UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

LEISURE AND CONVERSATION IN THE FIN DE SIÈCLE NOVEL

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

HEIDI MAE-MARIE SILCOX
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

LEISURE AND CONVERSATION IN THE FIN DE SIÈCLE NOVEL

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

_____
Dr. Daniel Cottom, Chair

_____
Dr. Ronald Schleifer

_____
Dr. William Henry McDonald

_____
Dr. Francesca Sawaya

_____
Dr. Judith S. Lewis

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my patient and loving husband, Mark Silcox.

Acknowledgements

I have had the great fortune of studying under Dr. Daniel Cottom, Dr. Francesca Sawaya, Dr. Ronald Schleifer, Dr. Henry McDonald, and Dr. Judith Lewis, with whom I have had the best conversations over my years as a graduate student. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Cottom for his insights, extensive knowledge, and patience. I would also like to acknowledge Mark Silcox for his unfailing support and for helping me articulate and hone my ideas. Additionally, my friends in the UCO Philosophy department have always been supportive and ready for a good talk. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Eva Dadlez, Dr. Sarah Woolwine, and Dr. Mary Brodnax for organizing writing groups and engaging with me about my work. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the online gaming community and my many friends who have been instrumental in helping me understand the relationship between social life and game play.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This project examines images of leisure in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, *The Golden Bowl*, and *Howards End*. These novels, all of which are set in Britain, depict the rapidly changing post-industrial social landscape at the turn of the nineteenth century. This era saw the rise of middle-class power and promised the reward of upward mobility to those who embraced bourgeois values. The texts under discussion in this study illuminate the ways in which social climbers can perform the class to which they aspire by adopting patterns of communication similar to those in positions of power. Individuals who have wealth and status expect members of their class to, among other things, converse and comport themselves in a particular way, even during non-working hours. Consequently, I argue that these novels, in part, complicate the notion of leisure by proposing that there is none, if any, time that is truly free, particularly to those who wish to improve their economic circumstances. Middle-class aspirants can learn from these texts how to mimic the cultural cues that identify one as having high social status. However, they must commit to transparency, expect surveillance from others, and keep an ever-watchful eye on themselves. By problematizing leisure in this way, these novels show the pernicious effects of bourgeois surveillance on the individual's body and mind, as well as on the larger cultural organism.

Introduction: Context of the Discussion and a Definition of Leisure

In this study, I focus my attention on the image of leisure activities, especially among the middle classes, in late Victorian and early twentieth-century British literature. My argument concerns the ways in which representations of leisure served symbolically to define, revise, protect, and perpetuate class identity at a time when forms of recreation and class relations were both undergoing many changes. I am particularly interested in representations of communication in the fiction of this period for its ability to illuminate the changing ways in which people interact with one another during their leisure hours. By depicting bourgeois communication strategies, fictions can reveal how bourgeois men and women attain and keep their power, serving as a model for middle-class aspirants. To best illustrate these methods, I have chosen four novels that represent a developing pattern of communication. I begin my analysis with Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), which documents the clear differences in bourgeois communication strategies and those the middle-class man "others." Next, I examine Oscar Wilde's *Dorian Gray* (1890), which explores the creative and culture-shaping work done by the true man of leisure through his interactions with other people. Third, Henry James's *The Golden Bowl* (1904), I contend, depicts the struggles between the fully empowered bourgeois and those who seek to subtly undermine that power through a gaming metaphor. And finally, E.M. Forster's *Howards End* (1910) asks readers to identify with Margaret Schlegel, who, in spite of her alliance with Mr. Wilcox, maintains and develops excellent habits of mind and values by aligning herself with the aristocratic past.

I introduce my study by defining the term "leisure" and examining in detail the developing history of the concept of leisure in Britain from the eighteenth century though the late nineteenth century. Next, I detail the critical background that informs my approach on leisure, which is an important field of inquiry for historians, social scientists, sociologists, and gender theorists, among others. I follow the critical background with my methodology for research which essentially looks for the text's attitude through its diegetic elements. Finally, I preview each chapter's central focus, By doing so, I hope to make a *prima facie* case that the development of middle-class ideology and communication are worthy of continued investigation.

Historical Background

Before beginning our introductory discussion of leisure in these novels, however, it is imperative that we define a central term, and a profitable discussion of leisure presupposes an understanding of the term's key features. One such definition comes from Peter Bailey, whose influential *Leisure and Class in Victorian England* (1978), while dated, still informs much of the subsequent research in the field. Bailey defines leisure as "a certain kind of time spent in a certain kind of way. The time is that which lies outside the demands of work, direct social obligations and the routine activities of personal and domestic maintenance; the use of this time, though socially determined, is characterized by a high degree of personal freedom and choice" (6). This definition is certainly problematic because there is an ongoing philosophical debate about the extent to which our choices are truly free in light of social determinants.

However, I posit that there is certainly the *impression* of freedom when making decisions of this type.

Present notions of leisure, which inform this definition, have evolved from pre-industrial antecedents. The working and leisured lives of many people in the eighteenth century were not so starkly divided. In *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850* (1973), Robert Malcolmson reports that people in pre-industrial England enjoyed an atmosphere in which "work and recreation were so closely related that they were almost indistinguishable" due to the social nature of working relationships and the recreations that both accompanied and complemented labor (15-16). Indeed, Karl Marx documents the developing nature and process of alienation from medieval to capitalist economic forms. This alienation is characterized by the fact that "labor is external to the laborer—that is, it is not part of his nature and that the worker does not affirm himself in his work but denies himself, feels miserable and unhappy. . . The worker, therefore feels at ease only outside work, and during work he is outside himself" (3). The process of alienation is necessarily determined by economic forces that were not yet fully developed in the eighteenth century.

Working-class recreations slowly acquired a different character as England transitioned from a pre-industrial society. Slight changes occurred incrementally, and "the transition is not to 'industrialism' *tout court* but to industrial capitalism" (Thompson, "Time" 325). E.P. Thompson reports that by the year 1700, there were already perceptible trappings of "the familiar landscape of industrial capitalism" including workplace innovations that facilitated strict oversight (327). Large-scale changes occurring from the middle of the eighteenth century through the 1850s altered

the ways in which people thought of the relationship between leisure and work. Religious puritanism, legal innovations, the changing economic landscape, class conflict, and other cultural shifts contributed to a more segregated view of these activities. Malcolmson identifies the sources of these changes with "[t]he Enclosure movement, the growth of cities, the rise of evangelicalism and the rigorous disciplining of labour under the new industrial capitalism" (3). Legal claims to property reduced the amount of physical space for leisurely walks and social gatherings. Consequently, the average working person had less room in which to move and congregate, and in some cases, she or he might have little time away from the supervision of others.

Additionally, reformers desired to change the nature of working-class recreations. Members of the middle classes took their role as social guardians seriously, and social advocates attempted to change offensive behaviors by example. Bailey avers that "[s]etting an example was . . . a salutary exercise of the superior classes, but it was hoped that their presence in recreation would engender a mutual moral vigilance in the community at large. Thus would be created the police of public opinion" (Bailey 39). Reformers therefore hoped to make the working classes complicit by getting them to turn the critical eye back on themselves. Sometimes, however, the methods were more direct. Police and religious institutions aided middle-class reform efforts by harassing or incarcerating idlers, and by threatening them with eternal damnation.

The upper classes did not only use their power and influence to suppress longstanding practices and attitudes; they also wielded legal power to the worker's benefit by checking employers' practices. Yet, such benefits did not come without strings attached. For example, Lord Shaftsbury, who drafted the Ten Hours Bill, warned

"the working-class audience of the great responsibility they faced now that the bill had passed into law; he implored them to turn to good account the extra free time they had acquired" (Bailey 50). Patrons expected their working-class beneficiaries to "turn" from their current course of presumptive idleness and act as though they were perpetually accountable to others.

I am most interested in the example set by the middle classes in terms of a desirable mental life. Literature can be an effective method for directing thought and action because the literary author can facilitate imaginative engagement with ideologies or subject-positions outside the reader's ken. Scholars have noted the correlation between fictional engagement and real-world effects. Laura Green, for example, defines literary identification as "the encounter of the psyche of a reader and the rhetorical construction of a narrative by its author. 'Identification' and its cousin 'sympathy' have been used casually, often interchangeably . . . to describe a reader's involvement with the represented emotions of a fictional character, her willingness to animate a fictional character's actions and relationships with her own affects" (9). Identification is an important means to bring about desirable social change. Getting readers invested in middle-class projects and values can occur through social pressure, force, incentives, and imaginative engagement. The latter method, however, works only if there is a literate populace.

As literacy increased, reading became a working-class interest as well as a middle-class diversion in the Victorian period. Sally Mitchell details the various means by which working-class children could learn to read, including Sunday schools, ragged schools, and schools funded through philanthropic societies. Novelists, embedded in

their cultural milieu, were keenly aware of the background from which many of their readers came. For example, Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre attends Mr. Brocklehurst's Lowood Institution, which is funded partly through charitable donations. Jane asks her friend Helen Burns, "Do we not pay money? Do they keep us for nothing?" Helen responds, "We pay, or our friends pay, fifteen pounds a year for each . . . . Fifteen pounds is not enough for board and teaching and the deficiency is supplied by subscription" (50). Community outreach prompted charitable giving, which helped defray the costs associated with boarding and educating poorer students. Consequently, people understood the importance and desirability of a literate populace. The government, however, would take a more active role. Parliament eventually saw the need to fund education in order to ensure a literate populace, and Mitchell reports that by 1851, "there were almost five million children between age 3 and 15. Two million were in school, 600,000 at work, and the rest were neither working nor attending school" (173). These statistics are important for my purposes because literate children grew up to read the works that I discuss in this study.

