hell shall not be hidden'" (4), and that "'even if you descend into Hell, you will only be following [Christ], who left his Cross, a flaming symbol, even *there*'" (5), largely ignores the legal and political implications of literary censorship and chooses instead to argue for freedom of expression primarily on the grounds of a new-found liberal Christianity. By equating Zola with Hell, and by suggesting that "by Evil only, shall ye distinguish Good" (38) Buchanan has, apparently, mistaken what is primarily a question of social and political morality for one of religious morality, and though the Home Secretary, like Buchanan, may have happened to be a Roman Catholic, he was also, more importantly, the Home Secretary. Buchanan's pamphlet, then, like Lord Lytton's earlier letter, is especially interesting for the confused jumble of social, political and religious codes and considerations that both obscure and inform his response to Vizetelly's situation. The resulting essay probably says more about the passionate confusion that both

Zola and Vizetelly managed to provoke in Victorian England than it does about providing a sound legal or social argument against the proposed suppression of literature, the supposed subject of Buchanan's letter. On Descending into Hell, then, largely fails to provide an adequate defense for either Zola or Vizetelly, but instead provides Buchanan with a forum for defending his own idiosyncratic belief in "the right to attack and to defend . . . [and] to justify the Devil, if I want to" (35). Buchanan, it is true, argues in good faith, attacking and defending with equal conviction but, conviction apart, it would be difficult to construct an argument less likely to succeed as a justification of an author's works, or even of the publisher of those works, in an era that was already sufficiently confused about the underlying role of literature in shaping the moral and political consciousness of a nation.

All attempts to secure Vizetelly's release, to clear his name or to assist him financially having failed, an appeal was then made to the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund to provide monetary assistance. Vizetelly's formal application to the Committee is dated 4 May 1891. The following letter, dated two weeks previously, asks Hardy for his support of the Vizetelly application:[10]

31 Carnalt Gardens
Putney S. W.
April 21. 1891.

Sir--

As you were kind enough to sign the Memorial to the Home Secretary asking for the release of my father Henry Vizetelly from imprisonment for having published translations of some of Zola's novels, I venture to inquire if you would be willing to append your signature to an appeal, based on his claims as an author, which it has been found necessary to make on his behalf to the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund, if the document be posted to you. It has already been signed, I may mention, by Mr G. A. Sala & Mr Edmund Yates, both of whom have known my father for 35 years and are cognizant of his present distressful circumstances, & by Mr Walter Besant, Norman Maccoll Esq, J. S. Cotton M. A. Dr Garnett, R. Buchanan etc. As time is of importance an early reply to this inquiry would greatly oblige

Your obedient servant,
Ernest A. Vizetelly.

Thomas Hardy Esq.

Although Hardy's reply to Vizetelly's letter does not appear to have survived, he evidently did make a positive response, as his signature is appended to the appeal (reproduced in Appendix E) now housed in the Fund's archive.

The previous year, in January 1890, four months after Henry Vizetelly's release from prison, and six months after the circulation of the Memorial petitioning for his release, a symposium on "Candour in English Fiction" was published in the New Review, and as the three contributors--Hardy, Walter

Besant and E. Lynn Linton--had all signed the earlier Memorial, and would all sign the later appeal to the Royal Literary Fund, it seems likely that the subject for the symposium was suggested, at least in part, by the current crisis in literary circles brought about by Vizetelly's imprisonment. Both Hardy and Linton refer indirectly to Vizetelly's situation--Linton in discussing the circulation of French novels, "of which the translation lands a man in prison" (12)--and though neither Besant nor Linton evince any great sympathy for Zola himself, it seems unlikely that any of the three contributors would have failed to recognize the actual and symbolic significance of the recently imprisoned publisher to their arguments. Besant suggests that it is "Average Opinion" that sets the limits upon the author's choice and treatment of subject (6-7), and appears to argue that society is reasonably well-served in this regard. Linton argues that "the British Matron is the true censor of the Press, and exerts over fiction the repressive power she has tried to exert over Art" (10). She then goes on to suggest a need for "specialised literature" (11), with a literature for young persons and a literature for adults--concluding by invoking the proverbial "locked bookcase" as a ready solution for the protection of the young. Hardy's argument, by contrast, seems more complex, and suggests a

stronger sense of personal involvement with the subject than that of either Linton or Besant.

Hardy's contribution to the New Review symposium (reprinted in PW 125-33) appears, in particular, to be informed by at least two specific situations which had occupied his attention to different degrees throughout the preceding few months: his current personal difficulties in arranging for the serial publication of Tess of the d'Urbervilles (1891)--Too Late Beloved (Tess) had been rejected by Tillotson's in September 1889, and by Murray's Magazine and Macmillan's Magazine in November--and the less personal, but more severe situation suggested by the imprisoned publisher. Significantly, Hardy's argument is characterized by a pointed insistence on looking outward at the larger, external system of serial and book production and distribution in order to describe the current state of contemporary fiction. As Hardy notes, "when observers and critics remark, as they often do remark, that the great bulk of English fiction of the present day is characterised by its lack of sincerity, they usually omit to trace this serious defect to external, or even eccentric causes" (126):

> In a ramification of the profounder passions the treatment of which makes the great style, something 'unsuitable' is sure to arise; and then comes the struggle with the literary conscience

> . . . . The dilemma then confronts [the author], he must either whip and scourge [his] characters into doing something contrary to their natures, to produce the spurious effect of their being in harmony with social forms and ordinances, or, by leaving them alone to act as they will, he must bring down the thunders of respectability upon his head, not to say ruin his editor, his publisher, and himself. (129-30)

Importantly, Hardy appears to recognize that the need for the author to conform to certain "social forms and ordinances" is enforced not by one, but by two distinct levels or stages of external authority: the author interacts directly with the editor/publisher who, in Hardy's case, places some fairly severe restrictions upon the scope and direction of his work; but the editor/publisher is, in turn, made answerable to the will or wills of certain legal, political or quasi-political individuals or groups, such as the National Vigilance Association or the various Members of Parliament mentioned above, and the publisher, like author and editor, is bound to conformity by the prospect of potential social and economic ruin. By extension, then, there is an indirect, but significant, and evidently growing recognition on Hardy's part of the ways in which literary works interact within, and are restricted by, the larger socio-political body, and this recognition, arguably, has already begun to inform both the direction and the intent of his recent writings.

Most notably, it is the role of convention in defining the scope of the author's work that is Hardy's central concern throughout, and the conventions of choice and treatment of subject are, as he states it, in turn directly restricted by the conventions of literary production and distribution. Form, subject and treatment are all, of course, continually acting and reacting in relation to what are largely historical conventions and Hardy, delicately "reconciling an instinctive conservatism with an intellectual perception of the necessity for certain kinds of social and political change" (Millgate 2: 179), seems almost intuitively to recognize the direct relation between literary conventions, the socio-economic conventions of literary production and circulation, and the larger and largely political conventions of a deeply engrained social conservatism. "All fiction," he writes, "should not be shackled by conventions concerning budding womanhood, which may be altogether false" (131):

> Adults who would desire true views for their own reading insist, for a plausible but questionable reason, upon false views for the reading of their young people.
>
> As a consequence, the magazine in particular and the circulating library in general do not foster the growth of the novel which reflects and reveals life . . . . Cause and effect were never more clearly conjoined, though commentators upon the result, both French and English, seem seldom

if ever to trace their connection. (128)

Hardy's argument throughout "Candour in English Fiction," like that of Buchanan's On Descending into Hell, is at least partially derivative, and his suggestion that "the old stories and dramas" are considered "lessons in life," while the modern novel is considered "a lesson in iniquity" (131), though not an uncommon contemporary argument, does suggest some knowledge of the argument in the Vizetelly Extracts, published just over a year before, where the comparison between the old dramatists of Vizetelly's own Mermaid series and the modern novels of Zola is fully developed. Whether or not Hardy had actually read the Extracts seems largely irrelevant here; the argument was, as noted, widely reported, and must have figured prominently in literary circles of the day. Hardy does, however, give the argument an added twist by suggesting the role played by form in shaping the reader's response to the material at hand:

> To say that few of the old dramatic masterpieces, if newly published as a novel (the form which, experts tell us, they would have taken in modern conditions), would be tolerated in English magazines and libraries is a ludicrous understatement. Fancy a brazen young Shakespeare of our time--Othello, Hamlet, or Antony and Cleopatra never having yet appeared--sending up one of those creations in narrative form to the editor of a London magazine, with the author's

> compliments, and his hope that the story will be found acceptable to the editor's pages . . . . One can imagine the answer that young William would get for his mad supposition of such fitness from any one of the gentlemen who so correctly conduct that branch of the periodical Press. (130)

Interestingly enough, Hardy's list of old "dramatic" works given in support of his thesis here--Oedipus, Agamemnon and Prometheus, Goethe's Faust and Wilhelm Meister, and Milton's Paradise Lost--seems rather tame. By contrast, the list given a few years later in Jude the Obscure as examples of Sue's more liberal reading--"Lemprière, Catullus, Martial, Juvenal, Lucian, Beaumont and Fletcher, Boccaccio, Scarron, De Brantôme, Sterne, De Foe, Smollett, Fielding, Shakespeare, the Bible" (182)--corresponds much more closely with the Vizetelly list and, in the classical examples, to the works then being translated and circulated by Leonard Smithers, though it would be quite wrong, of course, to identify any of the above directly or exclusively with either publisher.[11] The correspondences simply indicate a common frame of reference, a common understanding of what might be considered *risqué* or slightly obscene at that particular point in time. Curiously, Vizetelly was planning a "sumptuous" edition of The Decameron in 1887 (EZ 253) which was never issued, and shortly after the first Vizetelly trial (1888) the NVA issued a court summons

against a London bookseller for selling a translation of Boccaccio's work (EZ 269). Chatto & Windus, who would begin to publish Zola in 1892, followed by destroying their stocks of both Boccaccio and Rabelais in 1889 (On Descending into Hell 39).

Hardy concludes his argument by suggesting three possible solutions to the restrictions imposed upon the writer by the circulating libraries and by the current method of serial publication: first, "a system of publication under which books could be bought and not borrowed"; second, "the plan of publication as a *feuilleton* in newspapers read mainly by adults might be more generally followed, as in France"; or third, "magazines for adults; exclusively for adults, if necessary" (132).

While it would be wrong to ignore the strong personal interest that Hardy has in the current methods of publication and circulation at this particular point in his career, it does seem evident that much of his argument has been informed by his specific knowledge of the situation surrounding the Vizetelly case. Although rarely more than on the periphery of events, his assessment of current publishing practices does suggest an informed detachment from events, an awareness of the larger implications of

literary conventions, and of the potential penalties when conventional boundaries are crossed.

A few months after publishing "Candour in English Fiction" Hardy received a letter from William Locker of the Graphic concerning the possible serialization of A Group of Noble Dames. Locker suggested that the stories were "very suitable and entirely harmless to the robust minds of a Club smoking-room; but not at all suitable for the more delicate imaginations of young girls":

> A series of tales almost every one of which turns upon questions of childbirth, and those relations between the sexes over which conventionality is accustomed (wisely or unwisely) to draw a veil. (25 June 1891; quoted in Gatrell 81)

The "delicate imaginations of young girls" seem, in particular, to be much on the minds of everyone concerned, from Members of Parliament to editors and editorial staff, leading one to suspect that "the doll of English fiction" might really be little more than a metaphor for "the doll of English maidenhood." The writings of the "Club smoking-room" seem, then, to have been largely confined to the private realm of the "illegitimate" publication--to the pseudonymous, somewhat nefarious world likened here to Leonard Smithers. The system of the doll, a literary,

social and political system, invariably worked to exclude sexuality from the public eye, reconstructing human reality in the shape of an inanimate object--a strangely passive and somewhat perverse being--a theoretical construction of stable simplicity.

Text and Context: Colour, Texture, Symbol and Sexuality in Tess and The Woodlanders

The discussion has so far tended to view Hardy in oblique relations to Zola: in historical terms, it is difficult to substantiate more than a limited knowledge of Zola's work, most of which has been gained through the reading of translated texts of questionable reliability; nor can Hardy's role in supporting Henry Vizetelly be described as anything more than supportive, however much his familiarity with the case may have affected his understanding of the larger socio-political implications of his own work. In textual terms, however, the relationship begins to take on substance, to reveal a common body of incidents, images and patterns of description that are potentially of considerable significance.

In his introduction to The Literary Notebooks of Thomas Hardy (1985), Lennart Björk discusses the complex relationship between reading, note-taking and writing, drawing on Hardy's essay on "The Profitable Reading of Fiction" (1888; reprinted in PW 110-25) to distinguish between the act of reading for, in Hardy's words, "the accidents and appendages of narrative" or "trifles of useful

knowledge, statistics, queer historical fact" (PW 112-3; LN 1: xxii), and that of reading for "intellectual or moral profit" (PW 112; LN 1: xxii). As Björk notes, the relative importance of the notebook entries which record specific details of potential usefulness, suggesting a conscious effort on Hardy's part to acquire a body of information that may be either directly or indirectly useful to his writing at some future point, "might easily be exaggerated at the expense of the other notes" (LN 1: xxiii). While this is certainly true, the recording of specific notes of "useful knowledge," particularly in Hardy's "Facts" notebook--not included in either Björk's edition of The Literary Notebooks or Richard Taylor's edition of The Personal Notebooks (1978)--suggests that the information-gathering process played a fairly significant role in Hardy's career as a novelist, most notably in relation to the writing of The Return of the Native (1878), The Trumpet-Major (1880) and The Mayor of Casterbridge (1885). In the case of The Mayor of Casterbridge, Hardy's notes appear to be taken largely from local historical reports, intended to help "establish the fictional Casterbridge as a densely and concretely realized image of a busy market town (Millgate 1: 248). A later example of an obvious and direct correspondence between "fact" and "fiction," notebook and novel, relates to

the writing of Tess of the d'Urbervilles (1891). An entry on page 162 of Hardy's "Facts" notebook, drawn from the London News for 19 August 1830, is directly recognizable as the source of the incident concerning the Durbeyfield horse, providing the motivation for Tess's first visit to her d'Urberville "cousin":

> Dark night--Shaft of waggon enters breast of ridden horse, when latter was passing between former + a gig passing it.[1]

Although it would perhaps be misleading to suggest that this type of direct correspondence concerning an incident of plot is particularly common in the existing notebooks, many of the entries in the "Facts" notebook are nevertheless at least potentially plot-oriented in nature, though the emphasis appears to be particularly on information that might be used to flesh out rather than to generate a narrative.

The more significant entries in The Literary Notebooks, those concerned with "intellectual or moral profit" to the reader are, Björk suggests, "best considered in relation to Hardy's central critical beliefs, that is, the anti-realistic basis of his aesthetic principles" (LN 1: xxiii). These entries, of larger scope and greater number are, then, suggestive of Hardy's developing intellectual, ideological

and aesthetic interests and concerns, and do not necessarily bear any direct relation to his own writings.

In detailing the relationship between Hardy's post-Mayor of Casterbridge (1885) fiction and the novels of Zola that Hardy is known to have read, the general observations offered by Björk, based upon Hardy's own insights as a reader of fiction, suggest a practical starting-point for the comparisons to follow. The basic approach will be two-fold: to demonstrate a series of often very specific and direct intertextual correspondences in order to establish a firm basis from which to generate a discussion of Hardy's developing ideological and aesthetic concerns. At the root of the discussion are two central issues: how has Hardy's reading of Zola, combined with his growing discomfort with the conventional novel form, affected his understanding of artistic treatment, and what are the larger ideological implications of his changing modes of artistic representation in the decade between 1886 and 1896? In short, how does Hardy respond to "the doll of English fiction"--the socio-political and economic construction of popular literary convention--in the late eighties and early nineties, and how does this affect his choice and treatment of subject?

It should be reiterated that while I am attempting to establish Zola as an important presence in the wider discussion of Hardy's evolving understanding of the larger implications of literary representation, I am also well aware that his reading of Zola was not, as previously stated, by any means an exclusive factor in determining the changing directions in his writing throughout this period, but was one of any number of determining factors. What is important is not how like or unlike Zola Hardy is at various points in the later novels, or how conscious or unconscious he was of any correspondences, but rather how useful Zola is as a type of sounding-board for a discussion of certain aspects of Hardy's writing. The argument, then, is intended to be open rather than closed, inclusive rather than exclusive, suggestive rather than conclusive.

In looking at Tess of the d'Urbervilles in relation to Zola's Abbé Mouret's Transgression (Vizetelly, 1886), Björk notes that "the similarities may not be far-reaching enough to indicate influence, but the possibility cannot be disregarded. Hardy read Abbé Mouret's Transgression in 1886 or 1887; he started writing Tess in the autumn of 1888" (LN 2: 571). For those readers not familiar with Zola's novel, Abbé Mouret is, in some ways, an unusual book for

Zola. Joris-Karl Huysmans, whose A Rebours (1884) describes, in part, the cultivation of the "unnatural," the artificial world of decadent desire, admired Abbé Mouret more than Germinal,[2] for reasons perhaps best stated in A Rebours itself:

> On the day when [Zola] too had been afflicted with this longing [for some other existence], this craving which in fact is poetry itself, to fly far away from the contemporary society which he was studying, he had fled to an idyllic region [in Abbé Mouret] where the sap boiled in the sunshine; he had dreamt of fantastic heavenly copulations, of long earthly ecstasies, of fertilizing showers of pollen falling into the palpitating genitals of flowers; he had arrived at a gigantic pantheism, and with the Garden of Eden in which he placed his Adam and Eve he had created, perhaps unconsciously, a prodigious Hindu poem, singing the glories of the flesh, extolling, in a style whose broad patches of crude colour had something of the weird brilliance of Indian paintings, living animate matter, which by its own frenzied procreation revealed to man and woman the forbidden fruit of love, its suffocating spasms, its instinctive caresses, its natural postures. (Trans. Robert Baldick, Against Nature 184)

On the one hand, the setting and subject of much of Zola's novel seem appropriate enough to the naturalist inquiry: the village of Les Artaud, where Serge Mouret has recently taken the priest's living, provides the ideal naturalist setting--a small, isolated community, like that of the Isle of Slingers in The Well-Beloved (1892 and 1897), where all the "inhabitants were related, all bore the same

name," where the villagers "intermarried shamelessly and indiscriminately" and where "cousinships were lost in the mists of centuries" (27); and Serge, the abbé of the title, provides a subject, that of a crisis in faith, which Zola would return to and explore at greater length in the Lourdes, Rome, Paris trilogy (1894-8). Yet, while all of Zola's novels contain elements of poetic description, La Faute de l'abbé Mouret is, as Huysmans suggests, markedly poetic in tone and structure, and the heavily patterned representations of natural flora in the Edenic garden of Le Paradou are, arguably, largely anti-mimetic, more concerned with the symbolic confusion of amassed detail than with the individual realistic detail itself. Serge Mouret's fall in the garden is, notably, the fall into disillusionment, or out of illusion and into the chaotic confusion of the senses, what David Baguley calls "the fall into the anonymous, indiscriminate, formless, depersonalised biological state" (NF 219-20), and Serge's (sexual) confusion is externally represented in the overpowering accumulation of sensory detail. Hippolyte Taine, writing to Zola shortly after the book's appearance in 1875, suggested that Abbé Mouret *"dépasse le ton et les proportions du roman,"* striking the reader as *"un poème persan"* or *"une symphonie"* (20 April 1875; quoted in Lapp 325).

Lennart Björk again provides perhaps the best introduction to the discussion to follow, and though his role in editing the notebooks is limited to suggesting "mere starting points for further research into subjects that seem well worth investigating" (LN 1: xxxix), his comments concerning Hardy's reading of Abbé Mouret seem suggestive enough to deserve quoting at length:

> Zola's strongly symbolic description of the garden Le Paradou . . . is part of a potentially significant overall similarity between Abbé Mouret's Transgressions[3] and Tess of the d'Urbervilles. Like Talbothays Dairy, Le Paradou is a place of pastoral innocence and natural emotions shielded from Christian morality. In addition to the affinity of the concepts of settings, the main characters of the novels are remarkably alike. Two girls of Nature, Albine and Tess, fall deeply and unreservedly in love with men who are emotionally frigid and under profound religious influences. In Serge, Albine discovers too late that 'a flame was lacking in the depths of his grey eyes' (p. 134), just as Tess is 'appalled by the determination revealed in the depths of this gentle being she has married--the will to subdue the grosser to the subtler emotion, the substance to the conception, the flesh to the spirit' (Tess, ch. 36; p. 313). Although Serge and Angel develop differently, their desertion and consequent ruin of their girls are similar and similarly motivated: Angel leaves Tess because of his Christian notions of morality and Serge Albine in order to serve the Church. Their actions dramatize the perhaps major theme of the two novels: (in Hardy's words) the 'unnatural sacrifice of humanity to mysticism' (Tess, ch. 40; p. 339). (LN 2: 571)

Björk's analysis, though broadly developed, is both concise and insightful, and the various points he raises will be taken in turn as the discussion develops. In terms of structure, Abbé Mouret is divided into three separate books: the first and third are set mainly in the little village of Les Artaud, amidst the arid hills of Zola's boyhood Provence; the second and central book, which forms the focus for much of the discussion here, is set solely within the bounds of the once-formal walled garden of Le Paradou, the ruined remains of an eighteenth-century estate, now fallen into disrepair and strangely overgrown, where Serge has been taken to recover from a feverish illness. Serge's initiation into the garden, guided by Albine, the uncultivated, "natural" girl[4] of Le Paradou, closely resembles Tess's initiation into the newly cultivated garden on the grounds of the d'Urberville estate, guided by her new-found "cousin," Alec. Albine is attempting to re-awaken Serge's suppressed, "natural" sensibilities by introducing him to the luxuriant, uncultivated beauty that crowds the parterre of Le Paradou. The darkening depth of the garden looms in the background, both forbidding and inviting, unnerving Serge's still-delicate sensibilities with the overpowering sensuality of its untamed growth. Although this initial visit to the garden does not extend beyond the

limits of the once-formal rose-garden, lengthy passages are dedicated to detailing the sight and smell of a riotous "shower of roses" (138):

> Around them bloomed the roses with a mad, amorous blossoming, full of crimson and rosy and white laughter . . . . Yellow roses were there scattering the golden skins of barbarian maidens, straw-coloured roses, lemon-coloured roses, sun-coloured roses--every shade of necks ambered by the glowing skies. Further on, the flesh grew tenderer of texture, the tea-roses looked bewitchingly moist and cool, displayed the secrets of their modesty, hidden parts not often seen, fine as silk and faintly tinged with the blue network of veins . . . . Roses dusky as the lees of wine, black and bleeding, gashed this bridal purity like passion's wounds . . . . The cup-like roses offered their perfume as in a precious crystal; the drooping, urn-shaped roses let it drip drop by drop; the round, cabbage-like roses exhaled it with the even breathing of slumbering flowers . . . . (138-9)

On their next visit to the garden, Albine leads Serge further afield, to the old orchard, now vastly overgrown and laden with the fruits reclaimed from previous cultivation:

> At every step their progress was barred by gooseberry bushes, gemmed over with their limpid fruit. Hedges of raspberry canes shot up like wild brambles, while the ground was quite carpeted with strawberry plants teeming with ripe berries which exhaled a slight odour of vanilla. (161)

At one point, Albine offers Serge some strawberries, saying that she will halve them so that both will taste each berry. Serge refuses, and Albine throws the berries away.

