Abstract

This thesis presents a detailed textual and contextual study of Thomas Hardy as reader of Émile 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 Work, 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 (1889) to the publication of
Rude 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.
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Fatish, in short, represents Maggie’s revolt against the conventions of her childhood, and the image of the doll, riven through with nails, and roughly decapitated 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 intimate 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), 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 shelves of the library, or in the locked bookcase for greater security. The Young Person was warmed 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."

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 puling brood of bastard bantlings, a race of Aestes that disgrace the intelligence of the English nation.

(Literature at Nurse, or Circulating Moral; reprinted in Greiner and Stiz 152)

Leaving aside, for the moment, the interesting inversion of sex roles, of the male librarian giving succor to the pelting 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. Masingham," 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" Aestes, 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—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
For the most part, Hardy's annotations to Hegdcock 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 'Man, 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 denounced 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: "There 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 Londoonsers, and especially the upper classes, are sharp, clear, incisive, and in many respects true, but they are wholly dark--or 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,
see perhaps better suited to Zola's *Carnival* or *L'Assemblée* 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]" (*Pall Mall Gazette*, 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, 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 as 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 naturalisme" (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 Hardysque 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 Bagley has suggested, "the principal factor of unity in naturalist fiction ... is thematic" (NM 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-xi).

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 291-2); although Hardy owned an 1884 French-language copy of Le Jue de vie on, the first concrete evidence of his actually reading Zola comes in 1886 or 1887 (see NM 2: 571). The only reference to Hardy and Zola meeting comes in 1893, when Hardy wrote to Florence Hemmick: "My address will be here [Max Gate] till Wedy, possibly Thursday, morn 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 Metropol 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" (NM 2: 34). A further note in The World for 4 October 1893, quoted in NM, "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 Travels with the author of Mann'" (NM 2: 34). Again, in 1897, regarding a proposed book on anti-vivisection, Hardy wrote to Florence Hemmick: "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. Visetos's With Zola in England (1899), and Visetos was extremely conscientious in noting the few people that Zola came into contact with—excepting, for the sake of discretion, Zola's mistress, Jeanne Rosenzweig, 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 Rebeckah 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 notes 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 29). 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.6 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" (EE 241-2). By 1880, there were American translations of nine of Zola's novels in print,7 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 1880s 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 Hummer'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 ware'souse (Colburn 1: 14)—and the experiment of issuing Zola in three-decker form, which "brought no profit either to Zola or to Tinsley Brothers" (Dowsey 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 1s. 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 Hummer'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 Hummer'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" (23 January 1885): C'est un beau rôle que vous tenez... vaillamment. Il est aussi excellent, ce que vous me racontes sur votre prompte
victoire, au sujet de vos librairies circulantes; car je suis persuadé que ce mode de publication avait un effet considerable sur la douce et laissière 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 œuvres prendre des audaces d'analyse...C'est à vous que l'Angleterre devra son roman virtu 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 immaturity 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 virtu 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 Médat qu'on arrête les choses littéraires du monde!" ("According to your advice I have attacked our system of circulating libraries... The system is finished. It's at Médat that the literary things of the world are arranged"); quoted in Correspondance de Zola:

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 strangulation 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 boldly 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).
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 [Mudies]" (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. Defily his fingers lift skirt and under-skirt, and if the examination prove satisfactory the sometimes daintily 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 the longs for some newer fashion in literary frills and turbans. (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 perversion 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 Visetously 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 Father 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: 533m). 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 habe lieb (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. Moore was later to refer to Hardy as "George Eliot's miscarriage" and to Tess of the d'Urbervilles as "that Tess book" (Home 378). Moore's overtly hostile remarks on Hardy in Conversations in Every 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" (EP 971m).

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 of my own
What then, such beauty (perfection) is not known.'

Deep dusting on him:
They'll not see
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 Visetously in
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 reprobate, 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 (Le Désâsèse 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).

(2) “Whenever M. Zola writes of war,” Gosse adds, “he writes seriously and well” (28).
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, & overcome my strong opinion that one novelist should not write on another except in rivalry—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 Voix to comment on the Dreyfus case (PL 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 Edgcombe 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 Return of the Native, The Downfall (Le Dénbiclé), 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 inexpensive dark brown cloth cover (this time showing a pair of leafy branches, with the leaves presumably about to fall). Le Dénbiclé 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 Le Dénbiclé 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 (1887), Alan Schon cites an interesting incident concerning a German edition of Le Dénbiclé 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 Le Dénbiclé 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," MODA 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
translated by Visetelly, it was necessary to impose still greater restraint upon the narrative, and Visetelly 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. (viii)

In his introduction to the correspondence of Zola and E. A. Visetelly (Les Cahiers naturalistes [42]: 61-96), Colin Burns explains Visetelly's position more precisely:

Pour Ernest Visetelly la cause de Zola en Angleterre était intimement liée à la siène et à celle de son père, dont il tenait, plus ou moins consciemment, à rétablir la réputation. La passion de Visetelly 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'œuvre de Zola, devant la société anglaise qui sa montrait parfois hostile aux doctrines humanitaires et réformatrices exposées par l'auteur des Rougon-Macquart . . . . Le dévouement de Visetelly à la cause de Zola en Angleterre était absolu, total, et totalement
vice in the book, but scene follows scene of women at ménagères' 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 unused 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)".

Despite Vicetelly's very real concern, his much bowdlerized translation of Fécundité (Fruitfulness) was finally published by Chatto & Windus in England in 1900. Nevertheless, as the above excerpt from his letter to Macmillan shows, Vicetelly 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 Powell (1892) and Doctor Pensei (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 Vicetelly translations, often heavily bowdlerized, as re-edited or, in some cases, re-translated by E. A. Vicetelly. 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 Vicetelly's dilemma over the English publication of Fécundité.

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's 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 Fille de D'Artagnan (1899), Count Hamilton's Les Quatre Farcins (1899) and Barbye d'Aurévilly's Les Diaboliennes (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 1888 (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 Vicetelly & 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 Vicetelly 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 Macmillan 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 confess" (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 cataloged 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. Gens d'Armes (Vinsetelly, 1885)
3. Abbé Moutot's Transgression (Vinsetelly, 1886)
4. L'inconnue (Vinsetelly, 1886)
5. La Diable (Charpentier, 1892)
6. The Dream (Chatto & Windus, 1893)
7. Le Docteur Pascal (Charpentier, 1893)
8. Ross (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 (LIN 1: 208), and referred both to La Jeune

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 Napoleon in connection with his research for The Dynasts (1903-8). As Michael Millgate notes in Testimonial 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.