Even though full novels were expensive, new institutions and strategies allowed working-class people, along with their middle-class counterparts, to enjoy imaginative fiction. During the middle of the period, libraries were popular. Bailey reports that in addition to circulating libraries, there were libraries founded by or for working men (10). Furthermore, the 1850 Libraries Act established a means of paying for the physical structures in which to house libraries; however, funds were not allocated for the purchasing of books (39). Supplying the library would be the task of philanthropists, who could decide which works to donate. Consequently, patrons had limited

worldviews from which to choose. However, technology advanced to the point that working people had more options at their disposal. New types of presses, cheaper paper, and typesetting machines made it easier for more people to obtain reading material, including newspapers, magazines, and novels (Mitchell 237-38). Additionally, publishers and authors made fiction available through serialization, and by publishing installments in magazines (238). In sum, reading became a popular and accessible leisure activity due to beneficial legislation, a renewed focus on literacy, and advances in publishing techniques.

Critical Background

There is a significant critical background to leisure research. Historians who are interested in leisure have analyzed the topic extensively. Robert Malcolmson examines the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century influences that precipitated changes in attitudes about leisure. Peter Bailey extends Malcolmson's analysis by focusing on the social forces that divided work from leisure and restricted leisure activities for the working poor in Victorian England. In addition, Bailey explores those forces that resisted pressures from above. In *Daily Life in Victorian England*, Sally Mitchell reports the day-to-day recreations in which Victorians engaged. And because religious institutions attempted to define acceptable forms of recreation, ecclesiastical notions of leisure become relevant. Josef Pieper traces the history of the evangelical attack on leisure in *Leisure: The Basis of Culture.* Along these lines, E.P. Thompson examines what effects the restructuring of work habits and lessons from religious institutions had on inward notions of time. In "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism,"

Thompson claims that "[p]uritanism, in its marriage of convenience with industrial capitalism, was the agent which converted men to new valuations of time; which taught children even in their infancy to improve each shining hour; and which saturated men's minds with the equation, time is money" (337). It is a marriage of convenience because both religious and capitalist institutions have an interest in instilling an urgent and ceaseless need for productivity.

A well-rounded depiction of the ways in which leisure evolved and continues to evolve necessarily involves an examination of the relationships that take place within a society. Consequently, many concepts that constitute leisure-theory discourse originate in the social sciences. While certainly controversial now, Thorstein Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) made significant contributions to leisure theory of the time through its analysis of emulation. Veblen argues that "each class envies and emulates the class next above it in the social scale, while it rarely compares itself with those below" (103). Veblen believes that our propensity for emulation explains why certain activities associated with the leisured classes gain popularity among the working classes. Literary authors are also attuned to this theory of human behavior. In the fictional world of *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, working Londoners "were all doing well, it seemed, and all *emulously* hoping to do better still, and laying out the surplus of their gains in coquetry; so that the shop fronts stood along the thoroughfare with the air of invitation" (8, emphasis mine). Working Londoners wish to improve their circumstances, so they model their actions on those of their middle-class capitalist counterparts. Stevenson contrasts this street to the next one over with its "[t]ramps slouched into the recess[es] . . . . children kept shop upon the steps; the

schoolboy had tried his knife on the moulding" (8). The puerile griminess and sloth form a contrast to the grown-up industry and cleanliness. The effect of these juxtaposed images, obviously, is to make us prefer the latter.

In addition to economics, sociology has made important contributions to leisure studies. In "Everywhere and Nowhere: the Sociology of Literature after 'the Sociology of Literature'" (2010), James F. English differentiates between the "old" sociology of literature and a revitalized and renewed interest in the subject. The tradition to which English alludes originates in the fusion of Western Marxism and sociology by scholars like Raymond Williams and Richard Hoggart, among others, who "could make free with the mantle of 'sociologist'" (vi). In *The Uses of Literacy* (1957), Hoggart predicts the decline of urban culture in light of an emerging mass culture characterized by toleration at the expense of critical inquiry, "a callow democratic egalitarianism" (148-49), ahistorical progressivism (157), and "personalization and fragmentation" (163). Mainstream colonizers prey upon the working classes' ability "to survive change by adapting or assimilating" (31). According to Hoggart, new forms of mass media seek to perpetuate an undifferentiated monoculture.

However, many of these accounts simply ignored women's leisure. Catriona Parratt's *More than Mere Amusement: Working-Class Women's Leisure in England: 1750-1914* (2001) draws from the existing body of work on leisure in order to detail the recreations available specifically to women during the relevant time period. Parratt seeks to fill a gap in the existing scholarship on English working-class cultural practices by including a previously ignored account of women's leisure experiences. She explores the ways in which women created zones of pleasure for themselves despite social

pressures working to direct or even suppress women's leisure activities. Their struggle is momentous because social institutions are extremely powerful. The nexus between thinking processes and structural phenomena is well-documented. In *The Civilizing Process* (1939), Norbert Elias investigates the order underlying historical changes by examining the "sociogenesis" of the state, as well as the correlation between state structural changes and those taking place within human beings. Additionally, in *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (1984), Pierre Bourdieu examines how culture produces and reproduces social distinctions and hierarchies through its institutions (Blackshaw and Crawford 23). Bourdieu's work on habitus suggests that although culture shapes behavior, it is also embodied; people routinely, unconsciously, symbolically interpret and practice social structures and imperatives (22).

This critical background seeks to explain many of the causes for the changes that we see in everyday attitudes and practices. The factors that these works identify may also explain why we see certain literary phenomena. Certainly, critics who write using structuralist and a range of poststructuralist interpretive practices have covered a great deal of ground in their efforts to explain the unarticulated forces pulsing under the surface of literary works of art. I examine the diegetic elements of certain representative *fin-de-siècle* texts because I hope to show how they symbolically work to initiate readers into the culture of the middle classes. I also hope to show how they guide the efforts of the middle classes to shape their culture.

Reading a text's descriptive details closely illumines the extent to which a work of art can be said to have a point of view. I propose that readers can determine which

leisure activities a text wishes to laud and demonize by looking closely at its diegetic elements. In essence, a text's perspective is made manifest though its evaluative attitude toward characters, actions, and events. A.W. Eaton explains the concept of textual attitude when she writes that "[a] work prescribes an attitude toward diegetic elements by imbuing them with traits that are prompts for the attitude in question, where a prompt is a feature (or set of features) that aims to stimulate and elicit a particular type of attitude under appropriate circumstances" (4). Certain character traits acting in concert are prompts for, say, shiftiness. We can therefore conclude that the text directs us to feel uneasy about that character.

For example, J. Sheridan Le Fanu describes an eerie encounter between Miss Max and Elihu Lizard in *The Rose and the Key* (1895). Miss Max enters a drawing room alone and sees "[a]t the far corner of the table, with a candle in his hand, which he instantly blew out . . . . the slim figure and sly lean face of Elihu Lizard, his white eyeball turned towards her, and his other eye squinting with the scowl of alarm, fiercely across his nose at her . . . His stockings and his shirt sleeves gave him a burglarious air, which rather heightened the shock of his ugly leer, thus unexpectedly encountered" (18). Descriptive details like "sly," "lean," "scowl," "burglarious," and "ugly leer" have palpable effects on readers. We are meant to distrust this character and regard his activities, however much they may seem innocent at first glance, as suspicious.

Similarly, a text's attitudes about leisure activities can be made visible by the ways in which the work prompts attitudes about those activities and characters who engage in them. However, this is not a means of side-stepping historical research. Eaton is clear that by "appropriate circumstances" she refers to the target audience from the

relevant time period. Certainly, the effects that diegetic elements have on audience members can change. A prompt for fear in one era may prompt amusement in another.

Chapters Breakdown

The four texts I have chosen for this study, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, *The Golden Bowl*, and *Howards End* represent significant moments in the history of nineteenth-century literature. There has certainly been a great deal of scholarship on these texts from various theoretical perspectives; the complexity of these novels attests to the intricate nature of a rapidly developing culture. They interest me for what they have to say about bourgeois communication. In particular, these novels document the ways in which the middle classes exert considerable pressure on people to conform to certain codes of conduct and interpersonal relations.

In *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, which is the subject of my first chapter, Stevenson illuminates the essential features of bourgeois communication and physical habits through Gabriel Utterson and those like him. Utterson serves as a model of piety, restraint, and quiet contemplation. His physical routines also serve as a model to others for their transparency and purposefulness. The bourgeois male seeks to protect the status quo and becomes the champion of civilized society when his values come under threat. He will use any means to protect those values, including stalking and surveilling people during their leisure hours. Threats to middle-class respectability are, like Hyde, difficult to describe but exist nonetheless. Those who feel most comfortable lurking in the shadows must be up to no good. Indeed, their very modes of

communication constitute an offense to the civilized ear. Those who fail to conform are ostracized and demonized. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* therefore instructs readers who wish to enter the middle classes on what to emulate and what to avoid on a surface level. However, the text's attitude is complicated and subtle clues in the text reveal how similar the upstanding middle-class male and the reprobate criminal are in the ways they communicate and comport themselves. Consequently, the novel ultimately questions the legitimacy of the bourgeois model.

It becomes clear from *The Strange Case* that nobody in middle-class society is off-the-clock; instead, everyone is subject to surveillance even after the close of business. We must therefore turn to the aristocratic world Oscar Wilde depicts in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* to observe the man with true leisure. In Chapter Two of my study, I examine *Dorian's* views of and attitudes about leisured communication. The cultivated persona is a creative force. This individual will forge his or her own distinctive mode of existence from inspiration provided by previous models. The creative individual, in turn, serves as a source of inspiration to others who create unique lives of their own. This is the way in which societies in general develop and evolve: by admitting different perspectives and ways of life. Lord Henry lives the creative life as the text envisions it. He is considerably outside the bourgeois norm, which makes him a curious object of study. Many readers tend to see him as a villain but the novel challenges readers to follow its lead and admit imaginative space for those who fall outside the status quo. Lord Henry is self-confident in his choices and inspires others through epigrammatic communication. Dorian is deeply affected by his encounter with him and sees life anew. While the younger man could be a source of inspiration to

others, Dorian chooses instead to remain static and unchanging. Consequently, the text illuminates the perils of status quo living and champions the creative life.