The effect of Zola's descriptions of the flower and fruit gardens, only briefly suggested here, is to overpower the overly sensitive Serge with a seemingly endless but ever-changing and engaging variety of colours and smells. The dominance of the "flesh-and-blood" hues of the roses, some delicate, some crudely impassioned, and the sexual imagery apparent in each new opening bud, leaves little doubt that each flower, each new cluster of fruit, bears its counterpart in the corresponding seduction of the young pair. The garden is the seducer, and Serge and Albine the as yet still innocent Adam and Eve. Albine, like Milton's Eve, takes the initiating role, though the fall in Abbé Mouret is, in part, a reversal of the Miltonic order, in that paradise has to be regained before it can once again be lost, and Serge, like Angel Clare, is largely responsible for the "fall," as he is unable to complete the transition from the corrupt to the Edenic state, to relinquish the social for the natural order.

In comparing these two scenes to that of Tess's first meeting with Alec, the resemblance seems clear. The elements of the storyline remain relatively unchanged,

though the role of the sexes has been reversed, and it is now Alec who escorts Tess through the garden, where before it was Albine who had escorted Serge. The descriptions of the garden have also been condensed, and are limited here to one fruit and one flower: the strawberry and the rose.

> [Alec] conducted [Tess] about the lawns, and flower-beds, and conservatories; and thence to the fruit-garden and green-houses, where he asked her if she liked strawberries.
>
> 'Yes,' said Tess. 'When they come.'
>
> 'They are already here.' D'Urberville began gathering specimens of the fruit for her, handing them back to her as he stooped: and presently selecting a specially fine product of the 'British Queen' variety he stood up and held it by the stem to her mouth.
>
> 'No, no!' she said quickly, putting her fingers between his hand and her lips. 'I would rather take it in my own hand.'
>
> 'Nonsense!' he insisted; and in a slight distress she parted her lips and took it in.
>
> They had spent some time wandering desultorily thus, Tess eating in a half-pleased, half-reluctant state whatever d'Urberbille offered her. When she could consume no more of the strawberries he filled her little basket with them: and then the two passed round to the rose-trees, whence he gathered blossoms and gave her to put in her bosom. She obeyed like one in a dream, and when she could affix no more he himself tucked a bud or two into her hat, and heaped her basket with others in the prodigality of his bounty. (55)

The highly cultivated garden and grounds of the d'Urberville estate are in direct contrast to the wild, untamed garden of Le Paradou and Alec, himself the newly

cultivated branch of a highly "unnatural" section of English society, acts as an intermediary between the "natural" girl and the "unnatural" pleasures of the garden, just as Albine is herself the "natural" intermediary between untamed nature and the unnaturally sensitive Serge.

Another perhaps more direct series of parallel scenes occurs when, at several points throughout their rambles, Serge carries Albine across the various streams that block their path. The situation, and Albine's reluctance to be carried, are both highly reminiscent of the scene in Tess where Angel carries the four stranded milkmaids across the flooded lane.

> When [Serge and Albine] reached the stream which ran through the garden at the end of the flower-beds, she halted in great distress. The water was swollen with the late rains.
>
> 'We shall never be able to get across,' she murmured. 'I can generally manage it by taking off my shoes and stockings and tucking up my skirts; but, to-day, the water would come up to our waists.'
>
> They walked for a moment or two along the edge, hoping to find some fordable point; but the young girl said it was hopeless . . . .
>
> 'Get on to my back,' said Serge.
>
> 'No, no; I'd rather not. If you were to slip, we should both of us get a famous wetting. You don't know how treacherous those stones are.'
>
> 'Get on to my back,' repeated Serge, 'you had really much better.' (158-9)

Here the correspondence between the two novels would suggest a fairly direct re-writing of Zola's scene, enlarging upon rather than, as in the previous example, condensing the original elements of the incident. Again, the storyline remains relatively unchanged, though the scene in Tess is given greater dramatic and comic force, largely through the addition of the three other milkmaids, Marian, Izz and Retty, whose wide-ranging emotions add greater complexity to the scene:

> When the girls reached the most depressed spot they found that the result of the rain had been to flood the lane over-shoe to a distance of some fifty yards. This would have been no serious hindrance on a week-day; they would have clicked through it in their high pattens and boots quite unconcerned; but on this day of vanity, . . . on this occasion for wearing their white stockings and thin shoes, and their pink, white, and lilac gowns, on which every mud-spot would be visible, the pool was an awkward impediment . . . .
>
> 'Who would have expected such a rise in the river in the summer-time!' said Marian, from the top of the roadside-bank on which they had climbed, and were maintaining a precarious footing in the hope of creeping along its slope . . . .
>
> While they stood clinging to the bank they heard a splashing round the bend of the road, and presently appeared Angel Clare, advancing along the lane towards them through the water . . . .
>
> 'I'll carry you through the pool--every Jill of you . . . . ' (200-203)

The scene concludes as Tess, the last to be carried across, tries to climb along the bank:

> 'I may be able to clim' along the bank, perhaps--I can clim' better than they. You must be so tired, Mr. Clare!'
>
> 'No, no, Tess!' said he quickly. And almost before she was aware she was seated in his arms and resting against his shoulder. (205)

A further scene from Abbé Mouret reflects and enlarges upon the impression of the first:

> The first [stream] flowed over a bed of pebbles, between two rows of willows, which so closely joined each other that the two children thought they would be able to clamber across upon the branches. Serge, however, having speedily tumbled into the water, which did not rise higher than his knees, took Albine in his arms and carried her across to the opposite bank . . . . (173)

The combined details of these two scenes from Zola's novel, with Albine's reluctance to be carried, her assertion that she could "generally manage it by taking off [her] shoes and stockings and tucking up [her] skirts" in the first scene, and by the pair's thinking that "they would be able to clamber across upon the branches" in the second, are clearly echoed in Tess in the girls' concern for their Sunday apparel, their attempts to creep along the bank, and in Tess's own reluctance to be carried across the lane.

A couple of points are perhaps worth considering here before continuing. The epic quality of Zola's narrative, as

in a number of his novels, depends heavily upon an orchestrated arrangement of cumulative detail: in the case of the flower descriptions, an extensive array of flowers is minutely detailed in terms of colour, scent, shape and motion. In addition, even a small scene, like that of Serge carrying Albine across a stream, is deliberately repeated, to give the sense that these are actions taking place "out of time," in a world ordered by individual sensory experience rather than by externally imposed societal regulations and conditions. The heavy use of sensory material, particularly of colour, texture and smell, and the orchestrated repetition and accumulation of incidental detail, though not, of course, unique to Zola, is at least developed to an unusually high degree in Abbé Mouret. All this, arguably, makes Zola's novel appeal to the reader's sensory memory in a way that is perhaps uncommon in a literary work. Michael Millgate has suggested that Hardy "was extraordinarily sensitive to colours" (1: 285),[5] and if this was so, then the excessive, almost savage use of colouring in Zola's novel may well have impressed itself on Hardy's imagination in ways that would be difficult to assess. A window-dresser in Zola's Le Ventre de Paris (1873) refers to *"le langage d'une tache rouge mise à côté d'une tache grise"* (II: 734), emphasizing the idea of a

consciously constructed language of colour symbolism in Zola's work. "Again, what meaning lies in Colour!" writes Carlyle[6] in Sartor Resartus (1836): "From the soberest drab to the high-flaming scarlet, spiritual idiosyncrasies unfold themselves in choice of Colour: if the Cut [of clothing] betoken Intellect and Talent, so does the Colour betoken Temper and Heart" (26). The common symbolic meaning of colour, the language of colour as used to represent personal idiosyncrasies of "Temper and Heart," to externally represent the internal emotions, forms perhaps the most striking point of comparison between Tess and Abbé Mouret, and suggests, in part, that the common scheme of coloration in the two novels might derive, in this particular, from a common methodology.

Another suggestive and unusual incident in Abbé Mouret bears a strong resemblance to a scene in Tess. In the crumbling old mansion where Serge has been brought to convalesce, there are some old paintings done in fresco that bear, like the portraits in the ancestral home where Tess and Angel spend their wedding night, an uncanny resemblance to the heroine of the story. In both instances, it is important that the paintings are either built into or are an integral part of the wall, and cannot be removed.

> 'You haven't noticed,' said Serge one morning during these uneasy intervals, 'that painting of a woman over the door there, have you? It is like you.'
> . . . They both turned to the paintings and dragged out the table once more alongside the wall, nervously desirous of occupying themselves.
> 'Oh! no,' murmured Albine. 'She is much stouter than I am. But one can't see her very well; she is lying in such a queer position . . . . (198)

Later on, as Serge and Albine begin to grow more anxious, both troubled by their growing sexual awareness, Albine chances to remark, "It is these paintings which make us feel so unhappy. They distress us by always looking at us and watching us" (205).

In Tess, the portraits of Tess's d'Urberville ancestors prove equally unsettling:

> 'What's the matter?' said [Angel].
> 'Those horrid women!' [Tess] answered, with a smile. 'How they frightened me.'
> He looked up, and perceived two life-sized portraits on panels built into the masonry . . . .
> 'Whose portraits are those?' asked Clare of the charwoman.
> 'I have been told by old folk that they were ladies of the d'Urberville family . . . . '
> The unpleasantness of the matter was that, in addition to their effect upon Tess, her fine features were unquestionably traceable in these exaggerated forms. (308)

Angel later remarks to Tess, "Those harridans on the panels upstairs have unsettled you. I am sorry I brought you here"

(310). Disturbed by the "unpleasantness" of the portraits, Tess follows Angel into the adjoining room. Here a single basin has been placed for washing their hands:

> Clare touched hers under the water.
> 'Which are my fingers and which are yours?' he said, looking up. 'They are very much mixed.'
> 'They are all yours,' said she . . . . (308)

In a similar scene in Zola's novel, Albine says to Serge:

> 'You remember the day when I first took you in . . . . You kissed my hands when the door was closed. There they are again, my hands. They are yours to take. (201)

Significantly, both of these scenes in Tess are direct reworkings of scenes from earlier Hardy novels, demonstrating how difficult it is to attempt to identify a single source as the basis for any given scene, though the scenes in Abbé Mouret may well have suggested different ways to develop the individual incidents. In Under the Greenwood Tree (1872), Dick Dewy and Fancy Day, like Tess and Angel, share a common wash-basin, and some of the same dialogue, though here there is no symbolic giving of the hands, and Dewy's awkwardness quickly dispels the intimacy of the moment:

> 'Really, I hardly know which are my own hands and which are yours, they have got so mixed up

> together,' [Fancy] said, withdrawing her own very suddenly.
> 'It doesn't matter at all,' said Dick, 'at least as far as I am concerned.' (108)

By contrast, the role of the ancestral portraits in Hardy's A Laodicean (1881) is more fully developed than in Tess, though to a slightly different effect. Here, the likeness between the de Stancy ancestral portraits and the current family representatives is mostly along the male line, and the effect, though providing a sinister reflection on Captain de Stancy, the present-day male descendant, is to draw his love interest, Paula Power, closer to him, rather than, as in Tess and Abbé Mouret, to create an awkwardness or uneasiness between the two:

> In a short time [de Stancy] had drawn near to the painting of the ancestor whom he so greatly resembled. When [Paula's] quick eye noted the speck on the face, indicative of inherited traits strongly pronounced, a new and romantic feeling that the de Stancys had stretched out a tentacle from their genealogical tree to seize her by the hand and draw her in to their mass took possession of Paula. (213)

What is especially intriguing here is not so much Hardy's apparent willingness to rework earlier scenes in his later novels--a process familiar enough to readers already aware of his much-noted reworkings of The Poor Man and the Lady material--but rather the realization that these last two

incidents in Tess and Abbé Mouret, seemingly so closely related, indeed had independent origins. However much Hardy and Zola might have differed on a wide range of issues and ideas, there does seem to be evidence to suggest that, in terms of choice and, more particularly, in terms of treatment of subject, the two seem to have shared a number of similar artistic tendencies and perceptions, sometimes, certainly, derived from a common source, but other times, apparently, independently arrived at.

As suggested in the "giving of the hands" scene, it is crucial to both novels that the female character submit herself entirely, without reserve, to the male, not simply as a gesture of submission and obedience, or in resignation to a perceived (and misconceived) authority, but also as a symbolic act, intended to convey the (one-sided) sacrifice of the self to the "pure" or "complete" union. The act of submission in each case coincides with the growing tyranny of the male, as both Angel and Serge, in turn, become cruel and inflexible. In Abbé Mouret, Albine prostrates herself before Serge, declaring:

> 'All that you tell me shall be a truth which I will listen to on my knees. Have I ever had a thought that was not your own? . . . You shall teach me, and make of me whatever you will.' (281)

In a similar scene, Tess proclaims her absolute submission to the will of Angel:

> 'I shan't do anything, unless you order me to. And if you go away from me I shall not follow 'ee; and if you never speak to me any more I shall not ask why, unless you tell me I may.'
> 'And if I do order you to do anything?'
> 'I will obey you, like your wretched slave, even if it is to lie down and die.' (326)

Although both Tess's "'I will obey you . . . even if it is to lie down and die'" and Albine's "'make of me whatever you will'" are, arguably, simply the stock phrases of conventional romanticism, they are also, when taken in context, largely symbolic statements that reverberate in tones that suggest the sacrificial denial of the self by the woman for the man.

In much the same way, the landscapes in Tess and Abbé Mouret provide symbolic backdrops to the changing emotions of the two pairs. In Zola's novel, each new discovery in the garden marks a new stage in the evolution of Albine and Serge's union. So closely inter-related are the lovers and their landscape that, like the landscape in Tess, "there is no separation between what the characters feel and the setting in which they feel it" (Alvarez 13). The landscape, in effect, belongs to the two: they often seem to be its

sole inhabitants; it often seems to exist solely for themselves:

> The orchard provided them with food, piling up Albine's skirts with its sweet ripe fruits, and spreading over them the protecting shade of its perfumed boughs, as they sat at their happy breakfasts in the early morning. Away in the meadows, the grass and the streams were all theirs . . . . (193)

Similarly in Tess, the outdoor world provides a place of refuge where Angel and Tess are protected against the prying eyes of conventional society:

> Being so often--possibly not always by chance--the first two persons to get up at the dairy-house, they seemed to themselves the first persons up of all the world . . . . The spectral, half-compounded, aqueous light which pervaded the open mead impressed them with a feeling of isolation, as if they were Adam and Eve. (185)[7]

Seen in such moments, Tess seems to "exhibit a dignified largeness . . . an almost regnant power . . . . She was no longer the milkmaid, but a visionary essence of woman--a whole sex condensed into one typical form" (185-6). Equally, E. A. Vizetelly writes in his introduction to the Chatto & Windus edition of Abbé Mouret, "Albine, if more or less unreal, a phantasm, the spirit as it were of nature incarnate in womanhood, is the ideal, the very quintessence of woman" (ix).

In addition to the similarity of their essential qualities as women, Tess and Albine share a number of physical traits which are, in turn, symbolic of their deeper emotional and psychological compositions. Both share a "strawberries-and-cream" as opposed to a "peaches-and-cream" complexion, which is constantly reinforced by the surrounding images of milk and the dominance of the pink and flesh-hued colours noted previously, as in the scene with the strawberries and roses. In both women, the blood is always just beneath the surface. The "real" sexual woman is always in conflict with the "ideal" asexual virgin.

In Abbé Mouret, this conflict is actually personified in Serge's transference of his ideal, spiritual love for the Virgin Mary to his very real, physical love for Albine. The image of the Virgin becomes for Serge an obsession with the female ideal:

> A tender smile wreathed [the Virgin's] lips, marked by a dash of crimson . . . . Her countenance was rosy, with clear eyes, upturned to Heaven: her hands were clasped--rosy, child-like hands . . . . (109)

In Albine, Serge discovers the ideal embodied in reality and, though Albine is very much of flesh-and-blood, like Tess, she is constantly referred to as the physical embodiment of the virginal ideal:

> [Albine] was sixteen; how strange she looked, with her slightly elongated face . . . . So accurate was [Serge's] recollection of her that he could see a scratch upon one of her supple wrists, a rosy scar upon the white skin. (107-8)

> Albine's skin . . . was milky white, and faintly gilded by the sunny sheen. The shower of roses round her, on her, steeped her in rosy pink . . . . She showed her stainless skin blooming unabashed as a flower, musky with a goodly fragrance. Her frame was slender, not too tall, and supple as a snake's, with softly rounded and voluptuously expanding outlines, instinct with the grace of a budding form . . . . Her oval face, with its narrow brow and rather full mouth, beamed smilingly with the tender, living light of her blue eyes. (138)

The "rosy scar upon the white skin," the "rather full mouth," and the fluctuating tones of pink and white, coupled with the Virgin's "dash of crimson," are all equally characteristic of Tess, who is described as having a "peony mouth" (22), a "pouted-up deep red mouth" (23) and "holmberry lips" (72), and whom Angel first describes as "a fresh and virginal daughter of Nature" (172). The young milkmaid's complexion fluctuates between "pink and flawless" (149) and "pale and tragical" (149). When she yawns, Angel observes "the red interior of her mouth as if it had been a snake's" (242). Again, both women are continually immersed in images of fruitfulness and milk: Albine is seen in the midst of "the milky sap of plants untouched by the sun"

(112) and amongst "the colossal bronze-green nettles, calmly exuding their blistering poison" (145), just as Tess is seen moving stealthily through a "profusion of growth, gathering cuckoo-spittle on her skirts, . . . staining her hands with thistle-milk and slug-slime, and rubbing off upon her naked arms sticky blights which, though snow-white on the appletree-trunks, made madder stains on her skin" (175). Again Tess is seen, her hands showing "themselves of the pinkness of the rose," "amid the immaculate whiteness of the curds" (253):

> Her arm, from her dabbling in the curds, was as cold and damp to [Angel's] mouth as a new-gathered mushroom, and tasted of the whey. But she was such a sheaf of susceptibilities that her pulse was accelerated by the touch, her blood driven to her finger-ends and the cool arms flushed hot. (253)

Pink and white, fruit, flower and milk surround the two young women as if they were "steeped in a milk of youth, and flooded with a golden halo" (AM 131). The blood is always rising to the surface of the snow-white skin: the real and the ideal, the woman and the virgin are continually in conflict, and in both cases the male mistakes the virginal ideal for the real woman.

For both Serge and Angel, the idea of the virginal ideal--in both cases, a contradictory concept of a

spiritually "disembodied" female who, paradoxically, seems to embody, to be the subject of, an idealized male desire--has gained a puritanical hold upon their understanding of reality, and both, in turn, become the unwilling but immovable instruments of their tyrannical ideal. Serge, at first, forsakes reality for the spiritual ideal, and in his adoration of the Virgin he provides a close parallel to Angel's mystical adoration of the virginal Tess. In a vision, Serge sees the Virgin surrounded by innocent children, who love with "pure hands, unsullied lips, tender limbs, without a stain, as if come forth from a bath of milk (111):

> 'In later years, our mouth gets tainted and reeks of our passions . . . . Everything is stained by this defect. Everywhere its universal stench is tainting love, the bridal chamber, the cradle of the new-born babe, and even the flowers expanding in the sun and the trees bursting into bud. Earth is steeped in this impurity, whose slightest drops spring forth again in growths of shame.' (111-2)

Serge's idealized love of the Virgin is later transferred to the physical reality of Albine and yet, like Angel, his deeply rooted vision of the virginal ideal will later re-surface in reaction against the "impurity" of Albine's sexual reality.

Angel, like Serge, is equally "the slave to custom and conventionality when surprised back into his early teachings" (369). Following his time in London, and before the advent of Tess at Talbothays, Angel apparently lives an "outwardly sainted" life, giving himself up to his studies, his music--being "ever in the habit of neglecting the particulars . . . for the general impression" (170). His love of the pastoral ideal he too transfers to the reality of the "bewitching" Tess, who becomes the ideal whose hands are quite literally "bathed in milk." Like Albine, Tess is also continually referred to by her virginal qualities, "as if she were merely a soul at large" (185-6).

For both male characters, then, there is an attempt to move from the spiritual ideal to an idealized reality, and for both, the shock of the natural imperfections in reality lead them, in turn, to desert reality in an attempt to return, disillusioned, to the now hollow ideal. For Angel, Brazil becomes the new ideal; for Serge, the church and the Virgin provide a refuge from imperfect reality. As Angel relates to Tess, "'Here was I thinking you a new-sprung child of nature' . . . . 'The woman I have been loving is not you'" (330; 325). The woman that Angel had loved was only in part the real Tess, just as with Serge, Albine was only an imitation of the ideal. Unable to distinguish

clearly between ideality and reality, both are bound to disillusionment, and to the final shattering of their "realized ideal."

When, in the final stages of either novel, both Serge and Angel are forced to assess their situations clearly and practically, and to devise a plan of escape from the communities that will condemn them, both react with similar indecision, ill-equipped as they are to meet the demands that will secure their release:

> [Serge] began to be a little uneasy as to their manner of life together. It would be difficult for them to remain in the neighbourhood; they would have to go away somewhere, without anyone knowing about it . . . . The practical side of the situation alarmed him, and thrust him, in all his weakness, face to face with a complicated problem with which he was totally unable to grapple.
>
> Where were they to get horses for their escape? And if they went away on foot, would they not be stopped and detained as vagabonds? Was he capable of getting any employment, by which he could earn bread for his wife? He had never been taught any kind of trade. He was quite ignorant of actual life. (316)

Angel, if not at first quite so indecisive as Serge, and perhaps slightly better off in terms of his trade, is equally ignorant of life, and soon lapses into similar indecision. His, "'I will not desert you'" (525) may be momentarily comforting, but his practical ignorance greatly hinders the chances of their escape:

> With an instinct as to possibilities he did not now, as he had intended, make for the first station beyond the town, but plunged still further under the firs . . . . Thus they proceeded for several miles till Tess, arousing herself, looked about her and said timidly: 'Are we going anywhere in particular?'
>
> 'I don't know, dearest. Why?'
>
> 'I don't know.'
>
> 'Well--we might walk a few miles further, and when it is evening find lodgings somewhere or other--in a lonely cottage perhaps . . . . '
>
> Upon the whole it seemed a good thing to do. Thereupon they quickened their pace, avoiding high-roads, and following obscure paths tending more or less northward. But there was an unpractical vagueness in their movements throughout the day: neither one of them seemed to consider any question of effectual escape, disguise, or long concealment. Their every idea was temporary and unforefending, like the plans of two children. (525-6)

The situation, the need for the female to escape social or legal condemnation, and the male's inability to formulate an adequate means of escape, is much the same in both accounts. Of course, Angel at least manages to act where Serge, more fully committed to the "customs and conventions" of Christian society and morality at this point than Angel, remains inert. In the end, Serge remains in the church and Albine dies an outcast, pregnant with Serge's child.