Experimental in "The Science of Fiction" (1892) and to contemporary criticism of L'Assommoir in his literary notebooks (LIN 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 Vinsetelly 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. Vinsetelly's 1904 biography of Zola, inscribed "To Thomas Hardy, Esq., in respectful recognition of various acts of kindness, Ernest Vinsetelly, 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

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 Diable, the one in French and the other in English, would seem to confirm a possible pattern and, like Thiers' History of Napoleon, La Diable 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 Jeune 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 Jeune 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 Jeune 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 Charpentrier 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 1913 under the three general headings of "Novels of Character and Environment," "Romances and Fantasies," and "Novels of Ingenuity" or "Experiments" may perhaps be seen as much Balzacian as Zolesque, 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 Visetosy titles in Hardy's library, *Germinal* (1885), *Abbe Mourat'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 Warden catalogue as containing "markings by Hardy scattered throughout"; and in addition to referring to both *Abbe Mours et* and *Germinal* in "The Science of Fiction," Hardy also recorded a series of extracts from the two novels in his "1867" notebook (ib 2: 473-5).

Of the three Chatter & Windsus titles, *The Dream* (1893; trans. of *Le Reve*), *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 Warden 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 Chatter & Windsus 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 "shelv" 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 Rehakon 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)⁵

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 Chatter & Windsus 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 reconsider 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* (Vinsetelly, n.d.) and Zola's *Nue Masterpiece* (Vinsetelly, 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 erms, 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 Rove and Ronx, L'Asommerir or la Terre*. This said, the present study has been conceived to consider only these 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 Vinsetelly, 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 *Abbe Mouret* and *Sémanial* recorded in 1886 or 1887; his article on "The Science of Fiction" in 1891; Hardy's most complete response to Zola; his notes and extracts from contemporary criticism of Zola, particularly from the *Bewe 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 *Abbe Mouret* and *Sémanial* consistently, and almost exclusively, reveal a marked preoccupation with the interpretative process of subjective representation. "All the hues, all the emotions of the sky," or, 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 hiccuped "verbenas & pinaks," 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 "véridic 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 experimentel*. 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 experimentel* "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 veld-hallow, and has been assumed in some places to mean copyism, in others its pruriency, and has led to two classes of delineators being included in one condemnation" (*PW* 136).

In *Le Roman experimentel*, 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 béte 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, “... n’en continuons 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 œuvre d’art quelconque. En bien! avec l’application de la méthode expérimentale au roman, toute question cesse. L’idée d’expérience entraîne avec elle l’idée de modification. Nous parvenons bien des faits vrais, qui sont notre base indestructible; mais, pour montrer le mécanisme des faits, il faut que nous produisions au sujet que nous dirigeons les phénomènes; c’est la notre part d’invention, de gêne dans l’œuvre. (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, that we continue to respond to us with the same imbecile 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 term “more-true-than-truth” and “véritable 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 storyteller” (PW 137) is really very similar to Zola’s earlier statement that “une œuvre n’est que le produit d’une individualité” (X: 795) or that “chaque œil a ainsi une vision particulière” (X: 1287). As Pierre d’Exideuil noted as early as 1928 in his book on The Human Fair 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 œuvre 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 163-83), in which James, like Hardy, argues that Zola “reasons less powerfully than he represents” (177). James, who also wrote reviews of The 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’ 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 passion 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. (1882-3)

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 sect 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. (138)

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 aspirations, 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 (1879-80) 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 CG 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 ... a 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. Hodgecock (Hardy, penseur et artiste 497), the only French translations of Hardy to appear before 1900 were of Far from the Madding Crowd (Soci. 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" (PG 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 ineptuously approached and overlapped in fault of lighted on. (PG 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" (PG 138) seem particularly relevant to the argument to follow:

The most devout apostle of realism, the sheerest naturalist, cannot escape, any more than the wicked 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 technician at a move. (PG 134)

It will be remembered that Hardy applied the term, "more-truth-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 romanzer as H. Zola in his work on the Roman Experimential, 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 not have been so unceremoniously 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 Fausse de l'Abbe Mouret.

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 Fausse de l'Abbe 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 (13 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 realistic part is frail; he subjudgets us by the old means of romanticism, in creating a synthetic monster, animated with formidable instincts, who leads its own life upon the real—a garden, a hotel, 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; AE 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," particularly as the two novels to be considered most extensively were 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

synthetic 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'Assemblée as "le poème du vin, de l'elégie et des saluariés" and to Nana as "le poème du vice" (Chroniques 2: 313):

Son des romantiques, romantique lui-même dans tous ses progrès, 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 œuvres sont d'ailleurs en désaccord. (Chroniques 2: 314)

**68**

Germaine. Abbé Mouret's Transgression and His Masterpiece

(L'Œuvre), not only reveals much about what David Baguley refers to as Zola's "deep-seated Romantic belief in individual genius" (BF 57), they also suggest how the blending of various modes of representation could constitute "an attack on generic conventions themselves" (BF 33):

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 semi-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. (BF 33)

As the character Sandos 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 veins 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" (AM 183).
On December 1891, Thomas Hardy wrote to H. V. Massingham, then literary editor of the Daily Chronicle, thanking him for his favourable review of Tess of the d'Urbervilles (18 December 1891) and praising the Daily Chronicle for "making literature as important a topic for a newspaper as... 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 Daily 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 Large (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 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):

By the late 1880s and early 90s the situation had changed dramatically. In 1894, to take a single example, George Egerton (Mary Chavelita Dunne) published her second volume of stories, Discords, the follow-up to her earlier volume, Kernotes (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 Mudge, 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 Griesch 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 Mudge's and Smith's officially announced 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 1889–90, 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 Flushbryant 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, 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 “Tristan” 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 ‘Tes’ 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 aim, 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 civilization 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 “Tristan’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 Athenæum (16 June 1877; reprinted in Bagley, Critical Essays on Émile Zola, 30–33), 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” (Bagley 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 bestiality 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-Sadistic horrors” and somewhat playfully re-titled L’Assommoir, Tontonfeu. 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 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 Athenæum, both broadly, though for different reasons, condemning the Poems and Ballads, specifically on charges of “sensuality and immorality, [and] sometimes of paganism and blasphemy” (Ryder 1). The first
The 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 *Ateneum* was contributed by Robert Buchanan, who, in particular, charged Swinburne with being "unclean for the sake of uncleanness" (137), with being "unnatural, insincere, and therefore unpatriotic" both in thought and in style of expression, and who in a later essay entitled "The Flashlight 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 *Visetelly* 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 puellarity, his excessive colouring and his drunkenly 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 delivery, free speech, free thought, ... the right to attack and to defend* (35). In his preface to *The Comite 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 endeavoring 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. And I passed 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 organisation is not always, and not necessarily, 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 Visetelly, and in turn considering the extent and implications of Hardy's involvement on Visetelly'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. Visetelly, 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 Kenst; among those who gave it countenance was W. T. Steed, then ... editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*. The publications of Kenst on *The High Church Confessional*, and those of Steed on *The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon*, would have seemed to indicate that both Kenst and Steed 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 persons and as Zola ... [but], generally speaking, they represented the doctrine of reticence and secrecy as opposed to that of publicity. There 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. (EE 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 indenent pamphlet" that had to be "withdrawn from sale at the street corner" (12 January 1894). Of the other pamphlet referred to by Visetelly, 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 EE 258). 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 Lamberton 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 Visetelly’s conviction in October 1888
and the second Visetelly trial in May 1889, the HVA 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
Visetelly’s conviction. A notice dated 1 January 1889, and
signed Mr. Alex. Coots, 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 331). Coots 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).