The world of James's *The Golden Bowl*, the subject of Chapter Three, shows the middle-class man of business at the height of his powers. Adam Verver is a culture shaper of a different sort. He scours Europe and plunders her treasures so that he can influence the course of his own country's development. Adam treats people as he does the objects he collects, an approach which engenders resistance. The impoverished Prince Amerigo marries Adam's daughter, Maggie, thereby passing along his title to her. Additionally, his relation to Amerigo Vespucci secures the Ververs' place in the myth of America's founding. The Prince knows he has, in essence, been bought and asserts himself by forming an illicit alliance with Adam's wife Charlotte. When the Ververs become aware of this resistance, they employ a gaming strategy with specific rules of communication to reassert their power. These are strategies that any middle-class aspirant can adopt and perfect. While the Ververs ultimately succeed, they are themselves altered in the process of assimilating others.

The final chapter of my study examines E.M. Forster's *Howards End*. The novel seemingly pits the leisured, upper middle-class Schlegels against the business-oriented Wilcoxes. However, the Schlegels and Wilcoxes share many of the same vices in communication, which impede their ability to connect with others. They noisily talk over each other and commit egregious breaches of etiquette. The novel, I contend, is a *bildungsroman* of sorts as Margaret and Helen learn, painfully at times, to truly connect by adopting aristocratic values of careful listening and thoughtful, unhurried conversation. Like Forster's protagonists, readers can learn to connect amidst the

pressures of living in a world that prioritizes a different set of values. The novel therefore eschews bourgeois communication wherever it is found and promotes a way of life in concert with others and the values of England's aristocratic past.

I hope to show, in sum, the extent to which instrumental *fin de siècle* authors sought to explore, understand, and question evolving trends in their rapidly changing society. These artists, to varying degrees, represent the structural and cultural forces designed to foster conformity to bourgeois ideologies. Consequently, they highlight the strategies middle-class imperialists employ to attain and secure status and power that aspirants can emulate. The reader may simply stop there. However, a deeper analysis shows the extent to which the diegetic elements in these novels also, either implicitly or explicitly, question the values of the new economy. These novels illuminate the hypocrisy, impurity, and ultimate undesirability of bourgeois thinking and living.

Chapter One: Underground *Flânerie,* Conversation, and Middle-Class Transparency in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*

Introduction

In 1888, Robert Louis Stevenson wrote an article for *Scribner's Magazine* describing his inspiration for *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), which he claims to have come from a dream. The dreamer, unlike others mired in day-to-day routine, has special capacities of observation. According to Stevenson, "there are some among us who claim to have lived longer and more richly than their neighbors; when they lay asleep they claim they were still active" (R.L. Stevenson "Dream Origin," 87). These individuals live more profoundly during their leisure hours than their wakeful neighbors precisely because the dreamer's thoughts are continuously turned on "[t]he look of the world" (87). While others work to manipulate and control their circumstances, the dreamer sees the world as it is.

At the time of Stevenson's article, the "look of the world" was changing rapidly, giving rise to inchoate "public fears about the safety of the metropolitan streets, generating a sense that the city was out of control, physically and morally" (Dryden, *The Modern Gothic* 51). London was in the throes of a nightmare as murderous predators stalked the dark corners of the city. The Ripper had the means and leisure to carry out his gruesome crimes, and journalists pointed to *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as a source of inspiration to him (50). London could not wake from its fearsome dream, which "is not that Hyde could be anywhere, it is that he already is everywhere" (MacDuffie 187). Hyde symbolizes the generalized public anxiety about the types of dangers one can meet around any corner because he exists, lurking somewhere, in everyone.

There has been some recent scholarly interest in *Jekyll and Hyde's* focus on the ways in which the text engages with its environment. Allen MacDuffie's *Victorian Literature, Energy, and the Ecological Imagination* (2014), for example, analyzes *Jekyll and Hyde* as a thermodynamic narrative that depicts the ways in which "energy travels through social, natural, and cosmic systems" (13). According to MacDuffie, *Jekyll and Hyde*, as well as other important nineteenth-century novels, exemplifies the ways in which the era represented its energy-consuming practices to itself. The focus on energy is important because these representations also inform current discussions of energy consumption (12). MacDuffie argues that *Jekyll and Hyde* examines a number of energy-related themes, including "the transformation of physical form, the continuity of identity through transformations, the expenditure of resources, and the phenomenon of irreversible change" (172). At its core, Stevenson's novella is concerned with the irreversibility of physical transformations, the consumption of finite energy, and the consequences of energy depletion (177). The continual transformations that give Jekyll a sense of youthful vigor ultimately result in "energy exhaustion," a type of socio-cultural illness resulting in desolation from which there is no escape (189). The fruits of Jekyll's respectable work-a-day world supply the capital necessary for Hyde's activities. However, these quickly dissipating resources are energy-intensive to maintain and necessarily degenerate over time because "[i]t *costs* something to preserve one's sense of identity as a moral being" (186). MacDuffie argues that Hyde immorally wastes the resources to which he has access. Jekyll/Hyde is certainly punished for waste, yet the novel is also clear that he is a product of his culture, for "[t]he pressurized world of reputation-making; professional success; respectability; social and financial

capital-accumulation . . . [come] at an unacknowledged cost, embodied in the dissipations of Hyde" (192). In essence, the pressures of repression breed the need for release.

Additionally, Jesse Oak Taylor's *The Sky of Our Manufacture: The London Fog in British Fiction from Dickens to Woolf* (2016) analyzes the impact of pollution on the body in Stevenson's text. Environmental pollutants produce "abhuman" bodies—bodies characterized by "morphic variability, continually in danger of becoming not-itself, becoming other" (99). The body is not separable from the environment that produces and sustains it, in spite of Jekyll's assertions to the contrary. Taylor argues that environmental impact is a central concern in the text: a larger nineteenth-century cultural preoccupation with theories of evolution through natural selection and the second law of thermodynamics, "with its promise of irreversible decay," lead inevitably to de-evolved, frightening figures that stalk the London landscape (112). The polluted industrial environment produces Hyde as "pollution personified" (118). Taylor posits that Stevenson's novella illuminates the extent to which bodies are imbricated with their surroundings and "presents a world in which the boundaries between one self, system, object, or assemblage and another can never be firmly fixed" (110). The concept of pollution, however, "provides a means *not* to account for those inconvenient remainders that cannot be reincorporated into the systems that produced them" such as Hyde, because the myth of a pristine state justifies the exploitation of areas deemed less ideal (12). Similarly, Jekyll believes in a pure self, one devoid of sin. However, when he attempts to separate himself from his less desirable parts, he inadvertently exponentially increases the overall amount of sin in the world (120).

My interest in the London of Stevenson's novella also concerns the changing urban landscape in which characters find themselves. MacDuffie and Taylor centralize their discussions of *Jekyll and Hyde* on the ways in which the external environment, such as pollution or the pressures of energy production and consumption, influence Jekyll/Hyde to act or react. I find these readings plausible yet incomplete ways of describing the menace posed by Hyde. My study, by extension, focuses on the pressures people exert on each other in order to protect a specific set of values and norms. Accordingly, I seek to expand on MacDuffie's arguments about the pressurized world of respectability and on Taylor's observations about the ways in which the pristine use those "inconvenient remainders" that cannot or will not be normalized and integrated into the larger social system. My specific focus on leisure was also an area of interest to Stevenson, who in his short essay "An Apology for Idlers" (1877) argues for the inherent wisdom of idlers whose way of life suffers by comparison with those advocating and living "[e]xtreme *busyness*" (82). Stevenson explores social relationships in a time of increasing prosperity and leisure among the middle classes. MacDuffie notes that "[t]he problem of energy waste is not located in the upper and lower classes, but in the self-serving fictions of the *middle class*, including the discourse of degeneration itself. It is the middle-class professionals in the novel who cloak their secret 'dissipations' under cover of professional reputation and social position, and who seem to represent, in their bachelor solitary, a reproductive dead-end" (195, emphasis mine). For MacDuffie, the fiction of bourgeois respectability is a self-serving disguise for their idiosyncratic waste and sterile lives. This may be true; however, these professionals will go to great lengths to protect their way of life, which includes a set of

behavioral and conversational norms. The nocturnal activities of leisured men with no apparent business are particularly disturbing to middle-class characters in the text, who are myopically concerned with the need for transparency in everyday dealings.[1] These vaguely threatening figures are readily identifiable by their gait and patterns of speech.