Two final points concerning the plots of the two novels need mentioning here. In the final pages of Abbé Mouret, two apparently unrelated events are described side-by-side,

so that the one is made to reflect upon the other: Albine's death, significantly, coincides with the death of a villager's illegitimate baby; and Albine, who was also pregnant at the time of her death, is nearly denied a Christian burial on grounds of suspected suicide. Serge, however, in his role as priest, ensures that Albine is properly buried, stating that "'eternity was for everybody'" (348). These two incidents, the death of the illegitimate child--closely associated here with Albine's own unborn child, also illegitimate--and the question of a Christian burial, are clearly meant to be read in conjunction with each other, and may have suggested, in part, Tess's own dilemma over the question of providing a Christian burial for Sorrow, her illegitimate child by Alec, in chapter XIV of Tess.

But perhaps the most important affinity between the two novels lies not so much in the similarity of specific scenes or in the likeness of the main characters, but in the authors' common use of symbolic imagery. In A Hardy Companion (1968), F. B. Pinion notes:

> Darwinian thought filled Hardy with a sense of Nature's 'passioned plans for bloom and beauty marred' (HS 'Discouragement', 1863-7), and it was for this reason that the imagery of Hamlet's world, as 'an unweeded garden' possessed by 'things rank and gross in nature', and that of

> Shelley's 'A Sensitive Plant' acquired a special and lasting significance. (165)

Pinion quite rightly goes on to ascribe Hardy's use of the "unweeded garden" imagery to the influence of Shelley by comparing passages from Hardy's "The Mother Mourns" (Poems of the Past and the Present), Desperate Remedies, Far from the Madding Crowd, The Return of the Native, The Woodlanders and Tess of the d'Urbervilles with a single passage from the Shelley poem mentioned above. Pinion's point is not only to relate Hardy to Shelley and to the more general influence of Darwinian thought, but also to demonstrate how the imagery of natural decay and corruption runs throughout Hardy's works, from his first published novel to the poems published in his later life. But what Pinion does not point out, and what is of primary importance here, is how Hardy's use of the symbolic imagery of the garden increased dramatically, particularly in Tess (1891), but also in The Woodlanders (1887), in the years following his reading of Zola's Abbé Mouret.

What A. Alvarez refers to as the "intense eroticism of the writing" (17) in Tess is most often directly associated with the imagery of the "unweeded garden" which, arguably, seems to be related to the garden of Le Paradou--a garden which, after all, has remained unweeded for over a century.

As Alvarez goes on to suggest, "it is as though the vegetation itself contained all the secret smells of physical passion" (17) and, if Hardy turns time and time again to the "rank luxuriance" (AM 146) of the garden for his central imagery of fecundity and decay, the garden of Zola's Abbé Mouret may be fairly described as one long, intoxicated exercise in "things rank and gross in nature."

Here it is not so much a question of direct parallels between the two novels, as a whole framework of images of natural regeneration and decay that have apparently been absorbed into Hardy's literary imagination. The broadening sensuality of the writing, the bolder use of colouring, and the images of lushness, fatness and secretion in Tess are all, to a large extent, the result of Hardy's constant use of the garden imagery and, in his continuing search to "intensify the expression of things" (LW 183), Zola's Abbé Mouret seems to have provided a major source of natural description:

> [Serge] could taste it coming, with a savour more and more marked, bringing him the healthful bitterness of the open air, holding to his lips a feast of sugared aromatics, acrid fruits, and milky shoots. He could inhale it, coming with the perfumes it had culled upon its way--the scent of the earth, the scent of the shady woods, the scent of heated plants, the scent of living animals, a whole posy of scents powerful to dizziness. (131)

Although Hardy's descriptions are less heavy-handed than Zola's (or, more correctly, than those of Zola's anonymous translator), are more powerfully suggestive and less minutely detailed, there can be little doubt that Hardy's descriptions of the valley of the Var or Froom bear a strong resemblance to those of Le Paradou:

> Immediately [Angel] began to descend from the upland to the fat alluvial soil below, the atmosphere grew heavier; the languid perfume of the summer fruits, the mists, the hay, the flowers, formed therein a vast pool of odour which at this hour seemed to make the animals, the very bees and butterflies, drowsy. (241)

Zola's descriptions of natural flora--his "lush colony of fleshy plants" (190)--in particular provide a wealth of potential material--animated, intensified, exaggerated, painted boldly, strangely scented and more strangely motioning, secreting--which is, in every sense, more insistent and excessive than anything that may be found in Hardy's work prior to the writing of Tess of the d'Urbervilles:

> Nasturtiums, bare and green of skin, gaped their mouths of ruddy gold, . . . scarlet-runners, tough as whip-chord, lit up scattered spots with the glow of their gleaming sparks; bind-weeds expanded their heart-shaped leaves and with their thousand of little bells rang a silent peal of exquisite colours . . . . wood-ruffs, with their soft musky

> perfume; brazen-throated mimuluses, blotched with bright vermilion; lofty pholoxes, crimson ones and white ones, shooting up their distaffs of flowers for the breezes to spin . . . . Marigolds buried beneath their choking foliage their writhing starry flowers, that already reeked of putrefaction. (AM 145-9)

A. Alvarez has suggested that "Hardy's version of the Paradise Garden was closer to Gauguin's than to that of the Book of Genesis" (17) and yet, it seems perhaps more apt to suggest that Hardy's garden is closer to Zola's than to Gauguin's, particularly in its consciousness of the imminence of nature's decay: Gauguin's garden is an eternal paradise; Hardy's, like Zola's, is constantly ready to rot:

> The outskirt of the garden in which Tess found herself had been left uncultivated for some years, and was now damp and rank with juicy grass which sent up mists of pollen at a touch, and with tall blooming weeds emitting offensive smells--weeds whose red and yellow and purple hues formed a polychrome as dazzling as that of cultivated flowers . . . . The rank-smelling weed-flowers glowed as if they would not close, for intentness, and the waves of colour mixed with the waves of sound. (TD 175)

> Rays from the sunrise drew forth the buds and stretched them into long stalks, lifted up sap in noiseless streams, opened petals, and sucked out scents in invisible jets and breathings. (TD 183)

Sap and milk, scents and shoots, images of rankness and lush, unbridled growth dominate the landscapes of Talbothays and Le Paradou: "Now they were treading under foot a foul-

odoured growth," writes Zola, "worm-wood with its bitter penetrating smell; dew that reeked like putrid flesh; and the hot valerian, all clammy with its aphrodisiacal exudations" (AM 188); "Amid the oozing fatness and warm ferments of the Var Vale," writes Hardy, "at the season when the rush of juices could almost be heard below the hiss of fertilization . . . " (TD 210). Hardy's natural world, like Zola's, is the Edenic garden intensified, made brilliant with "a hum of vivifying warmth" (AM 26), "patches of rank herbage" (AM 25), "damp and rank with juicy grass" (TD 175) and the "odour of a newly mown meadow" (AM 107). Outside the garden, pheasants are slaughtered, "their rich plumage dabbled with blood" (TD 385), just as pigs are slaughtered, the gash from the knife "still quite fresh, and . . . beaded with little drops of blood" (AM 345). Outside, death awaits, and society, with its conventions and institutions, seeks to order the everyday passing of life.

The text of The Woodlanders, which Hardy was working on throughout 1886, was completed in its serial form on 4 February 1887, and published in book form on 15 March 1887.[8] As the Vizetelly edition of Abbé Mouret was not published until October 1886[9]--approximately four months before the completion of Hardy's novel--it seems unlikely that, even if

he read Zola's novel as soon as it appeared, Hardy's reading of Abbé Mouret could have had more than a minor impact on the writing of The Woodlanders. Nevertheless, it is at times uncanny how closely attuned the two men's writing is, in some particulars, at this specific juncture, especially in the sexualization of landscape, in "that wondrous world of sap and leaves" (WL 306) and, more particularly, in the "various monstrosities of vegetation" (WL 54)--the fungi, and the sweat and stains of ruddy nature--that blight the otherwise idyllic landscape. Hardy's copulating woodland--to risk overstating a point--like Zola's Le Paradou, is a chaotic tangle of sexual imagery, a "mass of full-juiced leafage" (WL 267), where the "vegetation was heavy nightly with globes of dew" (WL 277), and where the tangles of ivy "were pushing in with such force at the [cottage] eaves as to lift from their supports the shelves that were fixed there" (WL 28).

Serge's church at Les Artaud is equally threatened by encompassing nature, by the "patches of rank herbage [that] swarmed over the threshold" (AM 25), and by "the first throb of shooting sap" (AM 25) that, in one passage, metaphorically threatens to topple the church. Zola's woodland--for Le Paradou, of course, has a woodland--is equally a place of "flaming growths" and "monstrous plants"

(AM 126), a "chaos of mossy trunks . . . teeming with snakes and nettles" (AM 321), of "straight lichen-stained trunks . . . [and] mouldering leaves" (AM 178). In each case, the ever-present cycle of fecundity and decay is continually evoked, as embattled nature struggles to reproduce:

> Upon the bark, torn and seamed with bleeding wounds, the fruit-pods were ripening, for the mere effort of bearing seed strained the old monster's skin till it split. (AM 179)

> Where slimy streams of fresh moisture, exuding from decayed holes caused by old amputation, ran down the bark of the oaks and elms, the rind below being coated with a lichenous wash as green as emerald. (WL 185)

"Delicate-patterned mosses, hyacinths, primroses, lords-and-ladies, and other strange and common plants" (WL 188) are scattered beneath "the vermilion light of the sun" (WL 111), while in the shadows arises "the scent of decay from the perishing leaves underfoot" (WL 45):

> In the greenish light which filtered through the foliage, the only sound that broke the deep silence of the orchard was the dull thud of the fruit as it fell to the ground, snapped off by the wind. (AM 160).

Allowing for a certain sense of play here, it is difficult at times to discern Hardy's prose from some of the better passages of the translated Zola. The same sense of

strangeness, of brightly coloured plantlife arising out of the surrounding stagnancy and decay, dominates both landscapes, as the light plays upon the "pale foliage in dew-gleaming masses of yellowish-green" (AM 148), and then turns to darkness, "throwing splotches of such ruddiness on the leaves . . . that they were turned to gory hues" (WL 289). And though the villagers of Les Artaud, "leisurely increasing and multiplying on their dunghills with the irreflectiveness of trees, . . . with no definite notion of the world that lay beyond those tawny rocks, in whose midst they vegetated" (AM 27), seem at first to bear little relation to the villagers of Little Hintock, the two communities, where "all seemed to quiver with a thrill as of shooting sap" (AM 20), share a common landscape of "gardens and orchards now bossed, nay encrusted, with scarlet and golden fruit" (WL 227).

In the end, it really matters little whether or not Hardy actually read Zola's novel before completing work on The Woodlanders. Both writers have come to a common point in terms of their use of colour and texture, exaggerating, intensifying their natural descriptions to an unnatural degree, and casting the inner lives of their villagers onto the landscape about.

What does seem important, however, is the realization of how strong an impression the reading of Zola's novel must have made on Hardy's consciousness at this particular point. The external landscape has increasingly become, for Hardy, a canvas against which to colour, to externally represent the internal emotions of his various characters. The "monstrosities of vegetation" (WL 54), the "huge lobes of fungi . . . like lungs" (WL 53), the "stemless yellow fungi like lemons and apricots" (WL 288) all suggest an "unnatural" nature--a nature of abnormal growths--which in turn is made to reflect upon society's own perversities: the "degraded mass underneath" (WL 204) the trees give life to "the lichen [that eats] the vigour of the stalk, and the ivy [that] slowly strangle[s] to death the promising sapling" (WL 53). This is not to suggest that Hardy has become, in any conventionally recognized form, explicitly critical of social and sexual mores, but that the voice of implicit dissent in his writing has become increasingly stronger in his socially reflective depiction of an "unnatural" natural world. In Hardy's "madder hues" there is a seeming madness, an apparently increasing but veiled anger, an unwillingness to simply tell a conventional story in a simple and conventional manner. By displacing what is arguably a combination of social, sexual and literary frustrations onto

the literary landscape, by creating a landscape that is almost always in some way disturbing, unsettling, Hardy is able, in a sense, to defy conventional expectations, to speak more frankly than convention would normally allow.

On Obscurity, Dreams and Rude Awakenings: From Church Spires to Cabbage Leaves and 'Pizzles' and Pigs

Writing in 1912, in his introduction to A Zola Dictionary, J. G. Patterson remarks: "It is safe to say that had L'Assommoir never been written there would have been no Jude the Obscure" (xxi). Although it is unsafe to say any such thing, Patterson nevertheless has a point: Jude the Obscure is a book that is built (and broken) around (and by) a few scattered acts of unexpected brutality. The very unexpectedness of the violence makes these acts seem both gratuitous and absurd. Yet it is this excess of the unexpected, and the corresponding lack or shortage of explanation or meaning, that is, in itself, one of the novel's most significant features. The meaning behind the violence, the brutality, is somehow obscured in its origin: that "'Nature's law be mutual butchery'" (JO 386)[1] may well explain, in part, butchery's philosophical basis, but does little to give the actual incident meaning. Jude, then, is a book in which obscurity of meaning is both central and essential. The breaking of lives, the disturbed and often disturbing narrative of Jude, seems to be as much a matter of circumstance, of random illogic, as of any otherwise

logical or rational order. This is not to suggest that Hardy was necessarily consciously constructing and controlling a postmodern world. Quite the contrary. Hardy seems to have been, as earlier suggested, an instinctual thinker, an emotive rather than a strictly rational writer. The broken world of Jude the Obscure is, thus, an essentially broken world rather than a world that is necessarily and systematically broken. This seems an important point.

Zola, of course, more strictly than any other writer of the period, attempts to explain social violence in terms of Nature's laws--though again, the actual incident is always more complex and more intriguing than the explanation given. There is, then, a logic, a rationale behind the "butchery," but more important than the logic is the shock of the irrational--the sudden recognition of an underlying and apparently chaotic violence that surfaces, shockingly, in many of the more extreme moments of Zola's fiction. As Henri Mitterand has suggested in a recent essay on La Bête humaine, "all of the Rougon Macquart are . . . regulated-deregulated in a way by the diagonal of a madman"; according to Mitterand, "La Bête humaine may stand as an emblem of novelistic production, a marriage between systemization and irrationality" (Naturalism in the European Novel 79).

Zola's determining system, his controlling sense of internal and external order--premise, method, illustration, exegesis --is always less important (and less impressive) than the sense of the uncontrolled--of the irrational "beast" behind the socialized being. Zola, then, on the surface, the great proponent of method--of system, proportion and order--is, in short, a paradox: though outwardly re-evaluating, re-ordering and reforming social mores and values (especially in his later works), Zola is arguably less convincing as a rational proponent of social reformation than as a chronicler of irrational disorder--of individual and collective dysfunction, disintegration, disease and degradation.

Jude the Obscure--however else one may read the book--is certainly the novel of Hardy's most readily read in the context of Zola's work, particularly in the more violent aspects of its plot. Hardy, of course, refuted this association, commenting to Edmund Gosse--or rather suggesting to Gosse, by way of the novelist to the reviewer --that Jude was more like Fielding than like Zola:

> As to the 'coarse' scenes with Arabella, the battle in the school room, &c., the newspaper critics might, I thought, have sneered at them for their Fielding-ism rather than for their Zolaism. But your everyday critic knows nothing of Fielding. I am read in Zola very little, but

> have felt akin to Fielding, so many of his scenes having been laid down this way, & his home near. (20 November 1895)

However convincing these comments may or may not seem--and it would appear that Hardy is, in part, being consciously misleading here, both in his identification (or partial mis-identification) of the offending scenes and in his seeming desire to downplay his familiarity with Zola's work--Gosse dutifully and, for the most part, apparently unquestioningly, took up the author's point-of-view in writing his lengthy review of Jude the following month (Cosmopolis 1 [January 1896]: 60-9; reprinted in Cox 262-70). Although Gosse notes that "curiously enough--and doubtless by a pure accident--there are not a few passages of Jude the Obscure which naturally excite comparison with similar scenes in La Terre" (Cox 266)--though "the parallel is always in Mr. Hardy's favour" (266)--it is more to Hardy's English predecessors, to Fielding and Smollett, that Gosse is inclined to look in tracing the coarse treatment of the relations between the sexes in Hardy's novel.

Whatever the reader may think of Hardy's ruse--if ruse it was--if it was his intention to deflect attention away from comparisons to Zola and onto the more respectable (because long-dead and English) comparative shoulders of Henry Fielding, then the ruse certainly worked. Years

later, in a letter to F. A. Hedgcock, Gosse was to reaffirm his view of Hardy's intellectual and creative independence:

> Les idées qui ont depuis inspiré les livres de M. Hardy existaient déjà dans son esprit et se montraient dans sa conversation; elles étaient un résultat du tempérament et de l'observation plutôt que d'une influence. (28 July 1909; printed in Hedgcock 499)

* * *

> The ideas that have since inspired Mr. Hardy's books already existed in his mind and were evident in his conversation; they were a result of temperament and observation rather than of an influence.

Although Gosse was responding specifically to the question of Hardy's relation to Schopenhauer here, after receiving a letter from Hardy on the related subjects of Schopenhauer and Hedgcock's enquiry a few days earlier (25 July 1909), it seems evident from the context of the letter that his comments were intended to have a more general application, to give a broader (and broadly romantic) impression of the "artist" working largely in isolation, with little interest in his fellow-writers and, for the most part, peculiarly untutored in his philosophy. This idea or, more correctly, idealization of Hardy--very much tied to Hardy's construction of himself--while not exactly wrong in any particular, nevertheless indirectly and, I think,

inaccurately, suggests, or rather suggested (to the early student of Hardy's work) a degree of disinterestedness on Hardy's part that remained too long unchallenged in Hardy criticism--though in recent years there has been a much clearer recognition of how consciously and how intimately Hardy was involved in shaping and directing critical perceptions of his life and work.[2] Still, writing in more critically innocent times, in his widely influential study, On a Darkling Plain (1947), Harvey Curtis Webster asserts:

> Zola, whom [Hardy] had read by 1891 [or, as we now know, by late 1886 or early 1887], may have given him more courage to treat social problems frankly, but we cannot say that Ibsen, Zola, or any of his English contemporaries exercised a specific influence on him. (197)

More recently, in his general study of Jude for the Penguin Critical Studies series (1992), Cedric Watts treats the comparative subject a little less defensively, though he continues to maintain Webster's basic argument:

> While sharing with Zola's fiction a sexual frankness and a general interest in heredity and social pressures, Jude the Obscure is perhaps most Zolaesque in the physicality of the pig-killing scene; even so, the differences between the two writers greatly outweigh the similarities. (50)

Although Watts is seeking to provide a concise, balanced and basic interpretation of relations, he then continues to

quote the above passage from Hardy's letter to Gosse, as if somehow to confirm that Hardy was really "'read in Zola very little,'" before taking up and discussing Hardy's suggestion of "a larger connection with Fielding" (51)--again, as if to reaffirm the essential veracity of Hardy's original statement.

A couple of obvious points need to be made here. Historically, the pattern has been to make large and largely uncritical assertions either for or against the relative "Zolaism" of Hardy's Jude, with little or no regard for specific contextual detail.[3] Watts has usefully identified the pig-killing scene as perhaps the most Zola-like of Hardy's scenes, but what he does not point out, and what certainly needs noting, is that there is an actual pig-killing scene of considerable significance in a novel that Hardy is known to have read, and to have read with some attention, a few years previously--that is, once again, in Zola's Abbé Mouret's Transgression. Although Hardy himself was presumably familiar with the pig-killing process--as Michael Millgate has noted, the Hardy family kept a pig "for slaughtering and salting down each autumn" (1: 27)--and though as a writer he had previously used the pig-killing act as a metaphor on at least one occasion--in The Hand of Ethelberta (1876), where Lord Montclere is described as

"busying himself round and round [Ethelberta's] person like the head scraper at a pig-killing" (264)--nevertheless, given the relative rarity of literary pig-killing scenes, the parallel is certainly worth considering seriously.

In Abbé Mouret, the mock-apostolic pig Matthew has been in the process of being fattened for slaughter throughout the novel. In the final chapter, as Albine and the illegitimate child are being buried (see chapter 3 above), Matthew the pig lies (actually and symbolically) just bled in the shed beside the church. Désirée, Serge's "simple" sister,--to adopt the language of the text, or of both texts, as Hardy's Jude was at one point entitled The Simpletons--who is both the breeder and the butcher of animal livestock, and who seems more animal than human herself, is, like Hardy's Arabella, the figure most closely involved in and associated with the killing of the pig, though in Zola's novel the butcher proper does, at least, show up to perform the actual act:

> The Artaud butcher had just slaughtered Matthew, the pig, in the shed. Désirée, quite wild about it all, had held Matthew's feet, while he was being bled, kissing him on the back that he might feel the pain of the knife less, and telling him that it was quite necessary that he should be killed, now that he had got so fat. No one could cut off a goose's neck with a single stroke of the hatchet more unconcernedly than she could, or gash open a fowl's throat with a pair of scissors. Her

> familiarity with the animals made her look upon their slaughter with great equanimity. It was quite necessary, she would say. (343)

Unlike Arabella--who, incidentally, also holds to the simple maxim that "'pigs must be killed'" (JO 76)--Désirée is more clearly a function of the naturalist paradigm, and though it is fairly obvious that she is less a character than a one-dimensional construct--more purely animal, more sexual and, strangely, more inherently humane than Arabella[4]--Désirée's extreme simplicity, her uninhibited and unquestioned animality, provides an interesting reflection upon Arabella's own rather more complex character. Both women are, most obviously, metaphorically constructed as sexually threatening--the goose's neck, in Désirée's instance, is hardly an accidental image--and importantly Serge is as afraid of his sister's sexuality as Jude is, ultimately, of Arabella's. The killing of the pig, in both instances, is largely a symbolic act made graphically present in the text: a sacrificial "killing"--a pseudo-sexual act--undertaken so that life may gain sustenance from death. Serge, significantly, has no more stomach for the kill than does Jude, and is not even present at the slaughter to play an erring part. Importantly, in both scenes, the gathering of the blood for the making of the black-puddings is partially a botched job: in Abbé Mouret a swarm of fowls is caught

drinking the blood from the pan, just as in Hardy's novel much of the blood is wasted when Jude accidentally kicks over the vessel. The spilling of blood, in sex as in death, is often a perilous task.

If the pig--symbolically a fairly basic creature on the scale of animal symbolism[5]--is closely associated with sexuality in either instance, then, arguably, to be awakened from a dream (JO 42) by being smacked in the ear with "the characteristic part of a barrow-pig" (41), with that portion of pig's flesh from "below the bladder,"[6] is surely to be quite literally and astonishingly struck in the face with a symbol of one's own sexual consciousness. Significantly, it is this very moment which first marks Jude's sexual awakening. What is perhaps most interesting here is that the thrower of the sexual missile is also, both actually and metaphorically, the cutter of the organ. Jude himself clearly recognizes Arabella's butchering role--while missing the metaphor--when he spots the bladder from which the pizzle has been cut lying close beside her (43). Moreover, as if to confirm her butchering abilities, we later learn that Arabella is quite capable with a knife in her hands. What is important here is not whether Arabella was actually involved in the butchering process in this particular instance, but rather the understanding that the woman who

first arouses Jude's sexual interest is also literally and metaphorically capable of sexual dismemberment: that Arabella is first seen with a severed penis in her hand is clearly significant.