Coots’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 Visetelly 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. (339)

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. (342)

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. Now 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. Coots, 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 notion, “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 Visetelly.

Following the debate in the House of Commons, and the
mounting pressure in the public press, Henry Visetelly
issued his Extracts Principally from English Classics,
showing that the moral suppression of M. Zola’s novels would
logically involve the bowdlerizing of some of the greatest
works in English literature. Visetelly’s volume was
prefaced by a letter from Visetelly 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. 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 (FF 271), the anonymous presentation of the
publication suggests a partial attempt on Visetelly’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, Visetelly 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. 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 Latvian Society editions of Zola, published Priapeia or the Erotic epigrams of divers poets on Priapus as translated by "Ourtdoors" (Sir Richard Burton) and introduced by "Neamiskos" (Smithers) under the imprint of the Erotika Bibliion 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'" (E 267), also published by Smithers between 1883 and 1888.

In his introduction to Priapeia, "Neamiskos" (Smithers) notes that some of the epigrams presented and translated into verse and prose "show a degree of pornography difficult to parallel" (a). 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 "Neamiskos" at length:

With a view of making the work an explanatory guide to the erotic dicta of the authors above-mentioned [Calpurnius, 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, trimenol, the castrations, masochism, bestiality, various figures of eroticism (modes and postures of copulation, particularly shot 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, anthropomimes, tribadism of the Roman matrons, the use of phalli, religious prostitution.

...aphrodisiacs, the 'infamous' finger, tabellae or licentious paintings, the Zibula as a procreative oil, the crepe-fine ventris, etc., etc. [p. xi; I am quoting from the 1890 edition of Priapeia published by 'The Translators' at Cosmopolit.' 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 his 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 unnervingly 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 infactual 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).

Visetelly 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, posting "a gigantic national danger" (Becker 352), Visetelly 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 selfless simplicity--of female sex, but passive, inanimate, immobile--was to remain, for the moment, at least outwardly intact, untouched by "Zola’s sassy 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 Visetelly’s situation: a failed attempt to secure the prisoner’s release was followed by further attempts to publicly clear Visetelly’s name of wrongdoing and then, finally, to secure him some relief from the difficult financial situation which awaited him. E. A. Visetelly 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, Havelock Ellis and many others, and submitted to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

One of the more interesting responses to Visetelly’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. Visetelly (Ex 198), 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 diverts the writer from the reader, and this division is further emphasised 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 Visetelly’s trial and imprisonment.

As the Memorial circulated by E. A. Visetelly failed to have the desired effect, Henry Visetelly served his full sentence and was released from prison at the end of August, 1889. Although Visetelly & 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 Visetelly, 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,6 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. Visetelly appeared on the title pages. (13 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),7 written while Visetelly was still in prison, in which Buchanan argues that Zola’s “seal 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 effluvium. 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. (3-4)

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 "aborn 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" (3), 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 Vitetelly's situation. The resulting essay probably says more about the passionate confusion that both

Zola and Vitetelly 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 Vitetelly, but instead provides Buchanan with a forum for defending his own idiocentric 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 Vitetelly's release, to clear his name or to assist his financially having failed, an appeal was then made to the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund to provide monetary assistance. Vitetelly's formal application to the Committee is dated 4 May 1893. The following letter, dated two weeks previously, asks Hardy for his support of the Vitetelly application:

Sir--

As you were kind enough to sign the Memorial to the Home Secretary asking for the release of my father Henry Vitetelly 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 Macclll 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. Vitetelly.

Thomas Hardy Esq.

Although Hardy's reply to Vitetelly'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 Vitetelly's release from prison, and six months after the circulation of the Memorial petitioning for his release, a symposium on "Gaudry 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 Vinetelly's imprisonment. Both Hardy and Linton refer indirectly to Vinetelly's situation—Linton in discussing the circulation of French novels, "of which the translation lends 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 (8-7), 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 the reproductive power she has tried to exert over Art" (10). He then goes on to suggest a need for "specialized 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 NV 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 A'Urbervilles (1891)—Two Late Beloved (Texas) had been rejected by Tiltleton'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 remission of the profounder passions the treatment of which makes the great style, something 'unassailable' 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, or 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. (159-60)

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" (Hillgate 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
Hardy's argument throughout "Candour in English Fiction," like that of Buchan's *In 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 Visetelly *Extracts*, published just over a year before, where the comparison between the old dramatics of Visetelly'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 balmy 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—*Candidus*, *Aeschammon* 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 *Julie the Obscure* as examples of Sue's more liberal reading—"Templier, Catilina, Martial, Juvenal, Lucian, Beaumont and Fletcher, Boccacio, Scarron, De Brantome, Sterne, De Foe, Smollett, Fielding, Shakespeare, the Bible" (182)—corresponds much more closely with the Visetelly 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, Visetelly was planning a "sumptuous" edition of *The Decameron* in 1887 (£2.5) which was never issued, and shortly after the first Visetelly trial (1888) the NVA issued a court summons against a London bookseller for selling a translation of Boccacio's work (£2.5). Chart a Windus, who would begin to publish Zola in 1892, followed by destroying their stocks of both Boccacio and Rabelais in 1889 (in *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 Visetelly 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 *Getrel 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, inextricably worked to exclude
sexuality from the public eye, reconstructing human reality
in the shape of an immanent object—a strangely passive and
somewhat perverse being—a theoretical construction of
stable simplicity.

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, much of which has been gained through the
reading of a selection of 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* (1885), 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 *FY* 118-25) 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” (*FY* 112-3; *AM*
1: xxii), and that of reading for “intellectual or moral
profit” (*FY* 112; *AM* 1: xxiii). 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” (*AM* 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
(1878)—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 have been taken largely
from local historical reports, intended to help “establish
the fictional Casterbridge as a densely and concretely
realised 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 Dorreefield horse,
providing the motivation for Tess’s first visit to her
d’Urberville “cousin”:

rack sight—shaft of wagon 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” (*AM* 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 (1886) 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 (Visetally, 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" (AD 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, 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 crested of fantastic heavenly
capitations, of long earthy evanesces, of
fertilizing showers of pollen falling into the
polytropous 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
creased, perhaps unconscious, a prodigious Hindu
poem, singing the glories of the flash, entailing,
into 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 procession revealed to man and woman the
forbidden fruit of love, its suffocating spasm, its
instinctive carcasses, 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 Las Artes, 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 Sliners 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 abbe 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, Renoir, Paris trilogy (1894-8). Yet, while all of
Zola's novels contain elements of poetic description, le
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 Magley calls "the fall into the
anonymous, indiscriminate, formless, depersonalised
biological state" (PP 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 323).
Lennarc 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” (L 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* and Tess of the d’Urbervilles. Like Tabocheys Dalry, Le Paradou is a place of pastoral innocence and natural emotions spilled 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 Sarge, 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 demonization 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 flash to the spirit’ (Tess, ch. 36: p. 313). Although Sarge 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 Sarge 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) (AR 2: 371)

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 Arcads, 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 Sarge has been taken to recover from a feverish illness. Sarge’s initiation into the garden, guided by Albine, the uncultivated, “natural” girl 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 Sarge’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 Sarge’s still-delicately 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 amased 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 leaves of wine, black and bleeding, bathed 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 exhale it with the even breathing of slumbering flowers . . . . (138-9)

On their next visit to the garden, Albine leads Sarge 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, grinned over with their lustrous fruit. Hedgerows of raspberry crows shot up like wild brambles, while the ground was quite carpeted with strawberry plants teeming with ripe berries which exhalled a slight odour of vanilla. (161)

At one point, Albine offers Sarge some strawberries, saying that she will have them so that both will taste each berry. Sarge 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 Sarge with a seemingly endless but ever-changing and engaging variety of colours and smells. The dominance of the “flush-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 Sarge 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 Sarge, 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 escorces 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 chanced 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 stopped; 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."