Stevenson effectively establishes an eerie and frightening atmosphere though the dimly illuminated figures that walk the city streets in the dead of night after the close of all legitimate business activities. Apart from Utterson, who is always on the job it seems, few characters go to and from a regular job during normal business hours. Dr. Lanyon remarks to Utterson, "I have *seen* devilish little" of Jekyll (*Jekyll and Hyde* 13, emphasis mine). The fact that Jekyll is hiding his activities is deeply troubling. Most characters are comfortable with others observing their comings and goings in the clear light of day. For example, Dr. Lanyon's house is constantly filled with "crowding patients" (13), and the many London capitalists are shown engaged in various commercial pursuits in order to enhance their material wealth. Consequently, I argue that the text highlights, in part, what it means to walk well. However, many of the walking habits of bourgeois characters look and feel at times very similar to those of less respectable characters. The text therefore reveals the uncomfortable similarities

[1] Stevenson's explorations are clearly gender biased. Henry James famously wrote that "[t]here is something almost impertinent in the way, as I have noticed, in which Mr. Stevenson achieves his best effects without the aid of the ladies" ("Reception" 102). I attempt to correct this imbalance in later chapters. James identifies a serious limitation in this novel. How can Stevenson represent social values while largely leaving out one half of the human population? Clare Harmon notes that Stevenson modified his approach to female characters after the failure of *Prince Otto* (1885), in which Stevenson stereotyped women and became quite enamored with his image of what he termed the "fuckstress" (248). After the story was universally panned, the author "returned to his former position of keeping women characters to a minimum, and as for 'fuckstresses', avoiding them altogether" (252). There may be a cultural explanation for Stevenson's inability to depict realistic female characters; Stevenson documents in *Jekyll and Hyde* the close relationships between men that begin at all-male boarding schools and that follow men through university and into their adult lives (13). Stevenson therefore focuses on male friendships in *Jekyll and Hyde*.

between acceptable and unacceptable walking practices. In many instances, middle-class characters fail to practice what they preach. Stevenson's novella therefore exposes bourgeois characters like Utterson, who engage in many of the same sorts of behaviors he seeks to eradicate, thereby unveiling middle-class hypocrisy.

While out and about in the city, one is also expected to engage socially with others, and pleasing social manners affiliate one with hegemonic ideology. The middle-class professional is a model of restrained contemplation. In fact, Utterson often sits silently at parties while guests take comfort in his sobriety. In contrast, the threatening Other is gruff, direct, and often rude. His remarkable conversational manner is another indicator of his failure to assimilate. These two groups could not, on the surface, be further apart in their discourse. However, the text shows just how close they are under the right circumstances. When the Hydes of the world threaten the status quo, the bourgeois professional musters a new set of conversational tactics to eradicate the threat. He gossips, speculates, lies, and verbally harasses others to achieve his ends. The novella therefore does not simply accept the public face of middle-class superiority but looks to how the professional male behaves conversationally when threatened so as to expose the mechanisms he employs to protect his position. The text discovers that, again, the bourgeois professional behaves in similarly harmful ways to the social deviant. The middle-class professional will employ any means necessary to hound the Other out of existence as Utterson hounds Jekyll to his death. In the self-serving middle-class fiction, the ends justify the means as long as social order, public confidence, and proper wealth transmission are achieved, even if injustice prevails.

This chapter first analyzes the large-scale social relationships that set the stage for the more nuanced treatment of human social interactions that take place later in the text. Stevenson juxtaposes the industrious West and scurrilous East sections of London. The West is a thriving community of aspiring capitalists, while tramps and idle poor inhabit the dilapidated East. It therefore appears, at first glance, that the text describes a simple and clear binary, approving morally of the industrious capitalists and disapproving of those who fail to live up to middle-class standards. The novella seems to replicate the binary on a smaller scale when depicting Hyde in contrast to characters like Utterson, Enfield, and Lanyon. Stevenson's text taps into the social threat posed by dreamily unregulated leisure through Hyde, who is most comfortable operating in the shadows. The second part of this chapter therefore examines the text's narrowing focus on the day-to-day behavioral and conversational patterns that mark one as upstanding citizen or threatening deviant. The novella shows in detail the ways in which the novel's villain, Hyde, fails to live up to middle-class pedestrian and conversational norms, marking him as unassimilated, threatening Other. The third section of this chapter complicates the initial binary by examining the effects and hypocrisies of the self-serving fictions of middle-class respectability that characters like Utterson espouse. These fictions put incredible pressure on people. For example, Jekyll feels acutely the normalizing pressures of his class, and in an extreme act of inward monitoring, attempts to separate himself from his baser instincts. What Jekyll fails to realize is that the middle-class professional will casually abandon his moral uprightness under certain circumstances. *Jekyll and Hyde* therefore blurs the distinction between judge and deviant when he portrays Utterson routinely violating the very values he champions.

Ultimately, the novel unveils the hypocrisies of bourgeois virtue and consequently reveals the extent to which the social contract is maintained by the destructive impulses that lurk in everyone. The text complicates the bourgeois narrative through the metaphors of walking and conversation. As I show in this chapter, the bourgeois "hero" and underground "villain" are closer in value than may at first appear on the surface.

The Industrious West and Scurrilous East

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde focuses its attention largely on the ways in which the middle-class male represents himself and uses power to protect the values of his class. A few essential questions, however, must be answered before proceeding further in our discussion of the text: Who exactly are we speaking about when discussing the bourgeoisie? Why does much literature of the Late Victorian period, including *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, concentrate on class relationships? Why was the bourgeoisie, as I have suggested, so concerned with maintaining control? And, finally, what can Gothic fiction add to our understanding of Victorian social relationships?

The ever-expanding Victorian London urban environment posed a significant threat to the existing power structure. Maps from 1837 through 1897 reveal incredible growth, leading to a sense that London was in a state of flux (Whelan 5). For example, in 1837, Hyde Park demarcates the westernmost boundary; however, by 1862, it is fully incorporated into the city limits (3, 5). A city as ungainly as London has the capacity to breed those forces resistant to the status quo and posing a significant challenge its authority. In fact, the sprawling metropolis, with its labyrinthine backways, provided ample shelter to the criminals it creates (Dryden, "City of Dreadful Night" 257).

Additionally, the spread of gas street lighting helped to engender a sense of security in certain parts of town; however, these lamps did not extend to the East End (259). The darkness and fog provide ample cover for nefarious, criminal activities. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* looks at London from the middle-class perspective, describing an eerie gothic landscape that is friend to the "dangerous impulses, destabilizing influences, and social fissures that are implied in Jekyll's metamorphosis into Hyde" (263). Consequently, the power structure, interested in maintaining its privilege, must be ever vigilant.

However, getting a sense of who was in charge in this shifting landscape is notoriously problematic. The difficulty of describing the power structure when class boundaries are themselves highly porous as society progressed toward greater "democratization, urbanization, and economic/ political equality" poses significant challenges (Swafford xi). The well-documented ascendance of the middle classes is plagued by difficulties of definition "despite [the middle class'] continued consolidation of power and cultural dominance throughout the century" (Whelan 2). In *The Bourgeois* (2013), Franco Moretti traces the origin of the term from its eleventh-century French roots, as designating residents of the *bourgs* who were free from feudal jurisdiction (8), through the calls for a way to describe the middle economic category that reflected the realities in early industrial England of persons who served as a link between the upper and lower orders (11). Moretti argues that, at its core, the bourgeoisie during the nineteenth century was identified as the "propertied and educated" gentleman (3) who exhibits energy, self-restraint, intellectual clarity, commercial honesty, and who is by all accounts strongly goal-oriented (16). Certain ways of conducting oneself therefore

marked one as belonging to or excluded from the middle class. Despite the Victorians' insistence on innate qualities that gave one the right to rule, "class identity . . . could not be distinguished securely except through a perceptual recognition of and adherence to a realm of symbolic action and cultural production" (Swafford 3). In essence, class was performed through certain behavioral cues, patterns of thought, and ways of seeing the world (xii). In what follows, I illuminate the extent to which *Jekyll and Hyde* recognizes class as a self-conscious performance of certain values tied closely to capitalist economic interests.

Genre analysis helps situate a literary work in a constellation of concerns that find expression in art. The modern English realists and naturalists, for example, "aimed at describing unflinchingly the horrors of modern civilization as seen in the lives of the poor wretches who labored in mines or factors, of prostitutes, degenerates, and criminals" (Dryden *The Modern Gothic* 5-6). The late nineteenth-century Romance, in turn, proposes, in part, a utopian future in which science and technology advance to the extent that humanity can progress toward a state of serenity (13). Stevenson's novella constitutes a return to the Gothic. Nineteenth-century gothic romance has the unique ability to tap into deep-seated social fears and draw out the worst for inspection. Through horror, the Gothic in its modern manifestation represents "encoded anxieties and preoccupations" inherent to the fearsome expanding metropolis (15). Its defining features include transformation, horror, a sense of historical distance, and supernatural intervention (31). In essence, nineteenth-century Gothic fictions depict various forms of horrific, supernatural doubling in order to examine the nature of identity (39-40). Concerns about identity in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* find expression

first in the East versus West binary. The West End aspiring capitalists perform a certain class identity while imposing identity on their less fortunate East End neighbors.

The Thriving West End and the Value of Transparency

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde surveys the current London scene, panning outwards to give readers a broad view of the human relations it explores later in more detail. The novella pointedly contrasts two different types of London street: the busy West End commercial district and the shady East End backways. The West is, according to the text, a site of industriousness as people happily go about their business in the clear light of day. According to the narrator, one typical "street was small and what is called quiet, but it drove a thriving trade on the week-days. The inhabitants were all doing well, it seemed, and all emulously hoping to do better still, and laying out the surplus of their gains in coquetry; so that the shop fronts stood along that thoroughfare with an air of invitation, like a row of smiling saleswomen" (8). This view of aspiring capitalists appears at first glance uncritically positive. During normal business days and hours, this part of London thrives like a carefully cultivated plant, and its ability to grow is dependent on the behavior of the human beings who are dedicated to its health. The symbiotic relationship between health and transparency is the hallmark of this economy.