Zola's use of genital metaphor and his almost obsessive thematic concern with various forms of bodily dismemberment have been well documented,[7] but one example seems particularly relevant here. The famous scene of the miners' riot in Germinal (Part 5, Chapter 6) culminates with the sexual mutilation of Maigrat, the village grocer. La Brûlé, the most ferocious of the group of attacking women, first grips the corpse's "dead virility" (351), pulls, and then holds "the lump of hairy, bleeding flesh" (352) aloft, much in the manner of some Dionysian ritual:

> La Brûlé, alors, planta tout le paquet au bout de son bâton; et, le portant en l'air, le promenant ainsi qu'un drapeau, elle se lança sur la route, suivie de la débandade hurlante des femmes. Des gouttes de sang pleuvaient, cette chair lamentable pendait, comme un déchet de viande à l'étal d'un boucher. (V: 290)
>
> * * *
>
> Then Ma Brûlé stuck the whole thing on the end of her stick, raised it on high and carried it like a standard down the street, followed by a rout of shrieking women. Drops of blood spattered down, and this miserable bit of flesh hung down like an odd piece of meat on a butcher's stall. (Trans. Leonard Tancock 352)[8]

In the Vizetelly edition of Germinal (1885), which Hardy read about the same time as Abbé Mouret,[9] the above scene was, of course, considerably bowdlerized, though Hardy may not have been strictly limited in his familiarity with the scene to the version produced in the Vizetelly translation, particularly as this scene has always been much discussed. In any case, La Brûlé's action is still largely recognizable, despite being subject to the same sort of editorial censorship that Hardy was to face with the serial version of Jude:

> The women had other vengeance to wreck upon him.
>
> They hovered round his corpse, sniffing like wolves. They were all seeking some outrage, some ferocious act which should give them satisfaction.
>
> Suddenly the Scorched-One's [La Brûlé's] shrill voice was heard:
>
> 'Cut him like a tom cat!'
>
> 'Yes, yes! like a tom cat! like a tom cat! He deserves it, the swine!'
>
> La Mouquette was already tearing off his clothes, while La Levaque seized him by the legs. And the Scorched-One with her bony old hands did the horrible deed, exclaiming as she laughed triumphantly:
>
> 'I've done it! I've done it!'
>
> A volley of imprecations greeted the abominable act.
>
> 'Ah! you filthy wretch, you'll leave our daughters alone now!' (327)

Again, literary scenes involving actual genital dismemberment, though perhaps not quite so rare as literary

pig-killing scenes, are certainly uncommon enough, particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century. Importantly, the detail concerning the placing of Maigrat's genitals on a stick by La Brûlé is missing from the text of the Vizetelly translation, though again it is quite possible that Hardy was also familiar with the scene through other sources--either through the reading of a French-language text or through discussion with his peers. In any case, the placing of the pig's penis on a stick in Jude seems to further the comparison:

> [Arabella and Jude] met in the middle of the plank, and Jude held out his stick with the fragment of pig dangling therefrom, looking elsewhere the while, and faintly colouring.
>
> She, too, looked in another direction, and took the piece as though ignorant of what her hand was doing. She hung it temporarily on the rail of the bridge, and then, by a species of mutual curiosity, they both turned, and regarded it. (44)

Admittedly, Arabella appears to have little enough in common with La Brûlé at this particular juncture, other than the piece of flesh that they so variously handle. Nevertheless, given Hardy's familiarity with Germinal, it seems fair to suggest that Zola has provided a fairly specific precedent and context for the incident in Jude, as also appears to have been the case with the pig-killing scene, however

different the two writers' focus and treatment of their individual scenes may be. In either case, Zola's example serves to situate Hardy's outspokenness within a larger discourse of destabilizing incident--in the case of Arabella, placing her into oblique but telling relation to La Brûlé's extreme ferocity and to Désirée's unsocialized desire. Abruptly, momentarily, ritual--the slaughter, the symbol of the phallus--is imposed upon the narrative and the act takes on a symbolic resonance. Although Hardy's sense of ritual is less obtrusive than Zola's, and his concept and treatment of character less rigid, more rounded, there is still the underlying sense that Arabella has been constructed along the conventional lines of the castrating female--although, strictly speaking, the barrow-pig has already been castrated. Arabella's butchering role in the novel seems, then, less a characterization than a construction, and is a fundamental part of Hardy's portrait of Jude as victim.

A few minor points of specific detail may serve to further illustrate the relationship of isolated but important pockets of subject matter and matters of treatment in Jude and certain aspects of Zola's work. What goes on underfoot in Zola is always of more-than-passing interest, and is very much keyed to what David Baguley calls the

"poetics of decomposition of naturalist texts" (NF 201)--although, particularly in La Faute de l'abbé Mouret, Zola's poetics consistently embrace an alternating vision of regeneration and decomposition, fecundity and decay. Taking examples first from the novel closest at hand--from the text most familiar to Hardy and, by now, if not before, familiar to the reader--from Abbé Mouret's Transgression, Serge and Albine are constantly seen treading life and death beneath their feet, as flora and fauna alternately embrace and decompose:[10]

> Now they were treading under foot a foul-odoured growth . . . . The paths were already littered with a thick bed of dead foliage, soaked with moisture, over which their muffled steps sounded like sighs . . . . A religious silence reigned beneath these giant arches, and the ground beneath them lay hard as stone in its nakedness, for not a blade of green smiled upon it, and its only covering was a dusty litter of mouldering leaves . . . (188; 320; 178).

In a number of other Zola novels, in L'Assommoir (1877), La Débâcle (1892), and particularly in Le Ventre de Paris (1873), the image of rotting vegetation becomes an almost obsessive motif. Indeed, in Le Ventre de Paris, set in les Halles, the central Parisian market, the idea of rotting vegetable matter, of market-stall peelings and the like, takes on a central, almost an organizing role in the

narrative, and one vegetable in particular, the cabbage, perhaps because of its cheapness, its symbolic resonance as the food of the underfed, and partly, apparently, because of its peculiar texture, because of the unusual viscosity of its rotting leafage, plays a more prominent role in the novel than any other vegetable. In particular, one of the market urchins, Marjolin, is first discovered "in a heap of cabbages at the Market of the Innocents" (174).[11] Later, he and another child, Cadine, are often found "beneath piles of vegetables . . . prattling to each other just as they did in bed at night":

> People passing some huge mountain of cos or cabbage lettuces often heard a muffled sound of chatter coming from it. And when the green-stuff was removed, the two children would be discovered lying side by side on their couch of verdure . . . . It was, indeed, chiefly under the cabbages that they grew up and learned to love each other. (177-8)

Indeed, so common is the cabbage leaf in Zola's fiction, particularly in its decomposing state, that it seems unlikely that another novelist, generally familiar with Zola's work, could write of rotting cabbage leaves in the 1890s and not be aware of Zola's precedent. Yet Jude and Sue Bridehead are seen walking up and down the market-house "over a floor littered with rotten cabbage leaves, and amid

all the usual squalors of decayed vegetable matter and unsaleable refuse" (205-6). Certainly the common cabbage leaf is a small point of comparison, but it strikes a distinctive, an unusually insistent note in this, Hardy's most insistent novel, just as when Jude is seen as a boy trying to avoid treading on the coupling worms beneath his feet:

> Here he beheld scores of coupled earthworms lying half their length on the surface of the damp ground, as they always did in such weather at that time of the year. It was impossible to advance in regular steps without crushing some of them at each tread. (13)

Like Zola's Serge, Jude is seemingly "conscious of an ineffaceable spot, deep down somewhere in his being, which might one day grow larger and cover him with mud" (AM 105), and this spot, externally represented here by the worms coupling in the mud, is symbolically embodied in the whole life-death cycle that struggles beneath his feet. The cabbage leaves and the coupling worms are, then, isolated images that strikingly disrupt the grey obscurity of Jude's unearthly dreams--his musings and reveries on church spires and books.

Of course, the most violently disruptive incident in Jude, and the scene that Havelock Ellis, one of the most

sympathetic and supportive reviewers of Hardy's novel (Savoy 6 [October 1896]: 35-49; reprinted in Cox 300-315), called "a serious lapse in the art of the book" (Cox 307), is the "corpses-in-the-closet" incident--the discovery of Little Father Time and the Fawley children hanging from their hooks and nails. As Ellis himself observes,

> Whatever failure of nervous energy may be present in the Fawley family, it is clear that Mr. Hardy was not proposing to himself a study of gross pathological degenerescence, a study of the hereditary evolution of criminality . . . . Nor can it be said that so wholesale a murder was required for the constructive development of the history; a much less serious catastrophe would surely have sufficed to influence the impressionable Sue. (307)

Certainly a less catastrophic event would have sufficed for the purposes of advancing the plot, and yet this is to presume an unwavering realistic intent--a large presumption concerning a writer who could state that "the exact truth as to material fact ceases to be of importance in art" (LW 192). Years later, in conversation with Marjorie Lilly, Lilly exclaimed, "'My word, . . . you did pull out all the stops when you wrote Jude!' Mr. Hardy smiled. 'Do you think so? My views on life are so extreme that I do not usually state them'" (THSR 1.4 (1978): 102). Assuming for the moment that the suicide/murder of the Fawley children

constitutes one of those rare episodes where the extreme reaches of Hardy's discordant imagination came violently into play, how, it might be asked, is the scene encoded to reveal to the reader the essential symbolic extremity of the act?

Jude's children by Sue, significantly, remain unnamed throughout the novel. Nor can they be said to have actual personalities: they do not act, they do not speak, they are only present to be moved about from place to place, like Beckettian pawns. Indeed, there is little sense of their having been born at all, so little is said of Sue's actual pregnancies, the children's births or their upbringings. The two unnamed beings exist simply for the slaughter--children are born to suffer and to die. There is no reason, no rationale. Little Father Time, however, with his crudely symbolic namesake, must have reason in order to act--yet, the more minimal the character, the more closely character is keyed to the symbolic realm, the more character is dissociated from reality. Little Father Time, then, operates on a crudely symbolic level: it is, in a sense, imperative for Hardy's purposes that Father Time be as unrealistic a creation as possible. His act must equally be seen to be distinctly divorced from the realistic realm--to be a symbolic act of near-random madness, a "satire of

circumstance," one of "time's laughingstocks." This, of course, is to grant Hardy a certain credibility in his handling of the Father Time figure, though at the last moment there is a failed attempt in his dialogue with Sue to move Father Time from the symbolic to the supposedly realistic realm in order to provide motivation for the scene to come:

> 'I wish father was quite well, and there had been room for him! Then it wouldn't matter so much! Poor father!'
> 'It wouldn't!'
> 'Can I do anything?'
> 'No! All is trouble, adversity and suffering!'
> 'Father went away to give us children room didn't he?'
> 'Partly.'
> 'It would be better to be out o' the world than in it, wouldn't it?'
> 'It would almost, dear.'
> . . . 'If children make so much trouble, why do people have 'em?'
> 'O--because it is a law of nature.'
> 'But we don't ask to be born?'
> 'No indeed.'
> . . . 'There is going to be another in our family soon,' she hesitatingly remarked.
> 'How?'
> 'There is going to be another baby.'
> 'What!' The boy jumped up wildly. 'O God, mother, you never a-sent for another; and such trouble with what you've got!' (420-1)

Poised between opposing realms, between the symbolic and the realistic orders of the book, the Little Father Time figure lapses into improbability--a confused series of cross-codes

that simply fail to convince, to meet the expectations of the reader. Yet, the resulting note of discord, the sense of improbability, of Hardy's apparent inability to convincingly give voice to the largely unexpressed absurdity of the incident, is in itself indicative of the larger sense of peril and disintegration that he is attempting to describe.

Where later postmodernist texts have form to express metaphorical disintegration and collapse, Hardy, at this point, had simply incident (although the strategy and pacing of incident, of course, is not without its formal considerations). Moreover, a tradition of exaggerated incident--of incident as symbol of violent disruption--was firmly a part of nineteenth-century narrative discourse, and the death of Little Father Time seems, to the modern reader, almost as Dickensian as the death of Little Nell. Although what might be termed the Dickensian model of exaggerated incident had, generally speaking, fallen out of favour well before the writing of Jude, the naturalist writer's desire "to shock and discompose the reader" (NF 176) inevitably lent itself to similar excesses, and a number of incidents might be suggested here to contextualize Hardy's scene.

The scene describing the sexual mutilation of Maigrat in Germinal is certainly intended to shock, but in addition

to the symbolic resonance of the act, the ritualized dismemberment is also realistically developed: La Brûlé, though characterized primarily by her ferocity, is nevertheless well-motivated in her act, and there is little sense of randomness or absurdity about the scene. In Le Docteur Pascal (1893),[12] however, the bizarre death of old Antoine Macquart by spontaneous combustion may be said to exemplify a general trend of random excess and absurdity in Zola's fiction. (There is a strikingly similar scene in Bleak House [1853], to further the comparison to Dickens, where Mr. Krook, after being "'continually in liquor'" [498], is reduced to cinder, soot and oil when he spontaneously combusts while reading his letters before the fire). In Le Docteur Pascal, Macquart, while sitting in a drunken slumber, is set alight after the burning tobacco from his pipe falls onto his trousers--all that is left is a pool of grease, some ashes and a layer of soot. Zola, of course, unlike Dickens, attempts to scientifically justify his scene, though the impression of the shocking randomness of the situation--of an incident more absurdly symbolic than actually realistic, more grotesque in its violence than the simple machinations of plot would require--is not lost upon the reader:

> It was the finest case of spontaneous combustion that ever medical man had observed. The Doctor had certainly read of some surprising ones, in sundry medical treatises, and among others of that of a bootmaker's wife, a drunken creature who had fallen asleep on her footwarmer, and of whom only a foot and a hand had afterwards been found; but for his own part he had hitherto had his doubts, unwilling to admit, as his forerunners had done, that the human body, when saturated with alcohol, diffuses a mysterious gas, capable of igniting spontaneously, and devouring both flesh and bones. (Trans. E. A. Vizetelly 209)

Zola, then, though framing the grotesque within the presumably accepted bounds of contemporary scientific theory[13]--and thereby granting the grotesque a certain validity within the realm of naturalist discourse--utilizes improbable incident to violently disrupt preconceived ideas of biological and, metaphorically, sociological stability, as well as to counter the accepted and controlling "laws" of narrative convention and probability. To what extent Hardy was familiar with Zola's scene is not at all the question: the incident marks, as suggested, a more general trend in Zola's writing--the use of grossly exaggerated incident, often graphically detailed, to shock, to unsettle and to disturb.

In Jude, the shock of the irrational, the seemingly random scattering of discontinuous and destabilizing incident, is set against a backdrop of near-continuous, stabilizing dreams--a point rarely mentioned, but made clear

in Hardy's rejected title for the book, The Dreamer.[14] As Marjorie Garson has noted, "Jude is wanting: he is constituted in lack" (152):

> The dream is of a whole which will at some moment add up to more than the sum of its parts, which will become monumental, permanent, resonant with interconnected meaning; which will make the individual whole, and unite him creatively with an organic community. (156)

That Jude's desire for wholeness, whether his desire be intellectual, emotional, physical or communal in nature, is so often expressed in terms of the verb "to dream" is arguably a central point, particularly given the rejected title of the book, and Hardy's use of the dream motif is both structurally and thematically determined by the two-fold meaning of the word: to dream as to aspire, and to dream as in a sleep. Jude, like "Joseph the dreamer of dreams" (JO 257), is continually, literally and metaphorically, ascending and descending the levels of consciousness that divide the waking world from the world of dreams and sleep. His dreams are, then, both literal and figurative, of wholeness and, in the latter stages of the book, of division, and the ideal world of aspiring dreams is constantly and chaotically in danger of being shattered by the violence of the waking reality.

Unlike Tess, with its intensely realized colour scheme of reds and greens and golden yellows, with its highly sexualized concept of the surrounding landscape, of a natural world simply shuddering to reproduce, Jude is more concerned with sterility than with fecundity, and the surrounding imagery, the fog, the mists, "the phantoms . . . in the college archways, and windows" (495) at Christminster, the brooding sense of reverie, of loss, is less green or golden than simply grey--a grey almost unbroken but for Arabella, but for a splash of blood from a pig or (figuratively) from a severed phallus. The grey, again, functions largely as an externalized consciousness, as Jude and Sue move through the greyness as in a fog or in a dream.

Zola's Le Rêve (1888),[15] written in part to counter the charges of brutality and obscenity that had characterized the reception of La Terre (1887) the previous year, and the only one of the Chatto & Windus volumes not to be translated by E. A. Vizetelly, is perhaps the most conventional and certainly the novel of Zola's least likely to give offence. When Eliza E. Chase's translation of Le Rêve (The Dream) appeared in 1893, even the Christian World called the book "a charming idyll . . . a delightfully original story." Yet, there seems to be little original about the story,

except the thoroughness with which the elements of the heroine's dream-world are explored. The Dream itself tells the story of Angelique, an orphan, who is found--not surprisingly--under the archway of a cathedral door, is brought up in an atmosphere of church artistry and purity, allows herself to envision the innocent dream of a pure union, meets her perfect lover, is made to understand the impossibility of their marriage, and dies--a virgin. Outwardly there is little to associate Zola's innocent dream with what Mrs. Oliphant refers to as the "grossness, indecency, and horror" of Mr. Hardy's most terrible book ("The Anti-Marriage League," Blackwood's Magazine 159 [January 1896]: 135-49; reprinted in Cox 256-62).[16] Yet, despite the simplicity and utter conventionality of the story--and it is the extent to which the conventional dream-world is envisioned and developed that is of primary interest here--a number of incidental details of character, subject and setting seem to shed light on a few obscure corners of Hardy's Jude.

Hardy's copy of The Dream, dated 1893, appears in the miscellaneous section of the Wreden catalogue--a section comprised of volumes that evidently did not contain Hardy's markings--and has since, apparently, disappeared from sight. Still, a couple of general comments concerning Hardy's

possible reading of the volume might be offered without presuming further knowledge. As the Chatto & Windus editions of Zola were frequently reprinted--and a "new" edition of The Dream appeared in 1894, although it was simply a reprint of the original edition with a new title page and publisher's listing--it seems safe to suggest a probable date of purchase as the year of issue. Moreover, as the story is of so simple a nature, the possibility of reader's markings or notes seems, in any case, unlikely. There is little of complexity about The Dream--it is a simple tale simply told, and fits nicely into the category of pleasurable reading that, according to Hardy, should be "swallowed whole, like any other alterative pill" (PW 111). Intriguingly, in the spring of 1893 Hardy was still at work on the outline for Jude the Obscure, and the final pages of the completed text, "according to the date on the manuscript itself, were not written until March 1895" (Millgate 1: 359). Although a number of specific points of comparison would seem to confirm Hardy's reading of Zola's novel before the completion of Jude, it is interesting to consider the possible effect of his reading of The Dream at an earlier stage--as the organizational principles of the novel began to fit into place.

Much of Angelique's dream is based upon her reading of the Golden Legends, a lives of saints and angels. Early on in the story she muses on their chronicles, envisioning the ghostly forms of the saints as they appear before her:

> They come, they go, they pass through walls, they appear in dreams, they speak from the height of clouds, they assist at births and deaths, they support those who are tortured, they deliver those who are in prison, and they go on dangerous missions. (84)

What follows is a listing of saints, so common to the epic form, in which each is in turn discussed before moving to the next: Saint Sylvester, Saint Loup, Saint Martin, Mary the Egyptian, Nicholas, Cecilia, Dorothea. Much later on, at a climactic point in the novel, Angelique is made to view another procession, this time the Procession of the Miracle of Saint Agnes, in which the real-life members of the clergy appear in ceremonial robes, accompanied by an effigy of Saint Agnes:

> First were the representatives from the great seminaries, the parishes, and then collegiate churches; then came the beneficed clergymen and clerks of the Cathedral, followed by the canons in white pluvials. In their midst were the choristers, in capes of red silk . . . The street was now filled with a rustling of muslin from the flying winged sleeves of the surplices . . . . (175)

Significantly, during the procession, Angelique herself becomes feverish in her excitement, and this day of celebration marks the beginning of her serious illness.

In Hardy's novel, Jude's reading also informs his vision of his scholarly predecessors at Christminster--his version of the saints--who pass in ghostly form before him:

> There were poets abroad, of early date and of late, from the friend and eulogist of Shakespeare down to him who has recently passed into silence, and that musical one of the tribe who is still among us. Speculative philosophers passed along . . . modern divines sheeted in their surplices . . . the well-known three, the enthusiast, the poet, and the formularist . . . . (95)

When Jude and Sue return to Christminster much later in the novel, just before the suicide of Little Father Time, Jude is once more made to view another procession, this time, like Angelique's, a real-life procession in celebration of Remembrance Day, in which the collegians pass before him in their "red and black gowned forms" (413). Once again, the procession is marred by Jude's feverish excitement as he stands waiting in the rain, and yet again the day of celebration marks the beginning of his serious illness. In both cases, then, the spectator first views a ghostly procession that is based upon his or her reading of history; later, a second procession is staged at a climactic point in

each novel, and what were once ghosts now take on real form, clad in silken gowns. In each case again, the material representation of the ideal dream--be it of the scholar or the saint--leads to the spectator's serious illness and, ultimately, to his or her own death.

In either case, the medieval setting--Hardy's Christminster and Zola's Beaumont-l'Eglise--provides not only the historical ideal, the dream of scholarship or sainthood, but also, importantly, the present occupation: the role of the stonemason (Jude), or the illuminator of church texts (Sue), the ecclesiastical embroiderer (Angelique) or the painter of church windows (Felicien, Angelique's lover). All four characters are, then, engaged in occupations which align them to a continuing and fundamentally conservative tradition of church craftsmanship, though in Jude's case he is neatly divided in his allegiance between the church and the university. But in this, and in the discussion to follow, it is the somewhat oblique but nevertheless intriguing parallel between Sue and Angelique that is of primary interest.

As David Baguley has noted, "the naturalist themselves were exclusively male" (NF 83) and this, combined with the naturalist writer's peculiar fascination with the human body, particularly as a metaphor for the idea of social

degeneration, degradation and dissolution, inevitably resulted in some fairly skewed portraits of female sexuality. That Hardy's complex portrait of Sue is problematic is perhaps a commonplace remark, but as Baguley again notes--and here the problem begins to appear to be at least partly generic, to be associated not simply with Hardy's Sue, but with the larger, exclusively male genre of naturalism--"the association of neurosis, female sexuality, nymphomania and female religiosity [formed] an essential component of naturalist thematics" (NF 84). Nymphomania aside, Hardy's portrait of a peculiarly disembodied sensibility, sexual neurosis (a term that, tellingly, covers a lot of ground) and, in the final stages, obsessive religiosity, combined with an insistent emphasis on, in Zola's words, the "*victoire des nerfs sur le sang*" (X, 56), --though in Sue's case, as in Angelique's, there is little blood for the nerves to triumph over--makes for a portrait that, as Marjorie Garson suggests, is "constituted by the male fantasies which shape her" (162).