"Ronseno!" 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'Urberville 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 seemed 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. (15)

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.

"No 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."

"No, no," he said gently. "If you were to slip, we should both of us get a famous wetting. You don't know how treacherous these 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 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-toe to a distance of some fifty yards. This would have been no serious hindrance on a week-day; they would have climbed through it in their high pattens and boots quite unconcerned; but on this day of vacancy ... on this occasion for wearing their white stockings and thin shoes, and their pink, white, and lilac gowns, on which every mud-splot 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 sound the head 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 climb along the bank, perhaps—" I can climb better than you. 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. (203)

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 Willsgate has suggested that Hardy “was extraordinarily sensitive to colours” (1: 285), 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 Venteur de Paris (1873) refers to “le langage d’une cache rouge mise à côté d’une cache grise” (II: 734), emphasizing the idea of a

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 uncovering 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].


He looked up, and perceived two life-sized portraits on panels built into the masonry . . .

“Those portraits are those!” asked Clare of the chambermaid.

“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 haridans 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 her 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 you; 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.' (298)

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 ... . . . (192)

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 road impressed them with a feeling of isolation, as if they were Adam and Eve. (185)

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. Visetosly writes in his introduction to the Chatto & Windus edition of Abbé Mouret, "Albine, if more or less unreal, a phantom, 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 Séraphine’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 Séraphine 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, Séraphine 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:

(112) and amongst “the colossal bronze-green nestles, 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-algae, and rubbing off upon her naked arms sticky slight which, though snow-white on the apple-tree-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” (255):

Her arm, from her dabling 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 sheer of susceptibilities that her pulse was accelerated by the touch, her blood driven to her finger-ends and the cool arms flushed hot. (255)

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 Séraphine 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. Séraphine, at first, forshakes 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, Séraphine 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 rooks of our passions . . . . Everything is stained by this defect. Everywhere its universal stain 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 growth of shame.’ (111-12)

Séraphine’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" (110). 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" (183-4).

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 new 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; 335). 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 wanted 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!" (312) may be momentarily comforting, but his practical ignorance greatly hinders the chances of their escape:

With an instinct as to possibilities he did not know, as he had intended, make for the first station beyond the town, but plunged still further under the firm . . . 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 wash it evening find lodgings somewhere or other—in a lonely cottage perhaps . . .

Upon the whole it seemed a good thing to do. Therefore 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 actual escape, disguise, or long concealment. Their every idea was temporary and unforeseen, like the plans of two children. (325-6)

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 village'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 Soror, 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. Finlon notes:

Darwinian thought filled Hardy with a sense of Nature's 'passioned plans for bloom and beauty marred' ([5], 'Discouragement', 1893-7), 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. (135)

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 Morn' (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" (AG 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, fitness 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" (AG 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 called upon its ways—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 disquiet.

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 uplifted in 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 sweated to make the animals, the very bees and butterflies, drowsy. (241)

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

Histortium, bare and green of skin, gaped their mouths of rusty gold, ... scarlet-runners, tough as whip-cord, lit up scattered spots with the glow of their gleaming sparks; bind-weeds expanded their heart-shaped leaves and with their thousand of little balls rang a silent peal of exquisite colours ... wood-ruffs, with their soft husky perfume; brazen-chested milleauus, bloated with bright version; lofty phloxes; crimson ones and white ones, shooting up their disaffairs of flowers for the breeze to spin ... flax and gillyflowers buried beneath their choking foliage their writhing starry flowers, that already reeked of putrefaction. (AG 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—indeed whose red and yellow and purple hues formed a polychromie as dazzling as that of cultivated flowers ... The rank-smelling weed-flowers gloomed as if they would not close, for incessance, and the waves of colour mixed with the waves of sound. (AG 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. (AG 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, "wore wood with its bitter penetrating smell; dew that reeked like putrid flesh; and the hot valerian, all Clove with its aphrodisiacal exudations" (AM 188); "Aid of the oozy freshness and warm ferment of the Var Vale," writes Hardy, "at the season when the rush of juices could almost be heard below the hiss of fertilization ... " (TH 210). Hardy's natural world, like Zola's, is the Edenic garden intensified, made brilliant with "a hum of vivifying warmth" (AM 24), "patches of rank herbage" (AM 25), "damp and rank with juicy grass" (TH 173) and the "odour of a newly mown meadow" (AM 107). Outside the garden, pheasants are slaughtered, "their rich plumage dabbled with blood" (TH 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. As the Visually edition of Abbé Mouret was not published until October 1886—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" (WH 306) and, more particularly, in the "various monstrosities of vegetation" (WH 54)—the fungi, and the sweat and stains ofруди 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" (WH 267), where the "vegetation was heavy nightly with globes of dew" (WH 277), and where the tangles of ivy "were pushing in with such force at the [cottage] walls as to lift from their supports the shelves that were fixed there" (WH 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" 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" (WH 289). And though the villagers of Les Artaud, "laissery 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" (WH 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 bosomed, now encrusted, with scarlet and golden fruit" (AM 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 realisation 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" (WM 54), the "huge lobes of fungi ... like lungs" (WM 53), the "stout yellow fungi like lemons and apricots" (WM 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" (WM 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" (WM 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 'Pizazz' 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" (30 386) 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 nadir"; according to Mitterand, *"La Bête humaine" may stand as an emblem of novelistic production, a marriage between systematization and irrationality* ('Naturalism in the European Novel', 79).
Zola's determining system, his controlling sense of internal and external order—premise, method, illustration, axiography—is always less important (and less impressive) than the sense of the uncontrolled—or 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, commencing 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, etc., 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

Later, in a letter to F. A. Hedgecock, 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 plus que d'une influence. (28 July 1909; printed in Hedgecock 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 Hedgecock's enquiry a few days earlier (25 July 1909), it seems evident from the content 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. 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 1881 (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. (107)

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 pike-killing scene; even so, the differences between the two writers greatly outweigh the similarities. (20)