West End inhabitants watch each other and expect surveillance, a phenomenon that invokes Foucault's theory of The Carceral and his account of the highly structured French prison Mettray, which opened its doors in 1840. Mettray is, for Foucault, the genesis of ideological social institutions such as hospitals and schools that comprise an ever expanding "carceral archipelago" designed in such a way as to produce "bodies

that were both docile and capable" through "a network of permanent observation" (295). *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* examines this growing "archipelago" through its deviants and judges of normality. Because the West End street thrives, its individual parts do as well, and vice-versa. This mutual arrangement is possible through competition, which works only because people can see each other and show off their success and stimulate jealousy in others. The text tells us that the business people look on each other "emulously." The *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) acknowledges that emulation involves achievement and ambition, which are positive virtues. However, emulation also may bring about the darker counterparts of rivalry, ill-will, and disparagement. Yet we never seem to see the destructive side of emulation. It appears to be an unambiguously good thing that their efforts and success are transparent, observed, and capable of being reproduced and even surpassed. Participants seem to cheerfully revel in the system that encourages "coquetry," those surface embellishments meant to attract the view of others. In *Refiguring the Coquette* (2008), Shelley King and Yaël Schlick examine the coquette's "centrality to an emerging modernity tied to the rise of capitalism [and]. . . to the emergence of a specular economy, to the anxiety of selfhood generated by the accommodation to newly commercialized social relations, and to the rise of the middle classes and middle-class culture" (13). King and Schlick note that the nineteenth-century conception of the coquette was uniformly negative, however, when she becomes the locus of callous sexuality and self-obsession. The coquette is also the ultimate consumer whose individual literary representative "serve as both thought experiment and warning to "British readers to consume with caution, lest they become a nation of coquettes"

(Braunschneider 59). Working for the good of the city means that one is a good capitalist and consumer, committed to activity and transparency, but perhaps, valuing surface adornments in lieu of genuine human interaction.

Everyone can see what is going on, for the most part, because everything is well maintained and generally clean. According to *Jekyll and Hyde's* narrator, "Even on Sunday, when it veiled its more florid charms and lay comparatively empty of passage, the street shone out in contrast to its dingy neighborhood, like a fire in a forest; and with its freshly painted shutters, well-polished brasses, and general cleanliness and gaiety of note, instantly caught and pleased the eye of the passenger" (8). The absence of dirt has, for the novel, a moral dimension. Its brilliant "fire" shines to reveal secrets that find a comfortable home in the darkness. Fire also purifies sins that breed in the encasing gloom. Additionally in the passage, the narrator equates the cleanliness of the street to religious observance by invoking the sanctity of Sundays when business is generally not conducted. According to Eileen Cleere, in *The Sanitary Arts* (2014), mid-to-late Victorian proponents of sanitation sought to change Victorian sensibilities in order to sensitize people to turn away from the repulsiveness of dirt and toward "ideological and aesthetic coherence" (Cleere 4).[2] There was a great deal to worry about in the things, people, and activities hidden in filth and shadow. In *London's Underground Spaces* (2013), Haewon Hwang documents the middle-class shift in consciousness during the 1840s and 50s when people began to consider how to deal with the human excreta and industrial waste that were an undeniable fact of modern life (20). That which is unseen sparks terror in the popular consciousness for its capacity to spiral out of control and

[2] Including Edwin Chadwick's *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population or Great Britain* (1843).

damage the social organism. Consequently, many Victorians wished to take control and rid their city of dirt. According to Hwang, "[t]he inescapability of filth both disgusted and fascinated the Victorians, who began to construct in their minds an image of an *unseen*, all-pervasive pestilence that hovered in the air and threatened to invade their bodies and their homes" (20, emphasis mine). Cleere argues that reformers, who counted among their ranks essayists, artists, novelists, and architects, collaborated culturally on the project of "redefining taste as a mechanism of public health and social justice" (9). In short, reformers needed authors and artists to help them do the cultural work of ideology dissemination. For example, John Ruskin was instrumental in this project, employing a moral component by associating "dirt with contemporary religious decay" (22). The London business district, with its freshness, clear surfaces, and cheerful atmosphere, becomes a shining example of bourgeois moral purity.

The Dubious and Dirty East End

Conversely, the dingy ramshackle next street over is shrouded in mystery. Its gloomy, imposing atmosphere is a symbol to the bourgeois of all things bad, just as it reminds Enfield of his encounter with Hyde. The Eastern part of the expanding urban landscape was "a vast, overpopulated centre of crime and poverty. For many, it came to symbolize all that was wrong in the metropolis . . . as a cesspit of crime, drunkenness and poverty, populated by 'savages' who were one step up the ladder from the beast" (Dryden *The Modern Gothic* 48). The less brilliant counterpart to the bustling industrial area does not stand up well in the Sunday light. The narrator explains in vivid detail that

> [t]wo doors from one corner, on the left hand going east, the line [of smart buildings] was broken by the entry of a court; and just at that point, a certain sinister block of building thrust forward its gable on the street. It was two storeys high; showed no window, nothing but a door on the lower storey and a blind forehead of discolored wall on the upper; and bore in every feature, the marks of prolonged and sordid negligence. The door, which was equipped with neither bell nor knocker, was blistered and distained. (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 8)

The further East one goes, the more one distrusts the very buildings that line the streets. The narrator calls it a "sinister" block, and there is every indication that one should be deeply suspicious of this neighborhood and its inhabitants. Utterson remarks that it was "like a district of some city in a nightmare" (23). The outward signs of violence, enclosure and neglect confront the walking subject at every turn. The block itself is "thrust forward" as though confronting the observer in a menacing fashion in contrast to the attractive and moral orderliness of the business district. Hyde's home, in particular, is remarkable for its enclosed architecture. There is no window to let light in the building itself to give the impression of honest life and transparency. In short, there is no way to supervise the activities within, provoking curiosity and suspicion. Additionally, there is no obvious indication of how one is to enter or even signal a desire to enter this dwelling, whose door has apparently no bell nor knocker. The neglect, as evidenced by the "discolored" wall, and the blistering and "distained" door suggests a culpable carelessness, and probably something "sordid" at work. The middle-class imagination has clear limitations. What else could people be doing other than

maintaining their homes? The text therefore looks at the East End from the bourgeois perspective, incidentally revealing a deeply suspicious mindset.

The people who inhabit the Eastern parts of town are also contrasted starkly to the individuals who contribute to the thriving health of the westernmost side. The narrator reports that "[t]ramps slouched into the recess and struck matches on the panels; children kept shop upon the steps; the schoolboy had tried his knife on the mouldings; and for close on a generation, no one had appeared to drive away these random visitors or to repair their ravages" (8). This "ravaged" street is clearly not thriving, in stark contrast to the business district. Eastside inhabitants are not upstanding business people. Children set up "shop" but it is an impromptu, puerile sort that does not contribute significantly to the health of that byway. There is a significant chance these children will grow up like their adult models, both male and female. Female street dwellers, too, receive harsh treatment at the hands of the narrator. While perusing Hyde, Utterson notices women of "many different nationalities passing out, key in hand, to have a morning glass" (23). In *Walking the Victorian Streets* (1995), Deborah Epstein Nord explains the nineteenth-century attitudes toward homeless women by examining the term "tramp" in light of gender difference. Nord recounts the adventures of Mary Higgs, "who produced a proto-Orwellian exploration of 'going on the tramp'" and who "discovered very quickly that, in her words, 'the harlot is the *female tramp.*' She also learned that, disguised as a tramp for the purpose of investigation, she was subject to taunts and jeers, and that the "bold free look of a man at the destitute woman 'must be felt to be realized'" (14-15). The female tramp is so remarkable a figure that she is always seen. *Jekyll and Hyde* remarks upon this figure in passing but primarily focuses

its attention on the male counterpart, who is, according to the *OED,* simply a person who "travels from place to place on foot, in search of employment . . . one who follows an itinerant business." Mid-century views, represented in the Dickensian universe are mixed about those unfortunates 'on the tramp,' walking great distances in search of work. They either represent "the collective plight of those who suffer within a system of wider social problems pertaining to unemployment, urbanization and industrialization" or negatively, rough, shabby parasites. Without a doubt, walking was an indicator of low social status (Mathieson 22-23). [3] The migratory workers in *Jekyll and Hyde* take comfort in anonymity, are transient, and have no permanent home, opting instead to "slouch" in the recesses of crumbling buildings. The matches they strike on the walls contrast to the brilliant fire of the Western tradespeople.

As I have argued in this section, *Jekyll and Hyde* depicts the middle-class commitment to transparency, which serves to maximize the health of the city. Everyone knows everyone else's business, and this knowledge, in turn, leads to emulation and competition. On a large scale, *Jekyll and Hyde* describes the differing classes of people that comprise the burgeoning metropolis in a way that is related to health. The result is a kind of "tale of two cities." Aspiring capitalists help the city thrive, while homeless transients contribute only to its decay. The bourgeois observer finds his difficulty penetrating the deep East End recesses deeply disturbing. Tramps secrete themselves in nooks to avoid prying eyes. Additionally, it appears as though the very buildings are designed to conceal the nefarious activities that are thought to take place within. As I will show in the next section, what emerges from the dirt is a veritable monstrosity.

[3] See, for example, the Hertfordshire bricklayers in *Bleak House* (Mathieson 21) and the tinker in *David Copperfield* 21).

Hyde is so deformed as to defy description. However, his distinctive stride immediately betrays his presence as an outsider, and his conversational manner confirms bourgeois prejudice and suspicion.

Hyde and the Bourgeois Image of the Underground *Flâneur*

In this section, I examine the walking habits of the novel's villain, Edward Hyde, who serves as a warning to others about the ways in which one should not behave while making one's way in the city. The text narrows its gaze, seemingly reinforcing the binaries it sets up in the broad view. In this novella about profound changes in an ever-expanding urban landscape, the act of walking reveals a great deal about character. The medical professional Henry Jekyll takes contemplative strolls, while the murderous Hyde scuttles about in the shadows. It is coincidentally during one of his walks that Jekyll begins to feel the pull of his inner Hyde. Jekyll reports, "I was stepping leisurely across the court after breakfast, drinking the chill of the air with pleasure, when I was seized again with those indescribable sensations that heralded the change" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 60). Jekyll's leisurely middle-class gait is consequently distorted into Hyde's monstrous tread. Where Jekyll is comfortable strolling in the open air under the gaze of occasional passersby, Jekyll-in-transformation must scurry away from prying eyes. He reports, "I had but time to gain the shelter of my cabinet, before I was once again raging and freezing with the passions of Hyde" (60). Jekyll can hold his head up high because he is not prone to extremes. Hyde, on the other hand, runs hot and cold, and he is the very embodiment of unpredictability. The text, therefore, distinguishes starkly between Jekyll's virtuous middle-class carriage and Hyde's heavy, violent march.