Angelique herself, being more or less a fabular figure, exists in a state of suspended awareness, a construction of her own imaginary ideal, largely unaware of herself either as an actual or sexual being. In Felicien she envisions "a companion shadow to her own" (92), a second self equally

dissociated from reality: "she had thus a double being, although she was alone with her fancies" (92). This doubling of the self, so central to the "two-in-oneness" (412) of Jude and Sue, is mediated primarily through Angelique's work as an embroiderer: in her "unfailing exactitude" and concentrated absorption in her work, "into the slightest details of which she put her whole soul" (137), Angelique re-creates herself in ideal union with her second self, Felicien. Sue, unlike Angelique, appears in oblique relation to her work, as Marjorie Garson notes, being "a mere replicator and exploiter" (163) of a text that she does not believe in. Sue simply illuminates, where Angelique, conversely, creates. Still, the intricate process of illumination and embroidery, carried out in an atmosphere of reverie, indeed of reverence, lends each woman a dream-like quality, as both the dreamer and the subject of dreams, and it is significant that Jude, after first seeing Sue at work, comes away seeing her as "a half-visionary form" (107), "more or less an ideal character, about whose form he began to weave curious and fantastic daydreams" (106).

Although Zola's text never descends from the realm of fantasy, never describes Angelique in anything more than the most basic physiological or psychological terms, the

underlying sense of neurosis, of Angelique's fundamental dissociation from reality, from any sense of a rational order, surfaces at certain key points in the narrative, particularly in relation to her suspended belief in herself as a natural or sexual entity, to her concept of herself as a being untouched by the sordid actuality of human relations. Significantly, Angelique at one point threatens to throw herself from the window if Felicien does not leave her chamber (266), just as Sue, when Phillotson enters her room by mistake, actually mounts the window-sill and leaps out (283). Moments later, shaken but unhurt, she explains: "'I was asleep, I think!' she began, her pale face still turned away from [Phillotson]. 'And something frightened me--a terrible dream . . . '"(284).

Importantly, it is on the subject of renunciation, on the two women's denial of their sexual selves, that the two narratives most easily converge:

> 'Little by little' [relates Angelique] 'without my knowledge, the good traits of my character have been drawn together and strongly united: humility, duty, and renunciation . . . . I have triumphed over temptation . . . . I have conquered myself, and my nature is freed from the evil tendencies it had.' (265-6)

For Sue, the internal struggle is more self-evident, and her language appears more strikingly and painfully self-

conscious, but in her struggle for resignation Sue seems somehow to echo an earlier Angelique:

> 'Self-abnegation is the higher road. We should mortify the flesh . . . . We ought to be continually sacrificing ourselves on the altar of duty! . . . I want a humble heart; and a chastened mind . . . . Self-renunciation--that's everything! I cannot humiliate myself too much.' (434-5)

Following their final failed attempt to legalize their union, not long before the suicide of Little Father Time, Sue turns to Jude and says, "'let us go home without killing our dream'" (360). The dream, for Sue and Jude, as for Angelique and Felicien, is, then, of a union somehow divorced from the constraints of authority, and the letter that "killeth" is not simply the letter of legal authority, but also of the largely unwritten but no less authoritative law of social convention. Two lessons that Angelique learned from her early reading of the Golden Legends seem, then, strangely suited to the subject of Jude and Sue: "One weds only to die" runs the moral of one story, and "couples [are] united only as a challenge to existence" (38).

When Jude last travels to Sue, ill and near to death, Sue tells how she has struggled and prayed to reconcile herself to the complexities of her situation:

> 'I have nearly brought my body into complete subjection. And you mustn't--will you--*wake*--' (490; my emphasis).

Sue's final *wake*--seems to echo through the text like the final sounding of a disparate reality, and like the cabbage leaves and the coupling worms, the pizzle and the killing of the pig, Sue's command to *wake*--is a final call to recognition, an abrupt and violent shattering of an ideal and doll-like dream.

Conclusion

In his biography of Oscar Wilde (1987), Richard Ellman suggests that "the Nineties began in 1889 [the year of Henry Vizetelly's imprisonment] and ended in 1895 [the year of Wilde's]" (450). Certainly, for Hardy, the age of outspoken notoriety ended with the writing of Jude the Obscure. It seems almost as if, having had his say, he could now retreat into the relative safety of a former self: in the past lay his stability; never again would Hardy look quite so clearly, and yet so obscurely, on the face of the modern moment. As Hugh Kingsmill wrily observed in After Puritanism (1929), it was not until Tess and Jude that "an attempt to return to a reasonable frankness was [made] by Thomas Hardy, whom the confusing atmosphere of the age sometimes compelled to write like Hall Caine and sometimes allowed to write like Shakespeare" (116-7). Looking back on the period from the perspective of the 1920s, and from the viewpoint of the pornographic chronicler, Frank Harris describes a polar division of literary traditions, combining in his observations, however excessively stated, a number of key elements of the age: a concern with the political

alignment of literature, a contempt for the mediocrity of conventional morality, a certain misogyny, a desire for frankness and a disdain for the English "doll":

> There are two main traditions of English writing: the one of perfect liberty, that of Chaucer and Shakespeare, completely outspoken, with a certain liking for lascivious details and witty smut, a man's speech; the other emasculated more and more by Puritanism and since the French Revolution, gelded to tamest propriety; for that upheaval brought the illiterate middle-class to power and insured the domination of girl readers. Under Victoria, English prose literally became half childish, as in stories of 'Little Mary,' or at best provincial, as anyone may see who cares to compare the influence of Dickens, Thackeray and Reade in the world with the influence of Balzac, Flaubert and Zola.
>
> Foreign masterpieces such as Les Contes Drolatiques and L'Assommoir were destroyed in London as obscene by a magistrate's order; even the Bible and Shakespeare were expurgated and all books dolled up to the prim decorum of the English Sunday-school. (My Life and Loves 2)

From Maggie Tulliver's "Fetish" to Frank Harris's varied fetishes,[1] the doll, then, constituted a sliding metaphor for the many views of female readership throughout the period. For the male writer, from Moore to Hardy to Harris, the convention of the female reader represented, to varying degrees, a restrictive barrier--ironically constructed on the basis of male authority, and maintained by the prevailing social, political and economic institutions of the day--to the free exchange of what might

be termed, in the case of Frank Harris, the discourse of the club smoking-room, and what, for Hardy and Moore, constituted the larger and much more important arena of discursive frankness itself. For Hardy, in particular, the idea of demolishing the doll seems to have been primarily tied to the sense of readership, to the encompassing system of the novel, though the metaphor itself is always suspiciously sexual, suggesting not simply a frustration with the construction of the female reader, but also, indirectly, metaphorically, the suggestion of an element of frustrated aggression towards the female herself. For Harris, of course, and perhaps more peculiarly for Moore, the concept of the doll is more obviously an object of contempt, and though the metaphor slides quickly between the subject of contention (the young female reader), the constructed object (the doll), and the system of construction, there is the lingering suspicion that all are, to varying extents, indirectly implicated in the more general aggression of the writer's disdain.

"All fiction should not be shackled by conventions concerning budding womanhood" (PW 131) wrote Hardy in his essay on "Candour in English Fiction," and for Hardy, as for many of his contemporaries, both male and female, the complex system of the doll, like Maggie's "Fetish" with the

wooden head, was a major impediment to the development of the novel as a forum for frankness, particularly on matters of sexuality and sexual mores.

APPENDIX A:
Victorian Translations of Zola

The following comparisons are provided as examples of textual variations in the various Victorian translations of L'Assommoir (1877). For a lengthy comparison and discussion of textual variations in the English translations of Zola's works see W. E. Colburn, Zola in England, 1883-1903, an unpublished dissertation, University of Illinois, 1952. The first example below has been adapted from Colburn. In each case, the French text is followed by the Lutetian Society translation (L'Assommoir, printed for private distribution amongst its members), the Vizetelly & Co. translation (The "Assommoir") and the Chatto & Windus translation (The Dram Shop).

Cercle du Livre Précieux (1967):

Les dames, quand elles eurent le nez sur la peinture, poussèrent de petits cris; puis, elles se détournèrent, très rouges. Les hommes les retinrent, rigolant, cherchant les détails orduriers.

'Voyez donc!' répétait Boche, 'ça vaut l'argent. En voilà un qui dégobille. Et celui-là, il arrose les pissenlits. Et celui-là, oh! celui-là . . . Ah bien! ils sont propres, ici!' (659).

Lutetian Society (translated by Arthur Symons, 1894, in the Boni and Liveright reprint, 1924):

The women, after looking closely at the picture, gave little screams and turned away, blushing red. The men held them back, laughing and looking out the dirty details.

'Well, here now!' said Boche, 'that's worth the money. Look! there's somebody spewing, and somebody pumping ship! And look at that one! oh, look at that one! Well, they are a nice set here!' (79).

Vizetelly & Co. (translator not acknowledged, 1884):

The ladies uttered faint cries the moment they brought their noses close to the painting. Then, blushing deeply, they turned away their heads. The men, though, kept them there, cracking jokes, and seeking for the coarser details.

'Just look!' exclaimed Boche, 'it's worth the money. There's one who's spewing, and another, he's watering the dandelions; and that one--oh! that one. Ah, well! they're a nice clean lot, they are!' (78).

Chatto & Windus (edited from the Vizetelly & Co. translation by E. A. Vizetelly, 1897):

At sight of it the ladies uttered faint cries, then turned away their heads, while the men indulged in coarse jokes (71).

Cercle du Livre Précieux:

Elle tremblait, elle perdait la tête. Et, pendant que Lantier la poussait dans sa chambre, le visage de Nana apparut à la porte vitrée du cabinet, derrière un carreau. La petite venait de se réveiller et de se lever doucement, en chemise, pâle de sommeil. Elle regarda son père roulé dans son vomissement; puis, la figure collée contre la vitre, elle resta là, à attendre que le jupon de sa mère eût disparu chez l'autre homme, en face. Elle était toute grave. Elle avait de grands yeux d'enfant vicieuse, allumés d'une curiosité sensuelle (812).

Lutetian Society:

She trembled; she knew not what she was doing. And, as Lantier pushed her before him into his room, the face of Nana appeared at the glass door of the little room, behind one of the panes. The child had just woke up, and she got up softly in her night-dress, pale with sleep. She saw her father wallowing in his vomit; then, with her face against the glass, she stood there waiting until her mother's petticoat had disappeared into the other man's room opposite. She stood there very seriously. She opened her eyes wide, vicious young eyes, lit now with a sensual curiosity (287).

Vizetelly & Co.:

She trembled, she lost her head. And whilst Lantier pushed her into his room, Nana's head appeared behind one of the panes of the glass door of her little chamber. The child had just awoke, and quietly got up in her night-gown, her face pale with sleep. She looked at her father sprawling in his filth; then, pressing close to the pane, she remained there, waiting till her mother's white petticoat had disappeared inside the other man's room opposite. She was quite grave. Her eyes were opened wide like a vicious child's, and lit up with a sensual curiosity (261).

Chatto & Windus:

She trembled, and lost her head. And as Lantier was drawing her away, Nana's face, pale with sleep, appeared at the glass door of her little chamber. The child had just awoke. She was very grave, and gazed at the others with diluted, wondering eyes (255).

APPENDIX B:
Vizetelly & Co. Publications (1880-1891)

As relatively little is known about Vizetelly & Co., one of the aims of the present study is to supplement the existing accounts of the Vizetellys and their activities with some of the information uncovered in the course of researching this project. It is, for instance, little known that Vizetelly & Co. continued to publish after Henry Vizetelly's release from prison in 1889, producing at least eight new titles in 1890-1. It is also little recognized that Henry Vizetelly published extensively in the 1840s and 50s under various imprints: Henry Vizetelly, H. Vizetelly, Vizetelly Brothers & Co. (with his older brother, James Thomas George Vizetelly) and Vizetelly & Co.

The following list of publications has been compiled from the catalogue of the British Library and supplemented by the publisher's lists in an 1884 copy of Nana and an 1886 copy of Abbé Mouret's Transgression (no dates given). Titles listed simply as "forthcoming," for which publication has not been confirmed, are marked by an asterisk.

It is hoped that the inclusion of this appendix will not only provide the reader with a larger context for the Vizetelly editions of Zola--and it is interesting to note that Vizetelly even published one of the sensational take-offs of Zola's Nana, Nana's Daughter by Alfred Sirven and Henri Leverdier--but also with a framework for understanding the more general state of translated literature in England in the 1880s. At the most basic level, it is interesting, for example, to see Flaubert, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Daudet and Zola placed side-by-side with some of the more mundane examples of French and English writing of the period.

The presentation of translated literature in the 1880s seems to have laid stress on the essential strangeness and sensationalism of foreign experience, and this is reflected not only in the selection and presentation of foreign literature, but also in those English portions of the Vizetelly list that are concerned with foreign experience. The contrast between life at home and abroad is especially evident in the popular English trivia of George Augustus Sala and E. C. Grenville-Murray--both of whom, despite appealing to the idea of the English person abroad, nevertheless appear to reinforce the essential stability and rationality of English life while emphasizing the often

exotic irrationality and instability of life abroad. For his part, Henry Vizetelly was soon to learn the irrational lengths to which the English parliamentary and legal systems would go to protect this ruling sense of social stability at home.

According to Henry Vizetelly, Vizetelly & Co. published "yearly far more translations from the French and Russian than all the other London publishers put together" (Pall Mall Gazette, 24 March 1888). The following list, though not by any means complete, and without attempting to list the various editions of each work, seems nevertheless to provide a fairly accurate guide to at least a major portion of the contemporary market for translated literature.

VIZETELLY & CO. PUBLICATIONS (1880-1891)

About, Edmond François Valentin. A New Lease of Life, & Saving a Daughter's Dowry. n.d.

---. The Notary's Nose and other stories. 1882.

Adams, Francis William Lauderdale. Songs of the Army of the Night. 1890.

Alarcon, P. A. de. Captain Spitfire, and The Unlucky Treasure. n.d.

---. The Three-Cornered Hat. n.d.

Aleman, Mateo. The Amusing Adventures of Guzman of Alfaraque. 1883.

Belot, Adolphe. The Drama of the Rue de la Paix. 1880.

---. The Woman of Fire, etc. 1886.

Bernard, Charles de. The Lion's Skin. 1889.

Boilvin, Emile. Rabelais illustrated (ten etchings). 1887.

Bourget, Paul Charles Joseph. A Cruel Enigma. 1887.

---. A Love Crime. 1888.

Bouvier, Alexis. Bewitching Iza, etc. 1888.

---. The Convict's Marriage. 1888.

---. A Dead Man's Wife and the Woman with Red Hair. 1887.

---. A Wily Widow. 1888.

Burchett, Godfrey. Dominie Penterne (a novel). 1888.

Burnand, F. C., H. Savile Clarke, R. E. Francillon, etc. No Rose without a Thorn and other tales. n.d.

Burney, Frances (afterwards d'Arblay). The Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay. 3 vols. 1890-1.

Busnach, William and Henri Chabrillat. Lecoq, the Detective's Daughter. 1888.

Capital Stories. 1888, etc.

Cassilis, Ina L. Between Midnight and Dawn. n.d.

Cherbuliez, Charles Victor. Blue-Eyed Meta Holdenis, and a Stroke of Diplomacy. 1881.

---. The Low-Born Lover's Revenge. 1881.

---. Samuel Brohl and Partner. 1880.

---. The Trials of Jetta Mataubret (Noirs et Rouges). n.d.

His Child Friend. By the author of "The Cheveley Novels" (i.e. Valentine Durrant). 1886.

Claretie, Jules. For Jacques' Sake. 1888.

---. Prince Zilah. n.d.

Claude, Chef de la Police de Sûreté. Memoirs of Monsieur Claude, Chief of Police under the Second Empire. 1887.

Coppée, François Edouard Joachim. The Passer-by. 1885.

Corkran, Henriette. The Black Cross Mystery. 1886.

The Cream of the Diarists and Memoir Writers. 3 vols. 1890-1.

Danby, Frank (pseud. Julia Frankau). Dr. Phillips: a Maida Vale idyll. 1887.

Daudet, Alphonse. Fromont the Younger and Risler the Elder. 1880.

---. Numa Roumestan: or, Joy abroad and grief at home. 1884.

---. The Prodigious Adventures of Tartarin of Tarascon. 1887.

---. Sappho. 1886.

Delpit, Albert. Odette's Marriage. 1886.

Dorat, Claude Joseph. The Kisses . . . preceded by the Month of May. 1889.

Dostoieffsky, Fedor. The Brothers Karamasoff.*

---. Crime and Punishment. n.d.

---. The Friend of the Family, & The Gambler.*

---. The Idiot.*

---. Injury and Insult. n.d.

---. Uncle's Dream, & The Permanent Husband.*

Droz, Gustave. Mama, Papa and Baby. 1887.

Dumas, Alexander. The Fiddler among the Bandits. n.d.

Duséjour, Dionis. The Origin of the Graces. 1889.

Ecilaw, Ary. Roland: or, The Expiation of Sin. n.d.

Fairlie, Walter. Wrecked in London. 1887.

Favre, Abbé. Beauty's Day. 1890.

Fenton, E. Dyne. Military Men as they were. n.d.

Feuillet, Octave. A Woman's Diary, & The Little Countess. n.d.

Féval, P. The Three Red Knights: or, The Brothers' Vengeance. n.d.

Feydeau, Ernest Aimé. Fanny. 1888.

Flemeng, Léopold. Illustrations to the Decameron, the Heptameron, the Hundred New Stories and Brantome's Gallant Ladies. 1887.

Flaubert, Gustave. Madame Bovary. 1886.

---. Salambo. 1886.

Gaboriau, Emile and Fortuné du Boisgobey. Gaboriau and Du Boisgobey Sensational Novels. 1881, etc.
The Angel of the Chimes. Bertha's Secret.
The Catastrophe. The Coral Pin. 2 vols.
The Count's Millions. The Crime of the Opera House.
The Day of Reckoning. 2 vols. Dossier No. 113.
A Fight for a Fortune. The Gilded Clique.
The Golden Pig: or, The Idol of Modern Paris. 2 vols.
His Great Revenge. 2 vols. In the Serpents' Coils.
Intrigues of a Female Prisoner. Intrigues of a Poisoner. The Jailor's Pretty Wife.
Lecoq the Detective. 2 vols. The Lerouge Case.
The Little Old Man of Batignolles. The Matapan Affair.
The Mystery of Orcival. The Old Age of Lecoq, the Detective. 2 vols. Other People's Money.
In Peril of his Life. Pretty Babiole. The Severed Hand. The Slaves of Paris. 2 vols. The Steel Necklace. The Thumb Stroke. Who Died Last? or The Rightful Heir.

Gautier, Théophile the Elder. Avatar. n.d.

---. Mademoiselle de Maupin. 1887.

Goldsmid, Howard J. Riven Asunder: a story told to a portrait. 1888.

Goncourt, Edmond and Jules de. Germinie Lacerteux. 1887.

---. Renée Mauperin. 1888.

Gordon, Charles George. Gordon and the Mahdi. 1885.

---. Thirteen Thousand. 1885.

Gozlan, Léon. The Emotions of Polydore Marasquin. 1888.

---. The Monkey's Revenge. n.d.

Greenwood, James. In Strange Company: being the experiences of a Roving Correspondent. 1886.

Gregg, William Stephenson (pseud. Frances Mabel Robinson). Irish History for English Readers. 1886.

Grenville-Murray, Eustace Clare. Flirts. n.d.

---. High Life in France under the Republic: social and satirical sketches in Paris and the Provinces. 1884.

---. Imprisoned in a Spanish Convent: an English girl's experiences, with other narratives and tales. 1886.

---. Jilts, and other social photographs. 1887.

---. Noble Lords. n.d.

---. Our Gilded Youth. n.d.

---. Our Silvered Youth. n.d.

---. People I have met. 1883.

---. Side-lights on English Society, or sketches from life, social and satirical. 1881.

---. Under the Lens: social photographs. 1885.

---. Young Widows. n.d.

Gréville, Henry. Wayward Dosia, & The Generous Diplomat. n.d.

Gunter, Archibald Clavering. Mr. Barnes of New York. 1887.

Hamilton, Anthony (called Count). Memoirs of the Count de Gramont. 2 vols. 1889.

Hatton, Joseph, Richard Jefferies, H. Savile Clarke, etc. The Dove's Nest and other tales. 1886.

Haviland, R. Langstaff de. The Forked Tongue. n.d.

Hill, John. The Corsars: or, Love and Lucre. n.d.

Icarus. By the author of A Jaunt in a Junk. n.d.

Irish Pictures . . . Sketches . . . republished from the Illustrated London News. 1881.

Jenkins, John Edward. Ben changes the motto. A sequel to "The blot on the Queen's Head". 1880.

Jennings, Hargrave. The childishness and brutality of the time: some plain truths in plain language. 1883.

Jephson, Mounteney. Nice Girls. n.d.

Kesnin, Bey (pseud. Eugène Chesnel). The Evil of the East: or, truths about Turkey. 1888.

Keyser, Arthur Louis. An Exile's Romance, or realities of Australian life. 1887.

---. So English. A Transatlantic sketch. 1888.

Knight, E. F. The Threatening Eye. n.d.

Law, John (pseud. Margaret Elise Harkness). A City Girl. 1887.

Longus. Daphnis and Chloe, a pastoral romance. 1890.

Lovelace, Fèlise. In the Change of Years. n.d.

"Lucifer". Lucifer in London, and his reflections on life, manners, and the prospects of society. 1885.

"Luigi". The Red Cross, and other stories. 1886.

Macé, Gustave. My First Crime, etc. 1886.

Malot, H. Doctor Claude: or, Love Rendered Desperate. 2 vols. n.d.

Masson, Alexandre Fréderic Jacques (Marquis de Pezay). Delia Bathing. 1890.

Matthey, A. (pseud. Arthur Arnould). Beautiful Julie & The Virgin Widow. n.d.

---. The Virgin Widow. 1887.

Maupassant, Guy de. Ladies' Man. n.d.

Mérimée, P. Colomba, & Carmen. n.d.

The Mermaid Series. The best plays of the old dramatists. General Ed. Havelock Ellis. Arden of Feversham and other plays attributed to Shakespeare.* Beaumont and Fletcher. 2 vols. 1887. George Chapman.* William Congreve. 1887. Thomas Dekker. 1887. John Dryden.* Etherege and Lacy.* George Farquhar.* Nathan Field.* John Ford. 1888. Thomas Heywood. 1888. Nathaniel Lee.* Christopher Marlowe. 1887. John Marston.* Philip Massinger. 2 vols. 1887 and 1889. Thomas Middleton. 2 vols. 1887 and 1890. Nero and other plays. 1888. Thomas Otway. 1888. The Parson's Wedding and other plays.* Patient Griss and other plays.* Thomas Shadwell. n.d. James Shirley. 1888. The Spanish Tragedy and other plays.* John Vanburgh. n.d. Webster and Tourneur. 1888. William Wycherley. 1888.