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 uncorrected 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 Abd el 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 Montalere 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 Abd el 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. Desidee, 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. Desidee, 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" (10 76)—Desidee 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 Arabella¹—Desidee'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 Desidee's instance, is hardly an accidental image—and importantly Serge is as afraid of his sister's sexuality as Jude is, ultimately, of Arabella¹. 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 Abd el 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 symbolism⁵—is closely associated with sexuality in either instance, then, arguably, to be awakened from a dream (20 42) by being smacked in the ear with "the characteristic part of a bawdy-pig" (41), with that portion of pig's flesh from "below the bladder,"⁶ is sure 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 herself 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 chemic 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 Brûlè, 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 Brûlè, alors, planta tout le paquet au bout de son bâton; et, le portant en l’air, le prit en main ainsi qu’un drapier, elle se lança sur le noyau, suivie de la débandade hurlante des femmes. Des gouttes de sang pleuvraient, cette chair lamentable pendait, comme un déchert 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 scattered 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 Victorian edition of Germinal (1885), which Hardy read about the same time as Abbe 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 Victorian translation, particularly as this scene has always been much discussed. In any case, La Brûle’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 wreak upon him.  
They roared round his corpse, sniffling like wolves. They were all seeking some outrage, some ferocious act which should give them satisfaction. Suddenly the Scorched-One’s (La Brûlè’s) shrill voice was heard:  
‘Cut his like a tom cat!’  
‘Yes, yes! like a tom cat! like a tom cat!’  
He deserves it, the swine!’  
La Rouquette was already tearing off his clothes, while La Levasseur 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 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 Brûlè is missing from the text of the Victorian 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 Brûlè 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 Brûlè’s extreme ferocity and to Désirée’s unsocialized desire. Abruptly, momentarily, ritual—the slaughter, the symbol of the phallos—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 Bagley calls the
"poetics of decomposition of naturalist texts" (Mac 201)—although, particularly in La Peau de l’abbé Mouret, Zola’s poetry 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-odied 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 those giant arches, and the ground beneath was hard as stones 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), Le Pére Goriot (1872), and particularly in La Vénus de Paris (1873), the image of rotting vegetation becomes an almost obsessive motif. Indeed, in La Vénus de Paris, set in les Halles, the central Parisian market, the idea of rotting vegetable matter, of market-stall pealings 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 cobs or cabbage lettuces often heard a suffused 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 scodors 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 ineffacable spot, deep down somewhere in his being, which might one day grow larger and cover him with mud” (AW 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 wholesome 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” (AW 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” (THUR 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?

Juda'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 cruelly 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 an 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 his hist! 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 of 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 room.' She hesitatingly remarked.

'How?'

'There is going to be another baby. 'What? The boy jumped up wildly. 'O God, mother, you never a-said for another; and such trouble with what you've got!''

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
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 foot-warmer, and of whose only a foot and a hand had afterwards been found; but for his own part he had bolder views had 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. Visetelly 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 incidents 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 marked, 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" (Gen 29), 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 mist, "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 phallos. 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 characterised the reception of *La Terre* (1887) the previous year, and the only one of the Chaton & Vindus volumes not to be translated by E. A. Visetelly, 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* 139 [January 1896]: 153-49; reprinted in *Cow* 356-62). 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 Warden 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 alternative pill" (PV 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.

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 posterous abroad, of early date and of late, from the Friend and eloquent 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 seated in their surplises... 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 Tim, 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—is 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-1'Église—provides not only the historical ideal, the dream of scholarship or sainthood, but also, importantly, the present occasion: the role of the stonemason (Jude), or the illuminator of church texts (Sue), the ecclesiastical embroider (Angelique) or the painter of church windows (Felician, 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 vivid portrayals of female sexuality. That Hardy's complex portrait of Sue is problematical 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 themes" (179). 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" (K, 35), --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" (182).

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 fiancés" (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 "unfilling 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-visionsary 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-renunciation 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.' (433-5)

Following their final failed attempt to legalize their union, not long before the suicide of Little Father Tim, 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 Legend seen, 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:
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 vitriol; the other emasculated more and more by Puritanism and since the French Revolution, guided to tame 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 Baltaz, Flaubert and Zola.

Foreign masterpieces such as *Les Contes Éroïques* and *L'Événement* were destroyed in London as obscene by a magistrate's order; even the Bible and Shakespeare were expurgated and all books dotted up to the grim decorum of the English Sunday-school. (My Life and Loves 2)

From Maggie Tulliver's "Fetish" to Frank Harris's varied fetishes, 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" (FM 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...
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. Z. Colburn, Zola in England, 1882-1902: 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 Visetelly & Co. translation (The Assommoir) and the Chatto & Windus translation (The Dram Shop).

Cercle du Livre Précieux (1907):

Les dames, quand elles ouvrent le nez sur la peinture, poussèrent de petits cris; puis, elles se détournerent, très rouge. Les hommes les retinrent, rigolant, cherchant les détails obscurs.

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

Lutetian Society (translated by Arthur Symons, 1894, in the Beni 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 puking ship! And look at that one! oh, look at that one! Well, they are a nice set here!" (79).

Visetelly & 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 till then, 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 uttering the dandelions; and that one—oh! that one. Ah, well! they’re a nice clean lot, they are!" (79).

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

At sight of it the ladies uttered faint cries, then turned away their heads, while the men indulged in coarse jokes (77).

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, pieds nus. Elle regarda son père roulé dans son voisinage; 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 vicieux, 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 vest; 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).
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 Vizetelly 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 Hans and an 1886 copy of Abbe Vogler's Travels (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-nums of Zola's Nana, Nana's Daughter by Alfred Sirven and Henri Levey—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, Dostoevsky, 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 R. C. Grenville-Hurray—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" (Paul Wallis, 26 March 1889). 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 Francois Valentin, A New Lease of Life: 
& Saving a Daughter's Honour. n.d.
---. The Notary's Nose and other stories. 1882.
---. The Three-Cornered Hat. n.d.
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.
Bolivin, Emile. Rubaisi illustrated (ten etchings). 1887.
---. A Love Crime. 1888.
Bouvier, Alexis. Bewitching Issa, etc. 1888.
---. The Convict's Marriage. 1888.
---. A Dead Man's Wife, &c. The Women with Red Hair. 1887.
---. A Wily Widow. 1889.
Burndom, F. C., M. Savile Clarke, R. E. Franscillo, 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.
Capital Stories. 1888, etc.
Cassilis, Isa. Between Midnight and Dawn. n.d.
Cherbulies, Charles Victor. Blue-Peter Nate Boldenish, and a Frolic Diplomatique. 1881.
---. The Low-Born Lover's Revenge. 1881.
---. Samuel Brohl and Partner. 1880.
---. The Trials of Jatta Mateoures (Noirs de Rouge). n.d.
His Child Friend. By the author of 'The Chevelay Novels' (i.e. Valentine Durrant). 1886.
Claretie, Jules. For Jacques' Sake. 1888.
---. Prince Ethel. 1887.
Claude, Chief de la Police de Sibeth. Memoirs of Monsieur Valde, Chief of Police under the Second Empire. 1887.
Corkran, Henriette. The Black Cross Mystery. 1886.
The Cream of the Diarists and Memoir Writers. 3 vols. 1890-1.
---. Crime and Punishment. n.d.
---. The Friend of the Family, & The Gambler. n.d.
---. The Idiot. n.d.
---. Injury and Inquest. n.d.
---. The Unce's Dream, & The Permanent Husband. n.d.
Droz, Gustave. Mama, Papa and Baby. 1887.
Dostoevsky, Fedor. The Brothers Karamazov. n.d.
---. Crime and Punishment. n.d.
---. The Friend of the Family, & The Gambler. n.d.
---. The Idiot. n.d.
---. Injury and Inquest. n.d.
---. The Unce's Dream, & The Permanent Husband. n.d.
Dumas, Alexandre. The Fidler among the Bandits. n.d.
Dusejour, Diamis. The Origin of the Grecians. 1889.
Ecalaw, Arly. Roland: or, The Epitaph of Sin. n.d.
Fenton, E. Dyne. Military Men as they were. n.d.
Feuillet, Octave. A Woman's Diary, & The Little Countess. n.d.
Daudet, Alphonse. From the Younger and older the Elder. 1880.
---. Sara Bouquet: or, Joy abroad and grief at home. 1884.
---. The Peculiar Adventures of Tarascon. 1887.
---. Sappho. 1886.
Dorat, Claude Joseph. The Kisses . . . preceded by the North of Var. 1889.
Doscolevsky, Fedor. The Brothers Karamazov. n.d.
---. Crime and Punishment. n.d.
---. The Friend of the Family, & The Gambler. n.d.
---. The Idiot. n.d.
---. Injury and Inquest. n.d.
---. The Unce's Dream, & The Permanent Husband. n.d.
Dumas, Alexander. The Fidler among the Bandits. n.d.
Dusejour, Diamis. The Origin of the Grecians. 1889.
Ecalaw, Arly. Roland: or, The Epitaph of Sin. n.d.
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.