Shadow Walking

Hyde's walking style befits his status, and there can be no doubt from it that he is the novel's chief villain. He is generally careless, self-obsessed, debauched, and violent. However, we do not find out the full extent of his depravities until Jekyll's final confession. Consequently, we can know Hyde's maliciousness only by the trail of devastation he leaves as he makes his way around the city. One of the very first scenes exemplifies Hyde's idiosyncratic way of moving through the city streets. Enfield tells Utterson:

> I saw two figures: one a little man who was stumping along eastward at a good walk, and the other a girl of maybe eight or ten who was running as hard as she was able down a cross street. Well, sir, the two ran into one another naturally enough at the corner; and then came the horrible part of the thing; for the man trampled calmly over the child's body and left her screaming on the ground . . . it was like some damned Juggernaut. (9)

Hyde's "stump" is unnatural and heavy. He moves but is himself unmovable. While the little girl is running to get a doctor, ironically enough, Hyde's progress clearly takes him to the Eastern, degraded side of town where we have seen little-to-no legitimate business taking place (9). The girl represents the most vulnerable of citizens, which social rules and conventions are designed to protect. Without these conventions, there is no way of stopping people with superior physical strength from abusing others or taking what they want. The term "trampling" has at its root "tramp," which, when applied to Hyde, betrays this character's class as one of those suspicious walkers. Instead of

acknowledging his fault and helping her out after the accident, Hyde "tramples" her as a mindless animal would have done. Indeed, Enfield describes Hyde as a Juggernaut, which, according to Katherine Linehan, is "[a]n inexorable destructive force; the term derives from accounts given by European travelers to India or religious worshippers being crushed to death beneath the wheels of the great processional chariot of the Hindu deity Jaggernath" (9). Hyde's forward momentum is unEnglish and fearsome. Consequently, the diegetic elements of this scene point to Hyde's callousness, irresponsibility, and alien walking habits. The Hydes of the world are exotic and fearsome curiosities for traveling Europeans, who are amazed to see the little regard held for human life in foreign parts.

Hyde shows little regard for the most venerable members of civilized society, just as he walks over the most vulnerable ones. The murder of Sir Danvers Carew exemplifies Hyde's callousness toward fellow citizens who arrest his progress and impose social demands on him. When Sir Danvers asked Hyde innocuously for directions, a working-class witness reports, Hyde "broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane, and carrying on . . . Mr. Hyde broke out of all bounds and clubbed him to the earth. And next moment [*sic*.], with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered" (22). The maid repeats the phrase "broke out" twice, as though Hyde is a caged animal that has severed its bonds. Certainly, he has breached social and legal rules that constrain action. Additionally, she employs the terms "trampling" and "stamping" to describe Hyde. He is engaged in suspicious walking in the dead of night when there is rarely a legitimate reason to be out. Hyde will not be

stopped and questioned by those in a superior social position. Hyde violently stamps his impression on the body of Sir Danvers.

The crime draws public attention and ire to a man who, up until now, consciously and consistently evades observation. In fact, Hyde normally does everything in his power to resist the prying eyes of his neighbors. For example, Dr. Lanyon is struck by Hyde's visit because "[t]here was a policemen not far off, advancing with his bull's eye open; and at the sight, I thought my visitor started and made greater haste" to enter the house (44). The police are seeking Hyde in connection with the Sir Danvers murder, so there is certainly good reason for Hyde to evade the officer's gaze. He has, however, displayed aversion to attention from the beginning of the story. For instance, to avoid, at all cost, public scrutiny, Hyde pays off the family of the girl he almost killed. Enfield reports, "We told the man we could and would make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other" unless he paid for the harm he had done (9-10). Public scandal would bring unwanted curiosity from those intent on protecting the status quo, so Hyde obliges Enfield, not due to a sense of moral obligation but from a commitment to self-preservation. Hyde's desire to avoid the prying eyes of others clearly marks him as villain from early on because he does not bow to the social pressures that dictate transparency.

Additionally, his very physical features defy classification. Enfield tells Utterson that "[t]here is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something downright detestable. I never saw a man I so disliked, and yet I scarce know why. He must be deformed somewhere" (11). Furthermore, Dr. Lanyon asserts that "there was

something abnormal and misbegotten in the very essence of the creature that now faced me—something seizing, surprising and revolting" (45). And Utterson describes Hyde as "hardly human! Something troglodytic" (17). The term "something" comes up over and over again in these descriptions of Hyde. Characters are disturbed by the fact that they cannot categorize him according to a preset social category. He is neither middle-class nor lower class. In fact, he has all of the trappings of respectability, including access to significant amounts of money, high connections, and a comfortable home. The narrator notes that Hyde's rooms "were furnished with luxury and good taste" (24). However, he is clearly not a gentleman in his public behavior. Dr. Lanyon wonders about Hyde, "his origin, his life, his fortune and status in the world" (45). If Hyde is not classifiable by the bourgeois male, then he must be something subhuman.

Those who encounter Hyde might not be able to remember his face; however, they generally recall his distinctive walking style. Jekyll himself describes Hyde's walking as "an object marked out for observation" (59). He "walked fast, haunted by his fears, chattering to himself, skulking through less frequented thoroughfares" (59). There is much to fear, for as Jekyll reports, his doppelgänger prefers "undignified" pleasures that betray Hyde's "depravity." These hedonistic, antisocial acts include excessive drinking, "bestial avidity," and torture (53). In fact, Hyde is often described in animal-like terms. For example, Poole complains to Utterson that Hyde walks incessantly back and forth like a caged animal. The servant reports to Utterson, "So it will walk all day sir . . . and the better part of the night" (38). Poole's use of the term "it" serves to dehumanize the walker. The public discourse surrounding Darwin's theory of evolution also evoked concerns about de-evolution, which helped explain criminality to

upstanding citizens, for whom "[e]volutionary 'reversion' provide[d] a scientific explanation for the involuntary anachronism of the modern criminal; it [was] involuntary because it [was] biological" (Mighall 143). This supposed existence of biologic degeneration potentially means that the middle classes cannot control the populace as tightly as it would like. As Jekyll's servant, Poole has the opportunity to observe Hyde a great deal; however, Hyde's walking habits are remarkable to even the most casual observer. Utterson, for instance, describes meeting Hyde for the first time in the depths of the night, when "the shops were closed, the by-street was very solitary and, in spite of the low growl of London from all round, very silent" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 15-16). Hyde's "swift," noisy footsteps alert Utterson by their very urgency at a time when there is no legitimate business to be conducted. There are few honest reasons for someone to be walking in that part of town at that hour, and those who are out and about deserve a special kind of scrutiny.

Hyde's distinctive pedestrianism has drawn some scholarly attention. For example, In *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles* (2003), Linda Dryden argues that Henry Jekyll and Edward Hyde are *flâneurs* who "perambulate the city seeking pleasures to satisfy their leisured boredom and their taste for illicit excitement" (58). Dryden is quick to note, however, that the *flâneur* in Stevenson's universe is not a benign observer but "a threatening and dangerous presence . . . a participant in crime" (58). Hyde as *flâneur* also appears elsewhere in the scholarly literature. Richard J. Walker in "Pious Works: Aesthetics, Ethics, and the Modern Individual in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*" (2006) argues that "Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* evokes the fluid and vaporous aesthetic of

modernity and individualism found in Baudelaire . . . Hyde, like the sinister Baudelaire, can be read as avant-garde artist/critic" (271). However, Hyde, in spite of Walker's assertions to the contrary, is not a gentleman. His status as a "threatening and dangerous presence" does not resemble a *flâneur* proper, but instead, a species of *flâneur*. Hyde, I posit, is the ultimate symbol of underground *flânerie*, which more accurately describes his illicit activities and fearsome presence. The underground *flâneur* bears an inverse relationship to the better-known bourgeois counterpart. If the middle-class *flâneur* is the "detached, bourgeois observer who delights in the visual spectacle of the city [,], . . . his underground counterpart had freedom of movement in the subterranean tunnels and relied heavily on the visual economy of the city, although in his world, it was the economy of waste" that posed significant threats of "disorder and degeneration" to the hegemony (35). Among underground *flâneurs*, Hwang identifies the flushers, toshers, mudlarks, pure-finders, miners, and factory workers (35).[4] The latter two categories of working-class representatives often "evoked fear rather than sympathy" during the nineteenth century as "the faceless masses of the 'furnace, engine and the factory'" (35). Hyde is most comfortable moving unobserved in the shadows and resembles, in many ways, these underground *flâneurs*.