Moore, George. A Drama in Muslin. n.d.

---. Literature at Nurse, or, Circulating Morals. 1885.

---. A Modern Lover. 1885.

---. A Mummer's Wife. 1885.

Murger, Henry. The Bohemians of the Latin Quarter. 1887.

Nesbit, Charles. Caroline Bauer and the Coburgs. 1885.

Ohnet, Georges (pseud. Georges Hénot). Cloud and Sunshine. 1887.

---. Countess Sarah. n.d.

---. The Ironmaster: or, Love and Pride. n.d.

---. Prince Serge Panine. n.d.

Oxoniensis. Juvenal in Piccadilly. 1888.

Parke, Walter. The Comic Golden Legend. n.d.

---. Lays of the Saintly: or the new Golden Legend. 1883(?).

---. Patter Poems, humorous and serious for readings or recitations, etc. 1885.

People who have made a Noise in the World. 1890, etc.

Payne, Charles G. Matrimony by Advertisement. n.d.

---. Songs of Singularity. n.d.

---. Vote for Pottlebeck! n.d.

Pimlico, Lord (pseud.). The Excellent Mystery. A matrimonial satire. 1888.

Popular Life of W. E. Gladstone. 1880.

Ragged, Hyder (pseud. Sir Henry Chartres Biron). King Solomon's Wives: or, the Phantom Mines. 1887.

Robertson, Frances Forbes (afterwards Harrod). In Herself Complete: a love story, etc. 1888.

Robinson, Frances Mabel. Disenchantment. n.d.

---. Mr. Butler's Ward. n.d.

---. The Plan of Campaign: a story of the fortune of war. 2 vols. 1888.

Sala, George Augustus. America revisited. 1882.

---. Colonel Quagg's Conversion and other stories. n.d.

---. Dutch Pictures: with some sketches in the Flemish manner. 1883.

---. Dutch Pictures, and Pictures done with a Quill. n.d.

---. A Journey due South. 1885.

---. Paris Herself Again in 1878-9. 1882.

---. Under the Sun: essays mainly written in hot countries. 1884.

Sand, George. The Town of Percement and Marianna. n.d.

The Seaside Library. Parts 1 and 2. 1887.

Secondat, Charles Louis de (Baron de Montesquieu). The Temple of Gnidus: followed by Cephisa and Cupid, and Arsaces and Ismenia. 1889.

Siree, James. Saved by a Smile. 1886.

Sirven, Alfred and Henri Leverdier. Nana's Daughter. n.d.

The Social Zoo: satirical, social, and humorous sketches by the best writers. n.d.

Society Novelettes. By F. C. Burnand, H. C. Clark, etc. 2 vols. 1883.

Staal, G. Illustrations to La Fontaine's Tales. 1887.

Stafford, Paul. A Tale of Madness; being the narrative of Paul Stafford. 1887.

Thackeray, W. M. The Great Hoggarty Diamond. n.d.

---. A Shabby Genteel Story. n.d.

Theuriet, A. The Godson of a Marquis. n.d.

---. Maugars Junior. n.d.

Tinseau, Léon de. The Chaplain's Secret. n.d.

---. The Marchioness's Team. n.d.

Tolstoi, Lev Nikolaevich. Anna Karenina. n.d.

---. Childhood, Boyhood, Youth. 1888.

---. The Dominion of Darkness. 1888.

---. War and Peace. 3 vols. 1886.

Uchard, Mario. My Uncle Barbassou. 1887.

Vast-Ricouard. The Young Guard. n.d.

Vitu, Auguste. The Strange Phantasy of Dr. Trintzius. n.d.

Vizetelly, Henry. Facts about Champagne. n.d.

---. Facts about Port and Madeira. n.d.

---. Facts about Sherry. n.d.

---. A History of Champagne. n.d.

---. The Story of the Diamond Necklace. 1881.

---. The Wines of the World. n.d.

Warnings to householders. 130 hints . . . concerning safety, health, and comfort in our dwellings. 1882.

Zola, Emile. Abbé Mouret's Transgression. 1886.

---. The "Assommoir". 1884.

---. Le Capitaine Burle and other stories. 1888.

---. The Conquest of Plassans: or, the Priest in the house. 1887.

---. Fat and Thin. 1888.

---. The Fortune of the Rougons. 1886.

---. Germinal; or, Master and Man. 1885.

---. His Excellency Eugène Rougon. 1887.

---. His Masterpiece? or, Claude Lantier's Struggle for Fame. 1886.

---. How Jolly Life is! 1886.

---. The Ladies' Paradise. 1886.

---. A Love Episode. 1887.

---. Madeleine Férat. 1888.

---. Nana. 1884.

---. Piping Hot! 1885.

---. The Rush for the Spoil. 1886.

---. The Soil. 1888.

---. Thérèse Raquin. 1887.

APPENDIX C:
Extracts from Hardy's Notebooks

The following extracts from Zola's Abbé Mouret's Transgression, Germinal and La Terre have been reproduced from Hardy's "1867" Notebook (LN 2: 473-5) and his Literary Notebook I (LN 1: 208). It should be stated that while the "1867" Notebook bears the date "1867" on its front fly-leaf as its only heading (LN 1: xxxi), the book contains notes from well after this date, as the excerpts from Zola testify.

From Abbé Mouret's Transgression:

1. The landscape . . . was <dying of its thirst, &> flying away in clouds of dust at the least breath of wind.

2. For years he had never seen the sun . . . gazing inwards on his soul.

3. If you live all alone you get to see things queerly. The trees are no longer trees, the earth puts on the ways of a living being, the stones seem to tell you tales.

4. That fearful land, utterly consumed with ardent passions . . .

5. The Artauds, even when asleep, resting with aching backs, shrouded in shadow, disturbed him with their slumber; he could recognize their breath in the air he breathed . . . The hamlet was not dead enough; the thatched roofs bulged like bosoms; through the gaping cracks in the doors came sighs, faint creaks, & hums of living silence.

6. Her laughter . . . resounded from every atom of his flesh.

7. All the hues, all the emotions of the sky.

8. The very by-paths entreated their presence from afar . . . A tide of impassioned emotion stirred the garden to

its depths . . . the old flower-garden escorted them.

9. The whole parterre was a riotous mob . . . where intoxicated Nature had hiccups of verbenas & pinks.

10. He beheld the rude plants of the plain--the dreadful-looking growths that had become iron-hard amid the arid rocks, of close-grained fibre & knotted like snakes & bossed over with muscle--set themselves to work.

11. The rust-hued lichens gnawed away at the rough plaster like a fiery leprosy. The thyme followed on, & thrust their roots between bricks like so many iron wedges.

12. ~~On the edge of the horizon, the hills, <still hot with the s> seemed all tremulous~~

13. Far off, on the edge of the horizon, the hills, still hot with the setting luminary's farewell kiss, seemed all tremulous & quivering, as though shaken by the steps of some invisible army. Nearer . . . all the pebbles in the valley seemed animated with a throbbing life.

From Germinal:

14. The human beings that one felt to be lying there [in dark chamber] ←————→

15. The shaft swallowed the men by mouthfuls of twenty & thirty at one time

16. She walked among them, grotesquely perturbing, with her lumps of flesh exaggerated almost to infirmity.

17. [Examp . . . of more-true-than-truth:-]
A warm odour of woman arose from the trodden grass: the loud sound of the men's voices was deadened as it were by the draperies of the room & the hot-house atmosphere.

18. Etienne was alone with La Maheude in the room downstairs . . . Crouching over the miserable fire she was suckling Estelle . . . 'Is it good news?' she asked. 'Are they going to send us money?' Etne. shook his head . . . She became absorbed by her recollections, droned out in a mournful voice, her eyes fixed on vacancy, her breast uncovered, while her daughter Estelle fell asleep on her lap. And Etienne, absorbed also, [in their trouble] sat

staring at that enormous breast, the soft whiteness of wh. contrasted with the yellow & weatherbeaten hue of her face.

19. The dust rose from the floor--the dust accumulated by the various dancing-bouts [some time earlier], & poisoned the atmosphere with a strong odour of tram-girls & boys [i.e. the dancers].

20. The Voreux pit . . . panting louder & louder with its thick & heavy breath, as if obstructed in its painful digestion of human flesh & blood.

21. The cage . . . The monster was still there, gobbling its ration of human flesh . . . without a pause, without an effort, with the facile voracity of an ogre.

22. Some giant belly, capable of digesting a whole people . . . Voracious silence.

From La Terre:

23. 'C'était une vieille alliance d'or, un de ces bijoux de grosse joaillerie commune, si usée, que les guillochures en avaient presque disparu. On sentait que la main où elle s'était élimée ainsi, ne reculait devant aucune besogne, toujours active, dans les vases à laver, dans les lits à repaire, frottant, essuyant, torchonnant, se fourrant partout. Et elle racontait tant de choses, cette bague, elle avait laissé de son or au fond de tant d'affaires . . . . '

APPENDIX D:
Memorial to the Right Hon. Henry Matthews

The following Memorial petitioning for Henry Vizetelly's release was written by E. A. Vizetelly and signed by between one hundred and a hundred and fifty writers and supporting figures. A number of rough proof copies of the Memorial, showing E. A. Vizetelly's notes and revisions, are now held in the J. Harlin O'Connell collection at Princeton University. The text given below incorporates the revisions indicated. Also noted on a number of the proof copies are various lists of the names of the supporters of the Memorial, evidently drawn from memory some years later by E. A. Vizetelly for inclusion in his 1904 biography of Zola. The O'Connell collection also includes a series of response letters from some of the signatories of the Memorial, as well as a number of rough proof copies of other letters and documents drawn up by Robert Buchanan. As the text of the Memorial has never been published, and as the points raised provide a brief history of Vizetelly's career, it seems useful to reproduce the full text here, followed by E. A. Vizetelly's partial list of supporting names as recorded in Emile Zola, Novelist and Reformer (297-8).

TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY MATTHEWS, M. P.,

Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Home Affairs,

The Memorial of the undersigned literary men and others sheweth:

1. That the undersigned have been informed and have every reason to believe that the following statements with regard to Henry Vizetelly, publisher and author, now at Holloway Gaol, are in every respect strictly true.

2. That the said Henry Vizetelly is undergoing a term of three months' imprisonment as a first-class misdemeanant in pursuance of a sentence passed upon him at the Central Criminal Court on May 29th last, on his pleading guilty to

having published certain libels--namely, translations of various works by Emile Zola and other French authors.

3. That, on a previous occasion, in October, 1888, the said Henry Vizetelly, on being indicted for publishing translations of three novels by M. Emile Zola, then also pleaded guilty to the charge preferred against him, and was sentenced to pay a fine of £100. That having voluntarily undertaken on this occasion to suppress any other of his publications which *in their then form* might appear to be as objectionable as the three incriminated works, he withdrew numerous books from circulation, and, being himself in extremely delicate health and unable to give attention to his business, instructed one of his sons, Mr. Ernest Vizetelly, a journalist, to examine the works thus withdrawn, and to expunge from them all such objectionable matter as he might find them to contain. That the said Ernest Vizetelly struck out or modified over 300 pages in some twenty volumes submitted to him, and that his father had every reason to believe that in their altered state the books might with propriety be re-issued.

4. That the translations, on account of which the said Henry Vizetelly was sentenced to imprisonment, were never proceeded against in the form in which they were first published, several years ago, but only after they had been expurgated, and on the ground that the expurgation, considerable as it had been, was yet inadequate. That the aforesaid expurgation, nevertheless, cost the said Henry Vizetelly several hundred pounds, and occupied his son during a period of two months--circumstances which show that a sincere desire existed to conform to the requirements of the law.

5. That the said Henry Vizetelly's counsel advised him to plead guilty on the ground that a common jury at the Old Bailey was a doubtful tribunal to try a delicate question of literary morals.

6. That both before and since the proceedings in question there has been considerable controversy with regard to the translations on account of which the said Henry Vizetelly was prosecuted. That while many English literary men, including some of your memorialists, view the incriminated works with disfavour, others approve of them, and contend that they should not be ranked as lewd and obscene libels.

7. That the said Henry Vizetelly is now over seventy years of age, and suffers from a serious internal complaint which largely affects his general health, and which on his arrival at Holloway necessitated his immediate transference to the infirmary, where he remained during the first week of his detention. That the continued confinement of a person of his age, affected with serious disease (coupled with the necessary attendant hardships of prison life), would, it is believed, have the effect of impairing his health permanently.

8. That during the last half century the said Henry Vizetelly has rendered various services to the community at large. That he greatly assisted the late Mr. Herbert Ingram in launching The Illustrated London News--the oldest paper of its kind--and was thus largely instrumental in founding the pictorial press. That he subsequently established and edited The Illustrated Times, which long had a successful career, and the pages of which he opened to many writers and artists now favourably known to the public. That he was prominently connected with the Repeal of the Paper Duty and the Aboliton of the Newspaper Stamp--reforms which not merely relieved newspaper proprietors of two weighty and obnoxious imposts, but, what was of greater consequence, tended to a more general diffusion of knowledge. That his petition to the House of Commons praying for the abolition of the Stamp Duty having been presented by Mr. Cobden, was printed by order of the Committee on Petitions, and was largely instrumental in effecting the desired reform. That as honorary secretary to the Association formed for obtaining the repeal of the Paper Duty he devoted his time, his money, and his energy to securing the desired result, visiting Dublin, Edinburgh and Glasgow, attending public meetings, and furthering the formation of local associations to promote the repeal.

9. That at a later period he became the Paris representative of The Illustrated London News and, by repeatedly risking his life at the time of the German Siege and the Commune, placed the English public in possession of a complete pictorial record of the events which then took place in the French capital.

10. That, as an author, the said Henry Vizetelly has contributed various historical and descriptive works to English literature--works which are admitted to be the standard books of reference upon the subjects they treat of. His writings upon wines, for which he prepared himself by

visiting all the chief vineyards of Europe, are not only consulted by the trade both at home and abroad, but are prized by the general public for the store of information they contain. In this connection it may, moreover, be mentioned that the said Henry Vizetelly acted as British wine juror at the Vienna and Paris Exhibitions of 1873 and 1878, and acquitted himself of his duties to the full satisfaction of Her Majesty's Commissioners.

11. That as a publisher he largely helped to popularise the poems of Longfellow and Edgar Allan Poe on this side of the Atlantic and was the first to introduce 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' to the English public. That apart from the translations that have been complained of, he has afforded access to more writings by foreign authors than any other publisher in the country. For instance, his catalogue comprises works by Count Lyof Tolstoi, Fedor Dostoieffsky, and other eminent Russian authors, by Spanish writers of high standing, and French novelists of the very first flight, to whom no sort of objection can be taken. Most, if not all, of these works he was the first to publish in England. Moreover, it is, in a large measure, to his enterprise that the public owes 'The Mermaid Series of Old Dramatists'--a series which has placed within the reach of the student of moderate means the best plays of many writers of whom the country has reason to be proud.

12. Further, that, as a wood-engraver, in his younger days the said Henry Vizetelly contributed in no small degree to bring a pre-eminently English art to a high state of perfection, as is testified by the eagerness with which connoisseurs seek after the various works containing illustrations by him.

Several of your Memorialists have personally known the said Henry Vizetelly for many years and can speak highly of his moral character. From a financial point of view his business was seriously crippled by the proceedings taken against him in October, 1888; his sales largely fell off, and, prior to the trial on May 29th last, his creditors compelled him to assign the whole of his property for their benefit. He had previously been bound over in his own recognisances in a sum of £200, and at the trial last May it was ordered that those recognisances should be estreated. Inasmuch, however, as the said Henry Vizetelly is not personally possessed of any means--his business being simply carried on by the trustees of his creditors with a view to liquidation--it is respectfully urged by your Memorialists

that the payment of the estreated recognisances should not be insisted upon, but that you should be pleased to advise Her Majesty to remit the unexpired portion of the said Henry Vizetelly's sentence and grant him a full release.

Trusting that you will carefully weigh the various considerations in Mr. Vizetelly's favour which we have addressed in this Memorial, and that you will grant our petition, we beg to subscribe ourselves, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

Sir Algernon Borthwick (now Lord Glenesk), M. P., Sir. E. W. Watkin, M. P., T. P. O'Connor, M. P., Samuel Storey, M. P., Charles Bradlaugh, M. P., Dr. C. Cameron, M. P., The Earl of Eesart, Sir J. E. Millais, R. A., Sir John Gilbert, R. A., W. P. Firth, R. A., Birket Foster, Linley Sambourne, Harry Furniss, George du Maurier, Prof. Henry Morley, Prof. Geddes, J. Arthur Thomson, Edmund Gosse, Dr. R. Garnett, Dr. F. J. Furnivall, Oscar Browning, John Addington Symonds, Leslie Stephen, Dr. R. Maitland Coffin, Norman Maccoll, James S. Cotton, St. Loe Strachey, Hon. Roden Noel, Havelock Ellis, Robert Buchanan, Walter Besant, Hon. Lewis Wingfield, Thomas Hardy, George Moore, W. Clark Russell, H. Rider Haggard, Hall Caine, 'Ouida,' Mrs. Frances Hodgson Burnett, Mrs. E. Lynn Linton, Mrs. Mona Caird, 'John Strange Winter,' Olive Schreiner, Mabel Collins, Harriett Jay, G. A. Sala, Edmund Yates, Frank Harris, Archibald Forbes, W. H. Lucy, H. D. Traill, A. W. Pinero, William Archer, Augustus Harris, Sir Henry Irving, Henry Arthur Jones, Fitzgerald Molloy, Ernest Rhys, S. W. Orson, Hon. F. C. Lawley, H. Sutherland Edwards, J. C. Parkinson, D. L., Arthur Symons, Alex C. Ewald, W. R. S. Ralston, Max O'Rell, Savile Clarke, Brinsley Nicholson, G. Laurence Gomme, Frank A. Marshall, Grant Allen, Grederick and James Greenwood, G. B. Le Fanu, F. C. Philips, William Sharp, C. N. Williamson, William Senior, H. T. Wharton, Julius Mayhew, W. H. Dircks, Frank T. Marziais, W. Faux, of W. H. Smith & Sons.

APPENDIX E:
Appeal to the Royal Literary Fund
on behalf of Henry Vizetelly (1891)

The following appeal to the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund, simply dated May 1891, is now housed in the Fund's archive (file no. 2365, document 6). The appeal was penned by George Augustus Sala:

The undersigned venture to draw the attention of the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund to the case of Mr. Henry Vizetelly, author and journalist, who has been before the public for nearly fifty years and now, at upwards of seventy years of age and suffering from an insidious complaint of long standing, has become reduced to a state not merely of privation but of absolute destitution.

Mr. Vizetelly was associated with the 'Illustrated London News' at the time of its foundation in 1842, and afterwards became editor of the 'Pictorial Times' which numbered on its staff W. M. Thackeray, Douglas Jerrold, Robert Bell, Peter Cunningham, etc. He subsequently edited the 'Illustrated Times', a journal of repute in its day, and was also honorary secretary to the Association which by its persistent efforts succeeded in obtaining the repeal of the Paper Duty.

During the Siege and the Commune he corresponded from Paris with the 'Illustrated London News', the 'Times', and the 'Pall Mall Gazette', but what more particularly constitutes a claim for his present distressful position to be favourably considered by the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund is the circumstance of his being the author of a dozen volumes a list of which is subjoined.

'Summer Excursions in the County of Kent.' 1846.
'Four Months among the Goldfinders of Alta California.' 1849. (written under the pseudonym of J. Tyrwhitt Brooks M.D.).
'Christmas with the Poets.' 185[1?].
'The Chinese Revolution.' 1853.
'The Story of the Diamond Necklace told in detail for the first time.' 2 vols. 1867. (now in its fourth edition).
'Berlin under the New Empire.' 2 vols. 1879.

'The Wines of the World': A Report upon the wines exhibited at the Vienna Exhibition of 1873, written for the British government, & for which the Emperor of Austria conferred the order of Franz-Josef upon the author. 1873.
'Paris in Peril.' 2 vols. 1882.
'A History of Champagne.' 1882.
'Count Königsmark and Tom of Ten Thousand.' 1890.

[signed] George Augustus Sala/ Edmund Yates/ Walter Besant/ Norman Maccoll/ Jas. S. Cotton/ Richard Garnett/ Robert Buchanan/ F. J. Furnivall, M. A., Ph.D./ Henry T. Wharton/ Henry Irving/ E. Lynn Linton/ Oscar Browning/ Thomas Hardy/ Grant Allen/ Henry Morley.

Vizetelly was awarded £75 following his application of 4 May 1891 and the same amount for a second application on 31 October 1893. A third application was made on 5 November 1894 by Vizetelly's daughter, Annie Vizetelly, who was awarded a further £70. A final letter to the Committee (file no. 2365, document no. 25) in 1930 from Annie Vizetelly is included here as a final note on the Vizetelly family:

Annie Vizetelly

c/of Mrs. Henry Knight
The Rectory/Lyminge/Kent
July 8th 1930

Dear Sir,

I am the sole surviving daughter of the late Henry Richard Vizetelly, author, journalist and publisher who died on January 1st 1894. In the autumn of that year, when my home was broken up and I was left practically penniless, The Royal Literary Fund made me a grant which enabled me to tide over a very painful period in my life; whilst I was looking out for work, which I finally obtained in the Spring of 1895 when I accepted a post as governess in Russia, where I have spent thirty five years.

This Spring I yielded to the wishes of friends who urged me to return to England, and who undertook to defray my expenses home. Conditions in Russia were so hard, my health was giving way. I therefore gave in and arrived

here, on May 9th; homeless and practically penniless at 68 years of age.

Friends applied to the Working Ladies' Guild on my behalf, and the Guild has guaranteed me £20 for one year.

The General Council for the Assistance of the British Repatriated from Russia will be prepared to make me an allowance of 25/= a week, when I leave Lyminge Rectory, which I must do at the end of August. The Secretary to the Council adds 'that this allowance cannot be guaranteed as all our allowances depend upon public subscriptions, and should these fall off all allowances would cease.'

This is how I stand at present: the only guaranteed help I have to rely on is £20 for one year; hence my letter to you.

I shall be grateful if you will kindly send me the appropriate form for the application I propose to make to The Royal Literary Fund; and apologise for troubling you in this way.

Yours truly
Annie Vizetelly

To/The Secretary
Royal Literary Fund
Stationers' Hall
Stationers' Hall Court
E. C. 4.

A note attached to the above letter dated 11 July 1930 regrets 'RLF unable to give further help. Restricted under Charter to a single grant to the relatives of a dead author.' A Vizetelly genealogical tree drawn up by a family member in 1964 lists Annie Vizetelly's date of death as 11 April 1930, but this is obviously incorrect as she was still alive in July of that year. Presumably she died shortly after.

NOTES:

Maggie's Doll: Image and Introduction

1. The three contributions to the New Review symposium were by Walter Besant, E. Lynn Linton and Thomas Hardy. See pages 98-105.

2. Moore's pamphlet on Literature at Nurse (Vizetelly, 1885) will be discussed in detail at a later point but, briefly, his argument focuses on the circulating libraries as the main culprits in restricting the scope of the novel throughout the period.