Fleming, Leopold. *Illustrations to the Odyssey, the Iliad and the Aeneid*. 1886.


---. *Salammbo*. 1866.


---. *Mademoiselle de Maupin*. 1887.

Goldsmith, Howard J. *Raven’s Legacy; a story told to a portrait*. 1888.


---. *Bande Maquere*. 1888.


Jenkins, John. *Ben changes the motto; a sequel to “The blot on the Queen’s Head”*. 1886.


---. *So English; a transatlantic sketch*. 1888.

Knight, E. F. *The Threatening Evo*. n.d.


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

Lovelace, Felice. *In the Change of Years*. n.d.


"Louis". *The Red Cross, and other stories*. 1886.


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


---. *Thirteen Thousand*. 1885.


---. *The Monk’s Revenge*. n.d.

Greenwood, James. *In Strange Company; being the experiences of a Social Correspondent*. 1886.


---. *High Life in France under the Republic; social and satirical sketches in Paris and the Provinces*. 1886.

---. *Imprisoned in a Spanish Convent; an English girl’s experiences, with other narratives and tales*. 1886.

---. *Vilts. 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.


---. *The Virgin Widow*. 1887.


Mariné, P. *Collana, a Carpen*. n.d.


Moore, George. *A Dream in Dublin*. n.d.

---. *Literature at Night, or, Circulating Mores*. 1885.

---. *A Modern Lover*. 1885.

---. *A Nunner’s Wife*. 1885.


---. *Countess Sarah*. n.d.
--- *The Ironmaster; or, Love and Pride*. n.d.
--- *Prince George Pavine*. n.d.
--- *Prayer to the Saints; or, the third Golden Legend*. 1881?1?
--- *Pater Poems; humorous and serious for readings or recitations*. etc., 1883.
--- *People who have made a Noise in the World*. 1890, etc.
--- *Payne, Charles G.* *Matrimonial Advertisement*. n.d.
--- *Poesy of Singsing*. n.d.
--- *Vote for Parliament*. n.d.
--- *Pinlico, Lord (pseud.)*. *The Excellent Mystery*. A matrimonial satire. 1888.
--- *Mr. Butler’s Ward*. n.d.
--- *Sala, George Augustus*. *America revisited*. 1882.
--- *Colonel Guage’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 teen South*. 1885.
--- *Paris Herself Again in 1876-9*. 1887.
--- *Under the Sun: essays mainly written in her countries*. 1884.
--- *The Seaside Library*. Parts 1 and 2. 1887.
--- *Secondat, Charles Louis de [Berger de Montesquieu]. The Temple of Gnosis: followed by Caspian and Cypria, and Araxes and Jeropas*. 1889.
--- *Sirree, James*. *Saved by a Smile*. 1886.
--- *The Social Zoo: satirical, social, and humorous sketches by the best writers*. n.d.
--- *Society Novelties*. By F. C. Burnand, H. C. Clark, etc. 2 vols. 1893.
--- *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 Mogharry Diamond*. n.d.
--- *A Shabby Gentleman*. n.d.
--- *Theuriet, A.* *The Godson of a Marquis*. n.d.
--- *Waggers Junior*. n.d.
--- *The Marchioness’s Team*. n.d.
--- *Twilight Life of*. 1886.
--- *The Ladies’ Paradise*. 1886.
--- *A Love Episode*. 1887.
--- *Madeleine Férat*. 1888.
--- *Man*. 1884.
--- *Pipeing Nots*. 1885.
--- *The Rush for the Spoil*. 1886.
--- *The Soil*. 1888.
--- *Thérèse Riquet*. 1887.
APPENDIX C:
Excerpts from Hardy's Notebooks

The following extracts from Zola’s *Abbé Mouret’s Transgression*, *Terminal*, and *La Terra* have been reproduced from Hardy’s *1867* Notebook (E 2; 473-5) and his Literary Notebook I (E 1: 208). It should be stated that while the *1867* Notebook bears the date “1867” on its front fly-leaf as its only heading (E 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, a 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 Arts Background, 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...  
6. The hamlet was not dead enough: the thatched roofs bulged like bosoms; through the gaping cracks in the doors came sighs, faint cracks, a hum of living silence.  
7. Her laughter... resounded from every crevice of his flesh.  
8. The very by-paths treatrusted their presence from afar... a tide of impassioned motion stirred the garden to its depths... the old flower-garden escorted them.  
9. The whole parturient was a riotous mob... where intoxicated nature had hicups of verdure & pinks.  
10. No beetle 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 mud—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 weevils.  
12. 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. Hearer... all the piddles in the valley seemed animated with a throbbing life.  

From *Terminal*:
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 infinitum.  
17. [Exemp... of mere-truth-thing-]- A warm odour of women arose from the trodden grass: the loud sound of the men’s voices was deepened 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 sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  
19. Etienne was alone with La Maheude in the room downstairs... Crouching over the miserable fire she was sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  
20. Estelle was alone with La Maheude in the room downstairs... Crouching over the miserable fire she was sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  
21. Crouching over the miserable fire she was sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  
22. Estelle was alone with La Maheude in the room downstairs... Crouching over the miserable fire she was sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  
23. Crouching over the miserable fire she was sucking Estelle. ‘Is it good news?’ she asked. ‘Are they going to send us money?’ Ette, shook his head...  