Talking to the Underground Flâneur

In spite of his efforts to hide in the shadows and evade observation, Hyde draws a great deal of attention. Occasionally, someone attempts to interact conversationally with him. Hyde not only betrays his opposition to the status quo by resisting transparency in his everyday comings and goings, but his conversational manner leaves

[4] Workers who cleaned sewer blockages, those who searched for lost valuables, people who scavenged along the Thames, and individuals who collected dog faeces respectively.

a great deal to be desired as well. Hyde's unconcern with the social niceties that make for fluid social relations, marking him, again, as an outsider to the system. Late nineteenth-century theorists, novelists and critics valued and evaluated each other's conversational facility (Miller 182). The numerous published essays marking good conversation as an Enlightenment value attest to the importance of conversational norms as class marker.[5] Hyde would certainly fail any evaluation of his conversational abilities. His dialogue with others is direct, functional, and often emotionally volatile. Like the beast he is consistently portrayed as, Hyde has a limited conversational range. For example, when Utterson first met Hyde, we are told the latter man "shrank back with a hissing intake of the breath" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 16). Hyde feels caught by having to engage with another human being, recoiling and hissing like a trapped snake. He also snarls and emits a "savage laugh" at Utterson before disappearing into his Soho residence (17). Upon reflection, Utterson concludes that Hyde "spoke with a husky, whispering and somewhat broken voice," which challenges comprehension let alone a meeting of the minds (17). Additionally, the content of his discourse leaves a great deal to be desired. He certainly knows what social conventions of conversation require of him, but his speech is often so direct as to be rude. In one instance, he unabashedly accuses Utterson of lying (17). Furthermore, he has difficulty with greetings. For example, upon their initial meeting, Hyde asks Utterson abruptly, "What do you want?" (16). And upon first meeting Dr. Lanyon, Hyde asks greedily,

[5] See, for example, John Taperell's treatise, *The Art of Conversation* (1731), *The Art of Conversation; or Polite Entertainer. Calculated for the Improvement of Both Sexes And Recommended as a Genteel Help in Modern Discourse. Illustrated with Several Curious Anecdotes on Different Subjects. By a Nobleman of Distinguished Abilities* (1758), *How to Shine in Society; or The Art of Conversation containing its Usages, Law, Rules, Application and Examples* (1860), and George Washington Carleton's *The Art of Conversation* (1866).

"Have you got it?" (45). Lanyon keeps his presence of mind and reminds Hyde to enact social ritual and make proper introductions (45). Hyde responds, "What you say is very well founded; and my impatience has shown its heels to my politeness" (45). Hyde is clearly capable of civility, but he makes the conscious choice to be rude. There is a kind of pleasure in being able to circumvent social niceties; however, it marks the speaker as different and threatening.

Hyde is the frightening "Other" who gives the socially powerful a way to conceptualize and represent the unfamiliar from a position of superiority (Said 1871). In *Degeneration, Normativity and the Gothic at the Fin de Siècle* (2015), Stephan Karschay defines norms as "explicit or implicit rules and regulations that prescribe specific forms of socially acceptable behavior, while being reinforced by authorities through the threat of predefined sanctions. Norms are thus pre-existent to social action" (16). Karschay posits that our concept of normality is a cultural construct long in formation since the mid-eighteenth century and corresponds to a set of behaviors that are prevalent (15). Even so, there are cases in which a large group of people may find themselves outside the norm. Karschay gives the example of homosexuality which, while criminalized in the nineteenth century, later becomes de-criminalized and socially acceptable because of its prevalence and changing ideas about healthy sexual practices (17). Homosexuality in the nineteenth century was just as normal but violated social norms of conduct, making an equation of normativity to "normal behavior," as commonly established, highly inaccurate. Similarly, I can say that *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* acknowledges the dark impulses that are a normal part of any human being while it documents the power structure's systematic attempts to suss out

and destroy that which violates social norms. Othering is an integral part of this process, which makes the practice a way of at once producing and condemning norm violation. Otherness is characterized, in part, by the presence of evil and finds expression in foreign invaders, among other categories (19).

Jekyll is motivated to divide himself on moral grounds reflecting the Victorian fear of religious Others, among others. Linda Dryden argues that the text documents the pervasive fears about the large influx of "poor Jews who, in the 1880s, were fleeing the Eastern Europeans pogroms" (*The Modern Gothic* 47), illuminating the close connection between Stevenson's image of London and the real city. Dryden further contends that the actions of people in "the imagined city and the real city merged into each other and were mutually influential" (52). *Jekyll and Hyde* is a window into the ways in which Victorian city dwellers feared and imagined their city to be. In fact, "[w]hat was happening on the streets of the real city became dramatized through the fictional narratives of the imagined city, and later events like the Ripper murders became associated in the popular consciousness with Stevenson's earlier Gothic narrative" (52). The causal chain extends from real occurrences to dramatically represented ones, which, in turn, influenced the way people viewed events in the real city. One way in which the real and fictional events intersected was in the religious othering that took place as a result of the influx of Jews in the 1880s. Many people speculated that the Ripper was of Jewish descent, "seeking to eradicate his 'crime' of sexual intercourse with a prostitute" (47). In *The Jew in the Victorian Novel* (1980), Anne Arsty Naman examines the image of Jews, based on accusations of deicide, as practitioners of ritual murder (33). Additionally, in the popular consciousness, the myth

of the Wandering Jew associated the Jew with the tramp. As punishment for striking Christ on the cross, the Jew was condemned to wander the earth until the second coming (41). The myth suggested an inherently evil nature in Jews, who roamed without loyalty to any nation-state (42). Consequently, the Jew was often employed as scapegoat (4-5), as in the case of the Ripper. In contrast, Jekyll is the strictly religious adherent to social norms. His swarthy counterpart, Hyde, certainly seeks degraded pleasures of the various sorts Jekyll feels he needs to eradicate.[6] The antagonism between Jekyll and Hyde, therefore, dramatizes the struggles for power in the real London. Hyde, as a symbol of the Jewish threat, becomes the unrestrained, unEnglish other who stalks the city in the depths of the night.

Hyde, then, is marked as "other" by his separation from English behavioral and conversational expectations in multiple ways. As discussed in this section, his walking style, limited social range, and direct discourse draw unwanted attention. Hyde is certainly a social curiosity. However, his violent outbursts especially mark him as "other" in the most extreme sense. His ferocity makes him a truly fearsome predator. The maid who observes Sir Danvers's murder reports that "the older man bowed and accosted the other with a very pretty manner of politeness. It did not seem as if the subject of his address were of great importance; indeed, from his pointing, it sometimes appeared as if he were only inquiring his way" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 21). Sir Danvers is described as having "accosted" Hyde with "politeness." The aristocrat imposes polite discourse on Hyde, who resists these impositions with every fiber of his

[6] The connection is not a new one. Judith Halberstam, in *Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters* (1995), argues that Arthur de Gobineau's theories concerning warring races within the body corresponds to the Jewish influx during the 1880s that threatened a cohesive sense of national character (79).

being. There is no apparent reason for Hyde's extreme response other than Sir Danvers's presumption and tone and Hyde's refusal to play the social game. His inability to assimilate to British cultural norms marks him as a licentious, fearsome Other who poses a significant threat to the health of the city.

This section has focused on Hyde as a species of the London underground *flâneur*. Stevenson's villain skulks around the city in the depths of the night, when no legitimate business is taking place. In doing so, he resists bourgeois pressures for transparency, seeking cover of night and anonymity for his adventures. He spends his free time seeking degraded pleasures and mysterious potions, and conducting terrible experiments on himself. His thoughts are consistently on himself, and he violently resists the hegemonic culture. In fact, Hyde has a highly antagonistic relationship with the city dwellers on legitimate business who get in his way. He tramples the little girl who runs to get her errand completed as quickly as possible, and he crushes the venerable Sir Danvers who only asks directions. Sir Danvers made the terrible mistake of attempting to converse civilly with Hyde and, in effect, to impose social expectations of civil discourse on Stevenson's villain. Additionally, Hyde is abrasive, confrontational, and downright rude to Utterson, and Dr. Lanyon must remind Hyde to behave in accord with bourgeois norms before he gets what he wants. Hyde is the novel's villain certainly for his violent hedonism, but also for his resistance to the demands of middle-class values. He makes no palpable contribution to society, which cannot thrive if there are more people like him. He lives solely for his own pleasure and makes little effort at ingratiating himself to others. Hyde, therefore, serves as a warning that assimilation is non-negotiable in this society.

Self-Serving Fictions and the Middle-Class "Hero"

This next section examines the bourgeois story Stevenson tells. Bourgeois professionals like Gabriel Utterson find themselves in a position in which they are responsible for safeguarding the nation's wealth in accordance with legal as well as customary traditions. For example, 1837 saw the enactment of The Wills Act, which altered existing rules for formalizing wills, significantly simplifying the process (Frank 3). The will was "a legal register of identity," thereby serving the interests of Gothic fictions nicely (3). Capitalism solidified the relationship between individual and his goods, and "a newly consolidated middle-class imbued goods with personality and [suggested] that those goods represent[ed] their 'selves'" (45). *Jekyll and Hyde* is, at its core, an inheritance plot that documents the middle-class professional's interference in private wealth transmission by heavily mediating the individual's relationship to legal systems. Jekyll can and does leave his wealth to Hyde initially; however, the state, through its agent Utterson, intervenes in this transaction. The lawyer articulates no rational reason at the outset for interrogating Jekyll's first will. After the will is already made, he investigates Jekyll's legatee and elicits help from agents of the state apparatus. Ultimately, Jekyll leaves his property to Utterson, who, after Jekyll/Hyde's death, finds "a will, drawn in the same eccentric terms as the one which he had returned six months before, to serve as a testament in the case of death and as a deed of gift in case of his disappearance; but in place of the name of Edward Hyde, the lawyer, with indescribable amazement, read the name of Gabriel John Utterson" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 40). This bequest certainly warrants further investigation due to professional conflict; however, that does not happen in the fictional world that Stevenson describes. This

omission suggests that Stevenson views the middle-class man as thoroughly ensconced in the national scene and is literally destined to inherit wealth and power. But what type of man is he? In what follows, I analyze the text's representations of and attitudes about the nation's cultural leaders.