History and Hardy: Reading Zola in Context

1. Hardy's copy of the Hedgcock book (signed "F. A. Hedgcock, 3-5-11") is held in the collection of the Dorset County Museum.

2. Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations of the various French passages throughout are my own.

3. See Hardy's letters to Vere H. Collins and Frank Hedgcock on 22 June, 24 June, 2 July, 9 July and 12 July 1922.

4. For detailed histories of Zola's publications and reception in England see E. A. Vizetelly, Emile Zola, Novelist and Reformer (1904); Lyn Pykett, "Representing the Real: The English Debate about Naturalism, 1884-1900," Naturalism in the European Novel (1992); Clarence R. Decker, "Zola's Literary Reputation in England," PMLA 49 (1934): 1140-53; W. E. Colburn, "Victorian Translations of Zola," Studies in the Literary Imagination 1 (October 1968): 22-32 and Zola in England, 1883-1903 (an unpublished dissertation, 1952); and Graham King, Garden of Zola (1978). Angus Wilson's book, Emile Zola: An Introductory Study of his Novels (1952), also contains a brief account of Zola and his English and American readers.

5. American translations of Madeleine Férat, La Fortune des Rougon, Le Ventre de Paris, La Conquête de Plassans, La

Faute de l'abbé Mouret, Son Excellence Eugène Rougon, L'Assommoir, Une Page d'amour and Nana were all available by 1880. For a complete bibliography of the English and American translations of Zola see David Baguley, "Les oeuvres de Zola traduites en anglais (1878-1968)," Les Cahiers naturalistes 40 (1970): 195-209.

6. As noted in Appendix B, Vizetelly had actually introduced the Vizetelly & Co. imprint in the 1850s, though the imprint was not used again until the new company was formed in 1880.

7. In the cases of Nana, L'Assommoir and Pot-Bouille (Piping Hot!) Vizetelly also issued a "profusely illustrated" Royal 8vo. edition priced at 7s. 6d.

8. Mudie's Select Library, the most powerful of the circulating libraries, began operations in Bloomsbury in 1842, and achieved its greatest prominence in the decades between 1850 and 1890. Following the movement away from the three-decker novel in the 1890s, the firm struggled on into the twentieth century, finally closing its doors in 1937. Guinevere Griest's book on Mudie's Circulating Library and the Victorian Novel (1970) remains the standard work on Mudie's, while J. A. Sutherland's Victorian Novelists and Publishers (1976) in some ways provides a more detailed study of the ways in which specific publishers interacted with the lending libraries. Richard Altick has also written extensively on various aspects of the Victorian book trade and its reading public, particularly in The English Common Reader (1957) and Writers, Readers, and Occasions (1989).

9. See letters and accompanying notes of 15 and 26 December 1910 to John Lane and George Moore respectively in CL.

10. The primary source for my summary of the Vizetelly trials is E. A. Vizetelly's Emile Zola: Novelist and Reformer (242-299). The events surrounding the trials, and their implications for Hardy, will form the basis for much of chapter 2. Vizetelly's letter to the Royal Literary Fund, along with various supporting documents, is held in the Fund's archive (file no. 2365, document no. 12; see Nigel Cross' index to The Archive of the Royal Literary Fund, World Microfilms Publications, 1982).

11. In the collection of the New York Public Library. I am indebted to Professor Owen Morgan for copies of Vizetelly's letters to Macmillan.

12. Items 1, 5 and 7 are listed in Frank Hollings (London) sale catalogue no. 212 (entitled Modern Times) as sale items 176-8; item 4 is listed in Hodgson & Co.'s (London) A Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Hardy O.M. (26 May 1938) as part of lot 278 and later reappears as sale item 137 in William P. Wreden's (Burlingame, California) Catalogue no. 11, A Selection of Books from the Library of Thomas Hardy, O.M. (1938); items 6, 8 and 9 also appear in Wreden as sale items 465-7; Lennart Björk identifies items 2 and 3 in LN 1: 385.

13. Hardy's copy of the Vizetelly biography first appears as part of lot 280 in Hodgson's catalogue of May 1938; it reappears in The Export Book Co.'s (Preston, Lancs.) Catalogue no. 287, Selections from the Library of . . . Thomas Hardy, O.M. (July 1938). The "various acts of kindness" that Vizetelly refers to in his inscription to Hardy will be discussed in chapter 2.

14. I am indebted to Professor Michael Millgate for the information concerning Hardy's copy of Le Docteur Pascal.

15. I am quoting from Professor Millgate's transcription of Emma Hardy's letter in the Colby College Library.

16. In his edition of The Literary Notebooks of Thomas Hardy, Lennart Björk suggests the date of 1886 or 1887 for Hardy's reading of Abbé Mouret's Transgression. Hardy's extracts from Germinal follow directly after those from Abbé Mouret in the "1867" notebook. In response to a letter of inquiry on this point, Professor Björk has assured me that the evidence for his dating of Hardy's reading of the two Zola novels is "circumstantial, but quite reliable. Judging from the dating of the other materials that Hardy copied into the "1867" Notebook after the Abbé Mouret excerpts, the evidence suggests 1886 or 1887" (18 March 1992).

17. Although the term "romancer" often had a more general use in the nineteenth century, simply meaning a novelist, Hardy's use of the term here does suggest a writer of romances, or a romantic novelist.

18. All references to Zola's novels are, where applicable, to the same editions either read or owned by Hardy.

On Descending into Hell: The Political Positioning of the Novel in the Nineties

1. Although several other women writers of the period might well be mentioned in this context--notably Rhoda Broughton and Sarah Grand--the example of Egerton seems most appropriate, particularly as Hardy was familiar with her work. Writing to Florence Henniker not long after the publication of Egerton's Keynotes, Hardy suggested that he was "not greatly curious" about the author (15 January 1894), though in a brief letter to Egerton herself the following year he praised the author for "the verisimilitude of the stories, & how you make us breathe the atmosphere of the scenes" (22 December 1895). What is intriguing here is Hardy's evident reticence concerning Egerton, who had initiated the correspondence in order to praise Hardy's portrait of Sue Bridehead as "a marvellously true psychological study of a temperament" (quoted in CL 2: 102n). Hardy's initial suggestion of seeming indifference to Egerton, and the later brevity of his response to her praise, seem to suggest that Hardy--who tended particularly to enter into paternal relationships with unestablished women writers, offering his assistance and advice--may well have felt threatened by a woman writer who was so obviously of an independent mind, who did not seek his tutelage, and who was not afraid to write frankly and seriously concerning matters of sexuality and the relations between the sexes.

2. For a bibliography of Zola criticism in England and America see Baguley, "Zola devant la critique de langue anglaise (1877-1970)," Les Cahiers naturalistes 43 (1970): 105-23.

3. Swinburne's responses to Buchanan, and to the various critics of the Poems and Ballads (1866) and the Songs before Sunrise (1871), are recorded in Notes on Poems and Reviews (1866) and Under the Microscope (1871), both reprinted in Clyde Kenneth Hyder's edition of Swinburne Replies (1966).

4. The controversy over who compiled the Extracts, and how many copies were actually printed, has long been a bibliographical puzzle, though the identification of Vizetelly as the compiler is now considered certain. Curiously, if Vizetelly was assisted by anyone in his task, the most likely candidate would not have been George Moore, whose name has so often been associated with the Extracts, but Havelock Ellis, who was currently editing the Mermaid

Series of old dramatists for Vizetelly, from which the bulk of the Extracts were drawn.

On the fly-leaf of a copy of the Extracts now held in the University of Victoria Library, British Columbia, Wilfred Partington (1888-1955), an early bibliographer and writer on the Extracts, noted that "A copy of this work does not appear to be in the British Museum Library. It is not catalogued either as by an Anonymous author, or under Zola, or Vizetelly, or George Moore, or Sir Richard Burton, or Uncle Tom Cobley. W. P." In a postscript added twelve years later, Partington noted, "After twelve years it has escaped my memory why, in spite of the letter signed 'Henry Vizetelly' to the Solicitor to the Treasury (see pp [1]-4), I was doubtful about the compilation having been done by him. But evidently the original bibliographer referred to in my article, who attributed it to George Moore, had the same doubt. From some notes of mine on the subject that I have just come across, two copies compared showed that one was wider than the other; and one sewed, the other wired. Again, in one the Letter to Sir A. K. Stephenson was bound before the Title-leaf, suggesting the explanation that the Letter was printed as an afterthought--hence the irregular binding-up of the few copies."

In "The Vizetelly Extracts" (Princeton University Library Chronicle 23 (Winter 1962): 54-9), W. E. Colburn identifies Vizetelly as both the compiler and publisher of the Extracts, and further details the differences between the original Vizetelly edition and a later "pirated reprint," which Colburn suggests was probably printed in a very small edition by Max Harzof of G. A. Baker & Co. of New York between 1920 and 1924 (Colburn 58).

The Dictionary of National Biography states that only twelve copies of the Extracts were issued, and this number was long accepted as correct. In 1960, Colburn ran an advertisement in The Times Literary Supplement asking for information concerning the whereabouts of various copies of the Extracts, and was able to locate twenty-four copies, nineteen of which appeared to be genuine, and five of which appeared to be pirated. Partington, in fact, was wrong about there not being a copy in the British Library, and Colburn lists the following institutions and individuals as holders of the nineteen genuine copies: "the British Museum, Newberry Library, New York Public Library, Bodleian Library, Library of Congress, Huntington Library, Houghton Library (3 copies), the libraries of Princeton, Lehigh and Stanford Universities; Mrs. Helen Manischewitz, West Orange, New Jersey; Rupert Hart-Davis, Herbert Van Thal, and Bertram Rota, Ltd., London; Edwin Gilcher, White Plains, New York;

B. Meredith Langstaff, Brooklyn, New York; and F. Murray H. Mayall, Cheshire" (56-7). The copy in the University of Victoria Library, a genuine copy not listed by Colburn, was purchased in 1962 (from Walford booksellers, London), two years after Colburn compiled his list. It seems unlikely that this copy corresponds to any of the six copies listed by Colburn as being held in private hands in 1960 (though this is now impossible to confirm) and so would appear to bring the number of genuine copies up to twenty. In addition, two further copies have recently come to my attention: a "pirated reprint" in the private collection of a Toronto bookseller, and a copy in the collection of the Zola Society in London, recently donated by Mr. Graham King. As these are only copies that have come to my personal attention, and although I have not ascertained who either of these last two copies were purchased from, it seems probable that there are more copies of the Extracts in circulation than has previously been considered.

The printer's proofs of the Extracts are now held in the J. Harlin O'Connell collection at Princeton University, along with various other letters and documents relating to the Vizetelly case.

5. For example, in The Early Life and Vicissitudes of Jack Smithers (1939), Leonard Smithers's son recounts the story of the mysterious "N---," presumably, though not necessarily, his father's former partner, Harry Sydney Nichols. Shortly after his father's death in 1907, Jack Smithers made his way to N---'s house, just off the Portobello Road. Here Jack finds N--- in possession of his father's printing press, which had earlier been stolen (85), turning out "the most obscene books, the very crudest or lewdest it is possible to conceive" (83). The N--- establishment, states Jack, "was nothing more or less than a wholesale factory of pornographic books and photographs" (82). Although these events take place in or around the year 1907, it seems evident that "N---" has been in the pornographic business, in one form or another, for some considerable time. Jack Smithers's description of the "N---" establishment, and the various goings-on there described, thus provides an important glimpse of a not often seen side of late Victorian life--that of the small-press pornographer involved in a variety of sex-related business ventures.

6. Interestingly enough, Harris, whose extremely frank literary and sexual autobiography, My Life and Loves, was to cause such a stir when the first of its five volumes was

published in 1925, "generously offered to bear all Vizetelly's expenses" for the 1889 trial (EZ 288).

7. In the O'Connell collection at Princeton. Lord Lytton (1831-91) gained a fairly large audience as a popular poet writing under the name of "Owen Meredith." His long dramatic poem Lucile (1860) first established his reputation and was often reprinted.

8. Also in the O'Connell collection. A note written across the top of the rough proof of Buchanan's letter requires 225 copies of the letter to be printed for circulation after the marked revisions have been made.

9. Apparently Buchanan's pamphlet originally had a slip inserted which listed the names of Vizetelly's supporters, though neither of the copies I inspected had the slip in question enclosed. The list might have been either a copy of the names that had accompanied E. A. Vizetelly's earlier Memorial or a list of the names of the people who had contributed to Buchanan's later subscription. In either case, it seems possible that the insertion was something of an afterthought on Buchanan's part, and that it was only inserted into a portion of the copies circulated.

For a contemporary commentary on the Vizetelly case from a French point of view see Edouard Clunet's pamphlet, Cas de poursuites judiciaires pour outrage aux bonnes moeurs par la voie de la presse dans les relations internationales (1889).

10. In the collection of the Dorset County Museum. Also in the DCM is Hardy's copy of a small printed card that was evidently circulated with the 1889 Memorial. A condensed version of the card's text is provided below:

A PLEA FOR THE RELEASE OF MR. VIZETELLY

Mr. Henry Vizetelly pleaded guilty at the Central Criminal Court to having published certain obscene libels because he was warned by his counsel that it would be almost impossible to defend successfully any book accused of indecency before a tribunal composed of a dozen small tradesmen, all wholly unacquainted with literature. The books incriminated are by Emile Zola, Gustave Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant, and Paul Bourget, and have been praised by eminent literary critics as being works of art of a very high order. 'Madame Bovary' would probably be placed in the

first half-dozen best novels the world has ever produced if a consensus of literary opinion were taken.

Under the circumstances, it would seem that the law relating to what may be published with safety needs amendment. At the present moment anyone can commence a prosecution against a publisher. The way is, therefore, open to the gratification of private malice, and unscrupulous solicitors in search of work may find it in vexatious prosecutions . . . . It is thought that English men of letters will view this censorship with the deepest distrust, and it is, therefore, proposed to organise a deputation to the Home Secretary to beg the immediate release of Mr. Henry Vizetelly.

Although Madame Bovary had originally been included in the list of works named in the 1889 summons of Vizetelly, following some objections in the press regarding the prosecution of Flaubert's work, "and with the gracious approval of the great [W. T.] Stead of the 'Maiden Tribute,' the summons respecting that work was eventually adjourned *sine die* . . . . The same course was taken with the summonses for 'L'Assommoir,' 'Germinal,' and 'The Fortune of the Rougons'" (EZ 286 and 286n).

11. Vizetelly's Extracts includes passages from Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, Sterne, Defoe, Smollet and Fielding. He also issued an edition of illustrations to The Decameron and Brantôme's Dames Galantes, etc. Smithers published a translation of Catullus in 1894, and the writings of Martial, Juvenal and Lucian figure extensively in the notes and accompanying essays to Smithers's Priapeia (1888).

Text and Context: Colour, Texture, Symbol and Sexuality in Tess and The Woodlanders

1. A pencilled note beside Hardy's entry on page 162 indicates that the incident has been "used in 'Tess'." Originally labelled "Commonplace Book III," Hardy's notebook, held in the Dorset County Museum, is headed "Facts, from Newspapers, Histories, Biographies & other Chronicles--(mainly Local)." As Michael Millgate has suggested, the main purpose of the "Facts" notebook "was to record material which might prove usable in the writing of future stories or poems" (Millgate 1: 248). As an

interesting aside, below the descriptive heading on the first page appears the pencilled instruction, "To be destroyed uncopied." Although Hardy's instruction was later erased, it is still clearly visible on the page. Ironically, an entry on page 12 of the same notebook, dated 23-11-83, reads: "Pencil marks, when apparently erased, will after a time reappear to some extent."

2. See Zola's letter to Huysmans (20 May 1884) and accompanying notes regarding his reading of A Rebours in Correspondance 5: 107-11, and Huysmans' response to Zola (25 May 1884) in Lettres inédites à Emile Zola 102-105. Hardy himself recorded an extract from an 1898 copy of Huysmans' La Cathédrale (LN 2: 227) and adds an interesting note to a suggestion in a review by Edward Dowden in the Fortnightly Review (November 1891). Dowden writes, "The possibility of a 'spiritual naturalism' has been conceived by M. Huysmans," to which Hardy adds, "'spiritual naturalism' nearly defines my own old idea of the principle of novels of the future" (LN 2: 48). In another of his post-Jude, anti-Zola statements, Hardy writes to Florence Henniker: "You mistake in supposing that I admire Zola. It is just what I don't do. I think him no artist, & too material. I feel that the animal side of human nature should never be dwelt on except as a contrast or foil to its spiritual side" (31 March 1897). Jude the Obscure presumably represents Hardy's attempt to contrast the animal to the spiritual, to give scope to the idea of a "spiritual naturalism," particularly in the contrast of Arabella's coarse materialism, her "animal" fleshiness, and Sue's almost disembodied spiritual self.

3. Throughout The Literary Notebooks, Björk refers to Zola's novel as Abbé Mouret's Transgressions instead of Abbé Mouret's Transgression. While this is undoubtedly a minor editorial error, it is worth correcting as it is actually quite central to the novel that Serge's transgression is seen as a single though lengthy episode rather than as a series of transgressions. This correction is not in any way meant to detract from the value of Björk's remarks, which are extremely insightful. More problematic is C. H. Salter's perpetuation of the same error in Good Little Thomas Hardy (1981). Salter's treatment of the two novels (129-30) is limited to the excerpts recorded in Hardy's "1867" notebook and to the points raised by Björk, while failing to supply the appropriate references or to place into an overall context the significance of his comparisons. This, coupled with the continuation of the error over the

book's title, suggests a very limited familiarity with Zola's novel.

4. The use of the term, "girl," both in the novels and here, may well seem problematic to the modern reader, particularly as both Tess and Albine show a degree of maturity well beyond their years, especially as their individual stories develop. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Zola, in particular, continues to stress the individual innocence of both Serge and Albine throughout the paradisal section of his novel, particularly emphasizing Serge's child-like state throughout the duration of his convalescence. Both Tess and Albine are very much on the verge of womanhood when their respective stories begin, and the female character's development from late adolescence into early womanhood forms a major focus for both novels.

5. Millgate cites an incident where Hardy had to cover up "a letter lying on a red velvet tablecloth so that it would not 'hit my eyes so hard'" (1: 285-6). J. B. Bullen, in The Expressive Eye (1986), suggests that Hardy's "vocabulary of over two hundred colour words is evidence of his precise, keen, and discriminating verbal palette" (7-8). Also worth reading in this context is Bullen's chapter on "Impression and Modernism" in The Expressive Eye (169-90). In "Colour and Movement in Hardy's Tess of the d'Urbervilles" (Critical Quarterly 10 (1968): 219-39), Tony Tanner writes: "For an artist as visually sensitive as Hardy, colour is of the first importance and significance, and there is one colour which literally catches the eye, and is meant to catch it, throughout [Tess]. This colour is red, the colour of blood, which is associated with Tess from first to last. It dogs her, disturbs her, destroys her. She is full of it, she spills it, she loses it. Watching Tess's life we begin to see that her destiny is nothing more or less than the colour red" (220-1). A comparison of the two writers' common use of the colour red will follow, but for a consideration of the colour red in Zola's novels see Baguley, "Image et symbole: la tache rouge dans l'oeuvre de Zola" (Les Cahiers naturalistes 39 (1970): 36-41.

6. The reference to Carlyle here is perhaps not quite so arbitrary as it might seem. Hardy was well read in Carlyle, and took extensive notes from his French Revolution (1837) in particular. The heavily symbolic colour scheme in that work, with its hellish reds and blacks alternating with, in the more enlightened moments, the occasional rays of golden light, is perhaps more closely related to Zola's Germinal

than to either of the novels being discussed here (as would be expected by the related subject of those two works). Nevertheless, Carlyle's colour symbolism, suggesting the violent upheaval of chaotic forces, is one of a number of interesting points of comparsion to Hardy, most obviously in relation to the writing of The Dynasts.

7. Interestingly enough, in his 1979 film of Tess, Roman Polanski--while presumably, though not necessarily, unfamiliar with Zola's novel--adapts his script to include Zola's archetypal Edenic scene: Tess and Angel running through the fields in the early morning mists; Angel in a tree throwing the breakfast apples to Tess, who catches them in her skirt. Of course, the obvious point here is that this is an archetypal scene which Hardy manages to suggest without actually including in his narrative. What is perhaps worth noting in this context is how brief and condensed many of the scenes in Tess actually are, and how much Hardy is able to suggest by his use of archetypal symbolism.

8. See Dale Kramer's introduction to the Oxford University Press edition of The Woodlanders (1981) for a brief history of the writing and publication of Hardy's novel.

9. Bookseller XXIX (6 November 1886): 1203.

On Obscurity, Dreams and Rude Awakenings:
From Church Spires to Cabbage Leaves and 'Pizzles' and Pigs

1. All references are to the first edition of Jude the Obscure (London: Osgood, McIlvaine and Co., 1896). Hardy made some significant revisions to the text for the 1903 Macmillan edition, toning down the language and, in certain instances, softening the effect of his narrative, particularly in the scene to be discussed where the offending piece of pig flesh is flung at the unsuspecting Jude. The 1903 revisions were retained for the later Wessex edition, which has been the text most often reprinted in subsequent editions, particularly in Britain. See Robert C. Slack, "The Text of Hardy's Jude the Obscure," Nineteenth-Century Fiction 11 (March 1957): 261-75 and Cedric Watts, Jude the Obscure (Penguin Critical Studies, 1992) 52-7.

2. See Peter Widdowson, Hardy in History (1989) and Michael Millgate, Testamentary Acts (1992) in particular.

3. More recently, David Baguley has made a number of brief but intriguing and, I think, convincing suggestions concerning both Tess and Jude as naturalist texts, though Baguley's argument is really very different from that being presented here. See Baguley, Naturalist Fiction: the entropic vision (1990) 118-9 and Baguley, "The Nature of Naturalism" in Naturalism in the European Novel (1992) 13-26.

4. It could well have been her reading of this particular scene,--of Désirée and the killing of Matthew the pig--along with similar scenes in La Débâcle and La Terre, that prompted Florence Henniker to suggest to Hardy that Zola might be a good candidate to write a book on anti-vivisection (see page 18 above).

5. A curious example of the pig as a symbol of "human animalism" or base sexual instinct is found in Paul Lisson's illustrations to Ambroise Macrose's La Flore pornographique (1883), a contemporary glossary to certain aspects of naturalist idiom. Lisson's illustration to the title page of the glossary shows a female pig giving suck to a crowd of (evidently male) human figures. Another illustration on page 159 shows a male pig with a large snout dressed in a dinner suit--evidently possessing an obscene appetite at table and otherwise.

6. I am quoting in this instance from the manuscript of Jude the Obscure (held in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, but widely available on microfilm). The "below the bladder" description does not appear in either the 1896 first edition or in the later Wessex edition of 1912.

7. Most recently in Jean-Louis Cabanes's massive two-volume study on Le Corps et la Maladie dans les récits réalistes (1856-1893) (Klincksieck, 1991).

8. English-language quotations to this point are from the standard modern translation of Germinal by Leonard Tancock (Penguin, 1954).