From *La Terra*:
23. ‘C’était une vaste alliance d’er, un de ces biens de grosse joliesse commune, al usage, que les guildeheure en avoaient presque disparu. On sentait que la main où elle s’endiolait ainsi, ne reculait devant aucune bourgeoisie à toutes saisons.  
24. toujours active, dans les fêtes de laver, dans les fêtes à repaire, frappant, estudiant, sourchonant, se fourrant partout. Et elle racontait tant de choses, cette baguette, elle avait laissé de son ou 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 petition, showing E. A. Vizetelly’s notes and revisions, are now held in the J. Harry 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 responses 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 *Smile Zola, Souvenir and Reform* (287-8).

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 misdemeanour 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 Émile Zola and other French authors.

3. That, on a previous occasion, in October, 1888, the said Henry Visetosely, on being indicted for publishing translations of three novels by M. Émile 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 form might appear to be objectionable as the three translations were, he withdrew numerous books from circulation, and, being himself, in extremely delicate health, unable to give any attention to his business, instructed one of his sons, M. Ernest Visette, to examine the works thus 'withdrawn, and to expunge from them all such objectionable matter as he might find therein contained. That the said Ernest Visette 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 Visetosely 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 Visetosely 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 Visetosely'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 in question, on account of which the said Henry Visetosely was prosecuted. That while many English literary men, including some of your memorialists, view the expurgated 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 Visetosely is now over seventy years of age, and suffers from a serious mental complaint which largely affects his general health, and which on his arrival at Holloway necessitated his immediate transfer to the St. Albans Sanatorium. That 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 Visetosely 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 were 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 Abolition of the Newspaper Stamp—reforms which were 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.

9. That, at a later period, he became a Paris representative of The Illustrated London News—when he repeatedly visited the field of action in the newspapers of France, and greatly contributed to English literature—works which are admitted to be the standard books of reference upon the subject of the events of his time. 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. Moreover, he has now and again expressed the desire that the payment of the unextracted recognitions should not be insisted upon, that you should be pleased to advise Her Majesty to remit the unextracted portion of the said Henry Visetosely's sentence and grant him a full pardon.

10. That, as an author, the said Henry Visetosely has contributed to the English historical and descriptive literature, 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. That he is a person of feeble health, affected with serious disease, and that he is now over seventy years of age. That the said Henry Visetosely has contributed to the English historical and descriptive literature, 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. That he is a person of feeble health, affected with serious disease, and that he is now over seventy years of age.

11. That as a publisher he has greatly helped to popularise the poems of Longfellow and 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 fine writings by foreign authors and other publishers in the country. For instance, his catalogue comprises works by O'Connell, Vatteville, Bostock, 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 has the honor to publish in England. Moreover, it is, in a large measure, to his enterprise that the public owes the 'Vermeil Series of Old Dramatists'—a series which has placed within the reach of the student of modern drama 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 Visetosely 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 Visetosely for many years and can speak highly of his moral character. From a financial point of view his business was seriously impaired by 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 bountiful in his own recognizances in sums of £200, and at the trial last May it was ordered that those recognizances should be estranged. Inasmuch, however, as the said Henry Visetosely 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
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. 2565, document 6). The appeal was penned by George Augustus Sala:

The undersigned venture to draw the attention of the Committee to 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 'Victorian Times' which numbered on its staff W. W. 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 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 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 Brooke M.D.).
'Christmas with the Poets.' 1857[17].
'The Chinese Revolution.' 1853.
'Berlin under the New Empire.' 2 vols. 1879.

here, on May 9th: homeless and practically penniless at 65 years of age.

Friends applied to the Working Ladies' Guild on my behalf, and the Guild has granted me 100 for the year.

The General Council for the Assistance of the British Repatriated from Russia will be prepared to make me an allowance of 50 a week, when I leave my residence in Kent, 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 fail off all allowances will cease. This is how I stand at present: the only guaranteed help I have to rely on is 100 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
Ann Vizetelly
The Secretary
Royal Literary Fund
Stationers' Hall
Stationers' Hall Court
E. C. 4.

A note attached to the above letter dated 11 July 1920 regrets 'I am 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 1984 lists Ann Vizetelly's date of death as 11 April 1920, but this is obviously incorrect as she was still alive in July of that year. Presumably she died shortly after.

'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.
'A History of Champage.' 1883.
'Count Königsmark and Tom of Ten Thousand.' 1890.

Vizetelly was awarded £55 following his application of 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. 1261, document no. 25) in 1910 from Annie Vizetelly is included here as a final note on the Vizetelly family:

Annie Vizetelly
4/6 Mrs. Henry Knight
The Rectory/ Wimborne/Kent
July 8th 1910

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 pleaded 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
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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 98-103.
2. Moore's pamphlet on Literature at Burgh (Vizetelly, 1885) will be discussed in detail in a later point but, briefly, his argument focuses on the circulating libraries as the main culprit in restricting the scope of the novel throughout the period.

History and Hardy: Reading Zola in Context
1. Hardy's copy of the Hedgecock book (signed "F. A. Hedgecock, 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 Hedgecock on 22 June, 24 June, 2 July, 9 July and 12 July 1922.
5. American translations of Madame Bovary, Le Fort de l'Aube, Le Ventre de Paris, La Comedie de Plaisance, La
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—by Rhoda Broughton and Sarah Grand, for example—the two most appropriate, particularly as far as Hardy was familiar with her work—W. C. T. of Florence Nightingale, with whom she was in close contact after the publication of Egerton’s Exquisites, might be mentioned—hardly get much notice, particularly in this essay, in which the emphasis is not so much on the political aspects of the novels as on their psychological and social implications. Hardy’s initial suggestion of the need for a psychological study of the work of the early Victorian novelists is not so much a commentary on the work of these writers as a commentary on the political and social milieu of the time.

2. For a bibliography of the work of these writers, see W. C. T. Cole and others, English Literature in the Nineteenth Century (London: Macmillan, 1891).
first half-dozen best novels the world has ever produced if a consensus of literary opinion is taken to be the test.

Under the circumstances, it would seem that the work relating to what may be called literary activity needs an amendment. At the present moment anyone can commence a prosecution against a publisher. The way is, therefore, open to the gratification of unscrupulous solicitors in search of work which may in venal prosecutions. It is true 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 Vicsetelly.

Although Madame Bovary had originally been included in the list of works named in the 1885 summary of Vicsetelly, following some objections in the press regarding the prosecution of Flaubert, Madame Bovary was removed from the list after the approval of the great [W. T.] Stead of the 'Herald Tribune.' The summons respecting that novel has not been served, and apart from having an unenforced sine die . . . . . . . The same course was taken with the summonees for L'Assommoir, "Germinal," and 'The Fortune of the Rougons' (at 286 and 286n).

11. Vicsetelly's Excerpts includes passages from Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, Sterne, D'oeuf, Smollet and Fielding. He also included an entire folio volume of 'The Decameron' and Brantome's 'Pens Galantes,' etc. Smichers published a translation of Catinus in 1894, and the writings of Martial, Juvenal and Lucan figure extensively in the notes and accompanying essays to Smichers' 'Pensees' (1888).