9. Hardy's notes from Germinal follow directly after those from Abbé Mouret in his "1867" notebook (LN 2: 474-5). See Appendix C.

10. One is reminded here of the opening scenes from David Lynch's film Blue Velvet (1986), where the camera first

focuses on the character's feet as he treads atop the grass, and then the camera literally goes underground to reveal a buried insect life toiling and coupling beneath the surface. Lynch, whether knowingly or not, is utilizing a common naturalist methodology here, literally and metaphorically to much the same effect.

11. As Hardy is not known to have read Le Ventre de Paris in any form, and for the combined sake of clarity and convenience, I am quoting from E. A. Vizetelly's translation of Zola's novel (Chatto & Windus, 1896).

12. It will be remembered that Hardy's copy of Le Docteur Pascal (Charpentier, 1893) bears no obvious sign of having been read by Hardy. My intention, then, in discussing the incident involving Antoine Macquart is not to draw a direct analogy between Zola's scene and the scene in Jude, but rather to provide a striking but not uncharacteristic example of Zola's largely unrealistic use of random and exaggerated violence to shockingly symbolize a more general trend of moral dissolution and collapse. As above, again for the sake of clarity and convenience, I am quoting from E. A. Vizetelly's translation of Zola's novel (Chatto & Windus, 1893).

13. Writing to Zola after the publication of Le Docteur Pascal, Jacques van Santen Kolff, a Dutch critic, directed Zola's attention to the scene in Bleak House, as well as to a similar scene in Captain Marryat's novel, Jacob Faithful (1834). Zola responded that he had neither read nor had knowledge of the scene in Dicken's novel: "Votre trouvaille me stupéfie. Mais je savais que des livres de médecine relataient plusieurs de ces cas si curieux et pour moi peu scientifiques; car je vous dirai que, pour mon compte, je ne crois pas du tout à la combustion spontanée, je veux dire la combustion totale" (20 July 1893). For an interesting discussion of Zola's scene in Le Docteur Pascal see Michel Butor, "Au feu des pages" (Les Cahiers naturalistes 34 [1967]: 101-113).

14. The Dreamer, one of Hardy's rejected titles for the book, is clearly marked on the opening page of the manuscript of Jude. Norman Page, in his Thomas Hardy (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977) provides an interesting discussion of Jude's changing modes of perception in the book (82-9), noting that in the passage where Jude first observes Christminster on the horizon, "'dreams' is a significant and recurring word" (83).

15. For an important critical discussion of Zola's novel see Henri Mitterand, "Le Rêve: le bleu et le noir" in Mitterand, Zola: L'histoire et la fiction (157-178).

16. Mrs. Oliphant, who commended Bishop How "for consigning [Jude the Obscure] to flames" (Millgate 1: 373), wrote in "The Anti-Marriage League" that "the present writer does not pretend to a knowledge of the works of Zola, which perhaps she ought to have before presuming to say that nothing so coarsely indecent as the whole history of Jude in his relations with his wife Arabella has ever been put in English print--that is to say, from the hands of a Master" (Cox 257). Arabella, according to Mrs. Oliphant, is "a human pig," a "fleshly animal" (Cox 258).

Conclusion

1. Significantly, for all of Harris's apparent bravado, and his desire to break with convention, he still tends to view the literary domain as exclusively male and is quite content, with his love of what he calls "plastic beauty" (428), to look upon women as literal dolls. Though he advocates a return to a frank literature, his intended audience appears to be exclusively male--the female is merely the object of his descriptive desire.

Works Cited or Consulted

Primary Sources

All references to the writings of Thomas Hardy are to the Wessex edition (24 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912-31) except as follows:

Hardy, Thomas. The Collected Letters of Thomas Hardy. Ed. Richard Little Purdy and Michael Millgate. 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-88.

---. The Complete Poems. Ed. James Gibson. London: Macmillan, 1982.

---. Jude the Obscure. London: Osgood, McIlvaine, 1896.

---. The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy. Ed. Michael Millgate. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984.

---. The Literary Notebooks of Thomas Hardy. Ed. Lennart A. Björk. 2 vols. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985.

---. The Personal Notebooks of Thomas Hardy. Ed. Richard Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1978.

---. Tess of the d'Urbervilles. Ed. Juliet Grindle and Simon Gatrell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

---. Thomas Hardy's Personal Writings. Ed. Harold Orel. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1966.

---. The Woodlanders. Ed. Dale Kramer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

All references to the writings of Emile Zola are to the Cercle du Livre Précieux edition of the Oeuvres complètes edited by Henri Mitterand (15 vols. Paris: Cercle du Livre Précieux, 1966-9) except as follows:

Zola, Emile. Abbé Mouret's Transgression. London: Vizetelly & Co., 1885. Trans. of La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret.

---. The "Assommoir". London: Vizetelly & Co., 1884. Trans. of L'Assommoir.

---. Correspondance. Ed. B.H. Bakker et al. 8 vols. to date. Montréal and Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1978- .

---. Doctor Pascal. Trans. E.A. Vizetelly. London: Chatto & Windus, 1893. Trans. of Le Docteur Pascal.

---. The Downfall. Trans. E.A. Vizetelly. London: Chatto & Windus, 1892. Trans. of La Débâcle.

---. The Dream. Trans. Eliza E. Chase. London: Chatto & Windus, 1893. Trans. of Le Rêve.

---. Germinal. London: Vizetelly & Co., 1885.

---. Germinal. Trans. Leonard Tancock. 1954. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1983.

---. His Masterpiece? London: Vizetelly & Co., 1886. Trans. of L'Oeuvre.

---. Rome. Trans. E.A. Vizetelly. London: Chatto & Windus, 1896.

---. The Soil. London: Vizetelly & Co., 1888. Trans. of La Terre.

Secondary Sources

Altick, Richard D. The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

---. Lives and Letters. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1965.

---. Writers, Readers, and Occasions. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1989.

Alvarez, A. Introduction. Tess of the d'Urbervilles. By Thomas Hardy. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1982.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis. 1953. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974.

Baguley, David, ed. Bibliographie de la critique sur Emile Zola. 2 vols. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

---. Critical Essays on Emile Zola. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986.

---. "Image et symbole: la tache rouge dans l'oeuvre de Zola." Les Cahiers naturalistes 39 (1970): 36-41.

---. Naturalist Fiction. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

---. "Les oeuvres de Zola traduites en anglais." Les Cahiers naturalistes 40 (1970): 195-209.

---. "Zola devant la critique de langue anglaise (1877-1970)." Les Cahiers naturalistes 43 (1972): 105-123.

---. "Zola, the Novelist(s)." Zola and the Craft of Fiction. Ed. Robert Lethbridge and Terry Keefe. Leicester, London and New York: Leicester UP, 1990. 15-27.

Becker, George J., ed. Documents of Modern Literary Realism. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.

Beckson, Karl. London in the 1890s: A Cultural History. New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.

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

Björk, Lennart A., ed. The Literary Notebooks of Thomas Hardy. 2 vols. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985.

Blunden, Edmund. Thomas Hardy. 1942. London: Macmillan, 1967.

Bredin, Jean-Denis. The Affair. The Case of Alfred Dreyfus. Trans. Jeffrey Mehlman. New York: George Braziller, 1986.

Bullen, J.B. The Expressive Eye. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Buchanan, Robert. The Coming Terror. London: Heineman, 1891.

---. "The Fleshly School of Poetry." 1871. Victorian Poetry and Poetics. Ed. Walter E. Houghton and G. Robert Stange. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

---. A Look Around Literature. London: Ward and Downey, 1887.

---. On Descending into Hell: A Letter Addressed to the Right Hon. Henry Matthews, Q.C., Home Secretary concerning the Proposed Suppression of Literature. London: George Redway, 1889.

Burns, Colin. "Lettres inédites d'Emile Zola à Ernest Vizetelly (1891-1893)." Les Cahiers naturalistes 62 (1988): 61-96.

---. "Lettres inédites d'Emile Zola à Ernest Vizetelly (1894-1899)." Les Cahiers naturalistes 63 (1989): 51-90.

---. "Lettres inédites d'Emile Zola à Ernest Vizetelly (1899-1902) et à Chatto et Windus (1897-1900)." Les Cahiers naturalistes 64 (1990): 105-133.

---. "Le retentissement de l'Affaire Dreyfus dans la presse britannique en 1898-99: esquisse d'un projet de recherches futures." Les Cahiers naturalistes 54 (1980): 251-257.

Cabanes, Jean-Louis. Le Corps et la Maladie dans les récits réalistes (1856-1893). 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1991.

Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus and On Heroes and Hero Worship. 1836 and 1841. London: J. M. Dent, 1967.

Chase, Mary Ellen. Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

Clemens, Cyril. My Chat with Thomas Hardy. Webster Groves, Missouri: International Mark Twain Society, 1944.

Clunet, Edouard. Cas de poursuites judiciaires pour outrage aux bonnes moeurs par la voie de la presse dans les relations internationales. Paris: Marchal et Billard, 1889.

Colburn, W. E. "Victorian Translations of Zola." Studies in the Literary Imagination 1 (October, 1968): 22-32.

---. "The Vizetelly Extracts." The Princeton University Library Chronicle 23 (Winter 1962): 54-59.

---. Zola in England, 1883-1903. Unpublished Diss. University of Illinois, 1952.

Cox, J. Stevens, ed. The Library of Thomas Hardy. Guernsey: Toucan Press, 1969.

Craig, Alec. Suppressed Books. A History of the Conception of Literary Obscenity. 1962. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Company, 1966.

Croft-Cooke, Rupert. Feasting With Panthers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Nigel Cross, ed. Archive of the Royal Literary Fund. London: World Microfilms Publications, 1982. File 2365 (Henry Vizetelly).

---. The Common Writer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

---. The Royal Literary Fund, 1790-1918 (index). London: World Microfilms Publications, 1984.

Curtis, Simon. "Henry Vizetelly and Vizetelly & Co.: An Account." Bulletin of the Emile Zola Society 4 (November 1992): 7-14.

---. "Vizetelly & Co." Poetry Nation Review 32 (1983): 28-31.

Decker, Clarence R. The Victorian Conscience. New York: Twayne, 1952.

---. "Revolt against Naturalism." PMLA 53 (1938): 844-56.

---. "Zola's Literary Reputation in England." PMLA 49 (1934): 1140-1153.

Dickens, Charles. Bleak House. 1853. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1981.

Downey, Edmund. Twenty Years Ago. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1905.

Ebbatson, J. R. "Talbothay's Garden: A Source?" The Thomas Hardy Society Review 1 (1979): 136.

Edel, Leon. The Life of Henry James. 5 vols. 1953-72. New York: Avon Books, 1978.

Edel, Leon, and Dan H. Laurence. A Bibliography of Henry James. 1957. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Eliot, George. The Mill on the Floss. 1860. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Ellis, Havelock. "Concerning Jude the Obscure." The Savoy 1 (Oct. 1896): 35-49.

---. The New Spirit. London: George Bell, 1890.

---. "Thomas Hardy's Novels." Thomas Hardy: The Critical Heritage. Ed. R.G. Cox. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

---. "Zola: The Man and his Work." The Savoy 1 (1896): 67-82.

Ellmann, Richard. Oscar Wilde. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987.

d'Exideuil, Pierre. The Human Pair in the Work of Thomas Hardy. Trans. Felix W. Crosse. London: Humphrey Toulmin, n.d.

Extracts Principally from English Classics showing that the legal suppression of M. Zola's novels would logically involve the bowdlerizing of some of the greatest works in English literature. London: n.p., 1888.

Fish, Stanley. Is There a Text in this Class? Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction. 1978. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Frierson, William C. L'Influence du naturalisme français sur les romanciers anglais de 1885 à 1900. Paris: Marcel Giard, 1925.

Garson, Marjorie. Hardy's Fables of Integrity. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Gatrell, Simon. Hardy the Creator: A Textual Biography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

---. Thomas Hardy and the Proper Study of Mankind. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993.

Gauthier, Paul E. "New Light on Zola and Physiognomy." PMLA 75 (June 1960): 297-308.

Gerber, Helmut E., and W. Eugene Davis. Thomas Hardy: An Annotated Bibliography. 2 vols.. De Kalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois UP, 1973-83.

Gittings, Robert. Young Thomas Hardy. 1975. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1978.

---. The Older Hardy. 1978. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1980.

Gosse, Edmund. "The Short Stories of M. Zola." Introduction to The Attack on the Mill and other sketches of war. London: William Heinemann, 1892.

Grant, Elliott M. and Philip Walker. "Concerning Color in Germinal." PMLA 79 (June 1964): 348-354.

Greenslade, William. "The Lure of Pedigree in Tess of the d'Urbervilles." The Thomas Hardy Journal 7.3 (October 1991): 103-115.

Greiner, Walter, and Gerhard Stilz, eds. Naturalismus in England 1880-1920. Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983.

Griest, Guinevere L. Mudie's Circulating Library. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970.

Guieu, Jean-Max, and Alison Hilton, eds. Emile Zola and the Arts. Georgetown: Georgetown UP, 1988.

Hannigan, D.F. "The Latest Development of English Fiction." Westminster Review 138 (1892): 655-59.

---. "Mr. Thomas Hardy's Latest Novel." Westminster Review 142 (1896): 136-39.

Hardy, Emma. Some Recollections. 1961. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.

Frank Harris. My Life and Loves 1925-53. New York: Grove Press, 1963.

Hedgcock, Frank A. "Reminiscences of Thomas Hardy I." The National and English Review 137 (Oct. 1951): 220-228.

---. "Reminiscences of Thomas Hardy II." The National and English Review 137 (Nov. 1951): 289-294.

---. Thomas Hardy, penseur et artiste. Paris: Hachette & Cie., 1911.

Hemmings, F.W.J. The Life and Times of Emile Zola. London: Elek Books, 1977.

Hone, Joseph. The Life of George Moore. London: Victor Gollancz, 1936.

Huysmans, J.K. Against Nature. Trans. Robert Baldick. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1986. Trans. of A Rebours. 1884.

---. Lettres inédites à Emile Zola. Ed. Pierre Lambert. Genève: Droz, 1953.

Hyder, Clyde Kenneth, ed. Swinburne Replies. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1966.

Jackson, J. Hampden. Clemenceau and the Third Republic. 1946. London: English Universities Press, 1965.

James, Henry. "The Art of Fiction." 1884. The Art of Criticism. Ed. William Veeder and Susan M. Griffin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

---. "Emile Zola." 1903. The Art of Criticism. Ed. Veeder and Griffin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

---. "A Review of Une Page d'amour." The Nation (30 May 1878): 361-2.

---. "A Review of Zola's novel Nana." The Parisian 48 (1880): 6-7.

Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." New Directions in Literary History. Ed. Ralph Cohen. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

---. Toward an Aesthetic of Reception. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jones, Tobin H. "Mythic Vision and Ironic Allusion: Barbusse's Le Feu and Zola's Germinal." Modern Fiction Studies. 28.2 (1982): 215-228.

Josephson, Matthew. Zola and his Time. New York: Garden City Publishing, 1928.

Kay-Robinson, Denys. "Hardy's First Marriage: A False Picture." The Thomas Hardy Journal 6.3 (Oct. 1990): 59-70.

Kermode, Frank. The Genesis of Secrecy. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1979.

---. "Obscenity and the Public Interest." Modern Essays. London: Fontana, 1971.

King, Graham. Garden of Zola. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1978.

Kingsmill, Hugh. After Puritanism. London: Duckworth, 1929.

Knapp, Bettina L. Emile Zola. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980.

Lang, Andrew. "Emile Zola." Fortnightly Review 37 (1882): 439-52.

Lapp, John C. "Taine et Zola: Autour d'une correspondance." Revue des sciences humaines 87 (1957): 319-26.

---. Zola before the Rougon-Macquart. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Lea, Hermann. Thomas Hardy Through the Camera's Eye. Beaminster, Dorset: Toucan Press, 1964.

Lecercle, Jean Jacques. "The Violence of Style in Tess of the d'Urbervilles." Alternative Hardy. Ed. Lance St. John Butler. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 1-25.

Levin, Harry. The Gates of Horn. A Study of Five French Realists. New York: Oxford UP, 1963.

Lilly, Marjorie. "The Mr Hardy I Knew." Thomas Hardy Society Review 1.4 (1978): 100-103.

Lilly, W.S. "The New Naturalism." Fortnightly Review 44 (1885): 240-56.

Lukàcs, Georg. Studies in European Realism. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964.

Macrobe, Ambroise. La Flore pornographique. 1883. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1968.

Marandon, Sylvaine. L'Image de la France dans l'Angleterre victorienne, 1848-1900. Paris: Armand Colin, 1967.

Marcus, Steven. The Other Victorians. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Maupassant, Guy de. Chroniques. 3 vols. Paris: Union Générale d'éditions, 1980.

Miller, J. Hillis. Thomas Hardy: Distance and Desire. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1970.

Millgate, Michael. Testamentary Acts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

---. Thomas Hardy: A Biography. 1982. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.

---. Thomas Hardy: His Career as a Novelist. London: Bodley Head, 1971.

Mitterand, Henri. Zola. L'histoire et la fiction. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990.

Moore, George. The Confessions of a Young Man. 1888. New York: Boni and Liveright, n.d.

---. Impressions and Opinions. London: David Nutt, 1891.

---. Literature at Nurse, or Circulating Morals. London: Vizetelly & Co., 1885.

---. "A New Censorship of Literature." Pall Mall Gazette XL (10 Dec. 1884): 1-2.

Morgan, Charles. The House of Macmillan. London: Macmillan, 1943.

Morrell, Roy. Thomas Hardy. The Will and the Way. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1965.

Naturalism in the European Novel. Ed. Brian Nelson. New York: Berg, 1992.

Newton, A. Edward. The Book-Collecting Game. Boston: Little, Brown, 1928.

Newton, William. "Chance as Employed by Hardy and the Naturalists." Philological Quarterly 30 (1951): 154-175.

---. "Hardy and the Naturalists: Their Use of Physiology." Modern Philology 49 (1951): 28-41.

Norman, Henry. "Theories and Practice of Modern Fiction." Fortnightly Review 34 (1883): 870-76.

Orel, Harold. The Unknown Thomas Hardy. Brighton: Harvestor Press, 1987.

Page, Norman. Thomas Hardy. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

Pagès, Alain. Le Naturalisme. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1989.

Partington, Wilfred. Forging Ahead. New York: Putnam, 1939.

Patterson, J. G. A Zola Dictionary. 1912. New York: Gale Research Company, 1969.

Pernicious Literature. Debate in the House of Commons. Trial and Conviction for sale of Zola's Novels. With Opinions of the Press. London: The National Vigilance Association, 1888.

Pettit, Charles P.C. "Hardy's Concept of Purity in Tess of the d'Urbervilles." The Thomas Hardy Journal 7.3 (October 1991): 49-56.

Pinion, F.B. A Hardy Companion. London: Macmillan, 1968.

---. Thomas Hardy: His Life and Friends. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Priapeia or the Sportive Epigrams of divers Poets on Priapus. Trans. "Outidanos" (Sir Richard Burton). Ed. "Neaniskos" (Leonard Smithers). Cosmopoli: The Translators: 1890. (False imprint. Printed in London.)

Pryme, Eileen. "Zola's Plays in England 1870-1900." French Studies 13 (1959): 28-38.

Ripoll, Roger. "Le symbolisme végétal dans La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret." Les Cahiers naturalistes 31 (1966): 11-21.

Sala, George Augustus. Paris Herself Again. London: Vizetelly & Co., 1882.

Salter, C.H. Good Little Thomas Hardy. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1981.

Selby, Thomas G. The Theology of Fiction. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1897.

Seymour-Smith, Martin. Introduction. The Mayor of Casterbridge. By Thomas Hardy. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1978.

Sharp, William. "Thomas Hardy and his Novels." Forum 13 (July 1892): 583-593.

Sherard, Robert. Emile Zola. London: Chatto & Windus, 1893.

---. "Letter from Paris." The Author 5 (1895): 148-50.

Siemens, Lloyd. "Naturalism in the Poetry of Hardy and Meredith." English Studies in Canada 8.1 (1977): 69-86.

---. "What Hardy Really Said About the Critics: Cancelled Passages in the Life." The Thomas Hardy Journal 6.3 (Oct. 1990): 73-80.

Smithers, Jack. The Early Life and Vicissitudes of Jack Smithers. London: Martin Secker, 1939.

Starkie, Enid. From Gautier to Eliot. The Influence of France on English Literature 1851-1939. London: Hutchinson, 1960.

Stephens, Bertie Norman. Thomas Hardy in his Garden. Beaminster, Dorset: Toucan Press, 1963.

Stokes, John. In the Nineties. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.

Sutherland, J. A. Victorian Novelists and Publishers. London: Athlone Press, 1976.

Swinburne, A.C. "Note on the Question of the Hour." Athenaeum 2590 (1877): 768.

---. The Swinburne Letters. Ed. Cecil Y. Lang. 6 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1959-62.

Symons, Arthur. A Study of Thomas Hardy. London: Chas. J. Sawyer, 1927.

Tanner, Tony. "Colour and Movement in Hardy's Tess of the d'Urbervilles." Critical Quarterly 10 (1968): 219-39.

Tennyson, Alfred Lord. "Locksley Hall Sixty Years After." 1886. The Poems of Tennyson. Ed. Christopher Ricks. 3 vols. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group UK, 1987.

Thomas, Donald. A Long Time Burning. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Tyrrell, Robert Yelverton. "Jude the Obscure." Fortnightly Review 65 (1896): 859-64.

Vigar, Penelope. The Novels of Thomas Hardy: Illusion and Reality. London: Athlone Press, 1974.

Vizetelly, Ernest Alfred. Emile Zola. Novelist and Reformer. 1904. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.

---. Introduction. Abbé Mouret's Transgression. By Emile Zola. London: Chatto & Windus, 1900.

---. Preface. Doctor Pascal. By Emile Zola. London: Chatto & Windus, 1893.

---. "Some Recollections of Emile Zola." Pall Mall Gazette 29 (1903): 63-5.

---. With Zola in England. London: Chatto & Windus, 1899.

Vizetelly, Henry. Glances Back through Seventy Years. 2 vols. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893.

---. "My Life and Publications." Pall Mall Gazette (24 Mar. 1888): 1-4.

Walker, Phillip. Zola. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

---. "Zola's Use of Color Imagery in Germinal." PMLA 77 (September 1962): 442-449.

Warner, Charles Dudley. "Modern Fiction." Atlantic Monthly 51 (Apr. 1883): 464-74.

Webster, Harvey Curtis. On a Darkling Plain. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Widdowson, Peter. Hardy in History. A Study in Literary Sociology. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Wilson, Angus. Emile Zola. London: Secker & Warburg, 1952.

Wilson, H. Schutz. "L'Assommoir." Gentleman's Magazine 243 (1878): 737-49.

Winner, Anthony. Characters in the Twilight. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1981.

Winters, Yvor. Forms of Discovery. Chicago: Swallow, 1967.

Zietlow, Paul. Moments of Vision. The Poetry of Thomas Hardy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1974.

"Zola's Parisian Middle Classes." Scottish Review (Sept. 1883): 301-34.