Text and Context: Colour, Texture, Symbol and Sexuality in 'Loll' and 'The Wanderers.'

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 London." As Michael Kiligate has suggested, the main purpose of the "Facts" notebook "was to record material which might prove useful in the writing of future stories or poems" (Kiligate 1: 248). As an interesting aside, below the descriptive heading on the first page appears the pencilled expression: "deasured uncured." Although Hardy's instruction was later erased, it is still clearly visible on the first page. Ironically, an extract page 19 of the same notebook, dated 23-11-83, reads: "Pencils marks, when apparently erased, will alter the face of a page permanently." 2. See Zola's letter to Huysmans (20 May 1884) and accompanying notes regarding his reading of A Rebours in Correspondence: 107-107, and Huysman's response, in Lettres inédites à Émile Zola 102-103. Hardy himself recorded an extract from an 1898 copy of Huysman's La Cathédrale (p. 227) and adds an interesting note to a suggestion in a review by Edward Dowden in the Fortnightly Review (November 1893). Dowden writes, "the possibility of a 'spiritual naturalism' has been conceived by N. Huysmans," to which Hardy adds, "'spiritual naturalism' merely defines my own old idea of the principle of novels of the future." (at 24: 48). In another of his post-"Juda" anti-Zola statements, Hardy writes to Florence Hemlock: "you mistake in supposing that I admire Zola. It is just what I don't do. I think of this as a sort of 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)."
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 prosaic to the modern reader, particularly as Tess and Albine show a degree of naturalness well beyond their years, especially as their individual stories develop. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Zola, in particular, goes to great lengths to stress the individual innocence of both Sarge and Albine throughout theгардариуг section of his novel, particularly emphasizing Sarge's child-like state throughout the duration of his conviviality. 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'" (11: 285-6). J. B. Bulen, in *The Expressive Eye* (1986), suggests that Hardy's "vocabulary of over two hundred colours words is evidence of his precision, keen, and discriminating verbal palette" (7-8). Also worth reading in this context is Bulen's column on "Impression and Modernism" in *The Expressive Eye* (169-90). In "Colour and Movement in Hardy's Tess of the d'Urbervilles" in *Critical Quarterly* 10 (1968): 219-36, Tony Tanner writes: "For a 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 spits it, she loses it. Watching Tess's life we begin to see that her destiny is nothing more 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, "Tage et symphonie: île de corse ouvre de Zola" (* Cahiers Naturalistes* 39 (1976): 26-41).

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 first French translation (1837) in particular. The heavily symbolic colour scheme in that work, with its hellish reds and blacks alternating and more or less the same color. As already mentioned, the occasional rays of golden light, is perhaps more closely related to Zola's *Verolle*. To either of the novels being discussed here (as would be expected by the related subject of those two works). Nevertheless, certain of Zola's symbols, suggesting the violent upheaval of chaotic forces, is one of a number of interesting points of comparison to Hardy, most obviously in relation to the writing of *The Dynasts*.

7. Interestingly enough, in his 1879 film of *Tess*, Roman Polanski—with whom the author is unfamiliar with Zola's novel—adapts his script to include scenes where the erotic scene of Tess and Angel through the fields in the early morning mist; Angel in a tree throwing the beautiful flowers to Tess, who catches them in her skirt. Of course, the obvious point here is that this is a setting which Hardy might not see 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 symbols.


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

1. All references are to the first edition of *Jude the Obscure* (London: Macmillan, 1895). Hardy made some allusions to *Le Post* for the 1895 new edition, which was the text most often reprinted in subsequent editions. In *The New Review* (1987), Barbagli writes: "Jude the Obscure" (Stemmler, 1892)" (Penguin Critical Studies, 1992) 52-7.


3. More recently, David Baguley has made a number of brief but intriguing ideas concerning both Tess and Jude as naturalist texts. However, Baguley's argument is really very different from that being presented here. See Baguley, *Naturalist Fiction* (1990). The "humanism" of *The Nature of Naturalism* in the *European Novel* (1992) 13-26.

4. It could well have been her reading of this particular scene,—of Desire and the malevolent pig—along with similar scenes in *La Montesquiou* and *La Terre*, that prompted Florence Hemmick to suggest to Hardy that Zola might be a good candidate to write a book on antisemitism (see page 18 above).

5. A curious example of the pig as a symbol of "human animality" or "natural isolation" is found in Paul Lieum's illustrations to Ambroise THIBAUX's *Le Fisis de la nature* (1881). A contemporary glossary to certain aspects of naturalist idiom. Lieum's illustration to the title page of the Glossary shows a female pig giving suck to a crown of (evergreen male) human figures. Another illustration on page 109 shows a male pig with a large amputated in a dinner suit—evidently possessing an obscene appetite at table and otherwise.

6. I am quoting this in this instance from the manuscript of *Jude the Obscure* (held in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, but not available at the time of this writing). The "human flavoured" description does not appear in either the 1896 first edition or in the later Wessex edition.


8. Another note from Germania follow directly after those from "la Cante" in his "1882" notebook (12: 2: 474-5). See Appendix C.

9. A scene in which 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's life ERSTLING and coop. Lych's *Blue Velvet* (1986), where the camera first

10. One is reminded of the opening scenes from David Lynch's *Blue Velvet* (1986), where the camera first

11. As Hardy is not known to have read *Le Chanteur de Paris* in any form, and having made no effort to see the film, it is unlikely that he was influenced by it. In *The New Review* (1987), Barbagli writes: "Jude the Obscure" (Stemmler, 1892)" (Penguin Critical Studies, 1992) 52-7.

12. It will be remembered that Hardy's copy of *Le Docteur Pascal* (Charpentier, 1892) bears no obvious sign of having been read by Hardy. My intention, then, is to discuss the incident involving Antoine Maquiart to not draw a direct analogy between Zola's 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. W. Viscott's translation of *Le Docteur Pascal* (Chatto & Windus, 1893).

13. Writing to Zola after the publication of *Le Docteur Pascal*, Jacques van San Frenkoff, a Dutch critic, directed Zola's attention to the scene of *Black House*, as well as to a similar scene in *Le Chanteur de Paris* (1834). Zola responded that he had neither read nor had knowledge of the matter in hand. "Voray trouvaille me stupefie. Mais je sais que des livres de médecine relatent plusieurs de ces cas si curieux et je m'aperçois de la combustion totale" (20 July 1893). For an interesting discussion of Zola's scene in *Le Docteur Pascal* see Michel Reutier. "Au feu des pages" (*Les Cahiers naturalistes* 24 (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 Price, in Thomas Hardy (Boulenger & login Paul, 1977) provides an interesting discussion of Jude's changing point of view in the manuscript (82-9), noting that in the passage where Jude first observes Christminster on the horizon, "dream" is a significant and recurring word (83).

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 297). Arabella, according to Mrs. Oliphant, is a “human pig,” a “fleshly animal” (Cox 255).

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 literai 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.
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