Middle-Class Pedestrianism

More specifically, I examine Victorian bourgeois walking practices as Stevenson represents them. Walking, I contend, reveals a great deal more about characters than anything the narrator explains concerning their motivations, which are fraught with the same self-deceptions and idealizations as any self-report. Distance walking was certainly an important leisure practice for the upper classes during the early nineteenth century when people wanted to live the "Romantic ideals of freedom, independence, and communication and nature," with "space for philosophical reflection and creative thought" (Mathieson 20). Leisured pedestrianism was therefore a product of choice as opposed to necessity. Walking had other advantages as well. Pedestrianism, as a local and slow activity, could have a positive community-building function. In *Mobility in the Victorian Novel: Placing the Nation* (2015), Charlotte Mathieson asserts that in this era the walking journey "creates a mapping-out of the spaces of the nation, unfolding a vision of what the nation is, who inhabits it, and how its inter-connections are forged" (27). In short, as an alternative to the fast-paced methods of modern transportation, pedestrianism reveals more about the physical spaces and types of people who inhabit the landscape. It gives individuals an opportunity to not only know, but also master and perhaps even control processes of community formation.

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is considerably interested in the bourgeois professional and examines his influence thoroughly. Utterson's central position in the text, therefore, illuminates the importance of middle-class values, warranting a close examination of the newest class of cultural leaders in this novella. Social success seemingly involves a different set of walking and conversational values that men of his class find worthy of emulation. The bourgeois *flâneur* walks in broad daylight and is comfortable with public scrutiny although he certainly does not seek attention. He is, according to the text, contemplative, productive, and attracted to the value of friendship. However, it takes a Hyde to illuminate the darker side of bourgeois superiority. As I will endeavor to show in this section, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* describes what kinds of attitudes and ways of being are optimal for social climbers. Utterson has a distinctive way of carrying himself and certainly holds himself out as a model to others during his walks and social gatherings. Utterson-as-model is, however, not the text's ideal. The text illuminates the destructive effects Utterson's example has on other characters. He comes across as a sanctimonious bore who literally hounds Jekyll to death. For his part, Jekyll cracks under the pressures of bourgeois expectations and divides himself from his darker parts because he feels the weight of bourgeois expectations keenly.

Utterson walks with purpose in service to his city and friends. He is engaged in legitimate business as estate lawyer to some of the city's finest citizens, including Dr. Jekyll and Sir Danvers. Utterson has nothing to hide and openly invites observation from others. It seems as though every step he takes is a performance. In fact, the lawyer is often seen in the company of a distant relative, Richard Enfield, with whom he walks

regularly every Sunday in pious and contemplative silence (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 8). Friends like Enfield are dear to Utterson, who will traverse the city in their service. The narrator explains that "[h]is friends were those of his own blood or those whom he had known the longest; his affections, like ivy, were the growth of time" (7). Again, the text employs the plant metaphor to describe the careful cultivation of certain virtues. Utterson is the consummate gardener who attends assiduously to the health of his city and relationships. This is what leads him to look again at Henry Jekyll's will and investigate his favorite's protégé. Utterson's mind races, imagining the worst fate for his friend at the hands of Hyde (15). Consequently, he questions Dr. Lanyon, seeks out Hyde, and races to save Jekyll. In short, he makes his way around the city ostensibly for the purpose of protecting the interests of his longtime acquaintance and client.

Utterson holds himself out to others as the paragon of middle-class virtue. He is the epitome of middle-class success, and others treat him as worthy of emulation. He believes in serving as a shining example of sobriety and asceticism, and self-consciously puts himself on display. The values Utterson espouses and lives put a great deal of pressure on others. For example, "[h]osts loved to detain the dry lawyer . . . they liked to sit awhile in his unobtrusive company, practicing for solitude; sobering their minds in the man's rich silence after the expense and strain of gaiety" (19). The virtues of sobriety and comfort in solitude are not natural but take practice. However, Utterson achieves this type of admiration at a great personal cost. He must repress his instincts for pleasure. The narrator reports that "the lawyer was a man of a rugged countenance, that was never lighted by a smile; cold, scanty and embarrassed in discourse; backward in sentiment; lean, long, dusty, dreary . . . He was austere with himself; drank gin when

he was alone, to mortify a taste for vintages; and though he enjoyed the theater, had not crossed the doors of one for twenty years" (7). He is tough and strong; however, this confidence is purchased by sacrificing certain sources of pleasure. He flagellates his baser impulses, which include the enjoyment of wine and theater performances, into submission through austerity and self-denial. As a result, he has acquired unappealing characteristics, including a stern nature and dry mien, which are replicated in everything he does, including his walking habits. During his Sunday walks with Enfield, the two men "said nothing, looked singularly dull, and would hail with obvious relief the appearance of a friend" (8). Again, the text finds Utterson "dull," a state of being which is the result of extensive and painful self-fashioning.

Henry Jekyll feels these pressures keenly. In his full statement of the case, he reports that it is these very pressures that led him to take the actions he did. He confesses that his "gaiety of disposition" is at odds with his desire to carry his "head high, and wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public" (47-48). For Jekyll, the term "grave" seems to suggest not only solemnity but also a kind of death. Utterson is what Jekyll knows he ought to be in order to fit into the middle-class professional mold. He struggles but cannot attain Utterson's level of ennui. Jekyll explains, "I had not yet conquered my aversion to the dryness of a life of study" (52). He knows what he ought to be like but cannot engage in the self-flagellation Utterson employs to suppress his instincts. In short, he cannot lead a desiccated life of the Utterson school. He therefore feels himself a hypocrite for having to hide his true pleasures for the sake of public appearance. Consequently, Jekyll has never quite been able to adopt values of transparency, and his failure is written across his face. Jekyll is

trusted and accepted because he looks mostly right; he is described as "a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty." However, his features are somewhat marred "with something of a slyish cast" (19). The terms "large" and "well-made" indicate authority and regularity. In these respects, his physical appearance conforms to social norms. In addition, the fact that he is smooth-faced shows that he is free from wrinkles and other physical markers of worry and internal irregularity. He is also beardless, so it appears as though he has nothing to hide. However, careful observers will note a slight slyish cast that betrays a capacity to deceive.

Jekyll's failure and guilt lead him to excessive behaviors resulting in radical transformations. In order to become the model "dry" and "dusty" professional, Jekyll must, paradoxically enough, imbibe a peculiar liquid that separates him fully from his inner demon. In his final statement, Jekyll reports, "I compounded the elements, watched them boil and smoke together in the glass, and when the ebullition had subsided, with a strong glow of courage, drank off the potion" (50). Jekyll drinks the entire glass, thereby causing monstrous changes in Jekyll's physical appearance and temperament. He tells us that the resulting sensations "braced and delighted [him] like wine" (50). In *The Transforming Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Victorian Alcohol Debate* (2006), Thomas L. Reed proposes that Stevenson's novella is an allegory for the often conflicting late-Victorian attitudes about alcohol consumption (2-3), and that Stevenson shows that irresponsible drinking can transform the sober-minded Englishman into the very embodiment of unEnglish excess. Jekyll's alcoholism is not fit for bourgeois society and must be hidden away in the person of Hyde. Hyde, as it turns out, is a manifestation of the angry drunk. Where once Jekyll

could walk in the clear light of day, his guilty excesses now necessitate antisocial skulking in the shadows under cover of night.

In order to eradicate threatening excess, Utterson and others patrol the streets, thereby making certain habits of walking integral to the thriving metropolis. Utterson is the text's bourgeois champion and the driving force behind initiatives to restore order to a city in danger from Hyde and his kind. Walking helps him to know what to do about the growing menace. For example, the narrator explains that Utterson "began slowly to mount the street, pausing every step or two and putting his hand to his brow like a man in mental perplexity. The problem he was thus debating as he walked, was one of a class that is rarely solved" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 17). Hyde's presence is a deeply disturbing intrusion; however, walking slowly and talking to himself help the text's "hero" to work out what to do next. The result is not an unambiguous good. In fact, Utterson's walking habits begin to resemble those of Hyde more and more. He resolves to undertake self-righteous stalking of the London streets in the depths of the night in order to confront Hyde, announcing, "If he be Mr. Hyde . . . I shall be Mr. Seek" (15). Utterson begins to haunt Hyde's door and to hound a man he has never met in order to know this person to whom Jekyll has left his fortune. Utterson therefore employs the power of walking to essentially stalk a stranger.

Utterson pursues his prey with an alarming single-mindedness. In order to seek out the "truth" of Hyde's villainy and protect the status quo, the lawyer frequents the last place that Hyde was seen, and "[i]n the morning before office hours, at noon when business was plenty, and time scarce, at night under the face of the fogged city moon, by all lights and at all hours of solitude or concourse, the lawyer was to be found on his

chosen post" (15). This passage reveals the true nature of Utterson's initial search. He purposefully waits by Hyde's door during normal business hours to see if he has legitimate business to which Hyde must attend. If Hyde is an upstanding member of the professional classes, then presumably there is less to worry about. However, as it turns out, Hyde waits until the depths of the night to make his appearance, a delay which only confirms Utterson's suspicions that Hyde is up to no good. We see, then, that bourgeois walking in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is often regulatory in nature. The text reveals that the upstanding professional will, when necessary, patrol the streets for the safety of other citizens.

In this sense, the professional male acts as supplement to the Victorian police forces. The early nineteenth century saw a renewed interest in preventative policing in London (Beattie 219). The Metropolitan Police Act of 1829, for example, introduced major innovations to policing practices including "the abolition of the night watch; the creation of a single police district with a unified force under the command of commissioners who were not working magistrates; a hierarchical structure much more elaborate than anything that had gone before; a new pattern of patrolling" (245). The primary effect of reforms like this one was that an increasing number of officers covered a larger amount of territory. 1870 brought further reforms that focused on bureaucratic expansion, including specialized departments with a rigid hierarchy and systematic record-keeping on criminal activities (Petrow 4). Like the city it served, the police bureaucracy seemed to grow endlessly as more departments and specialists were added to the ranks. Backed by middle-class moral reformers, the police worked to enforce moral laws and prevent vice (5). In *Jekyll and Hyde,* Utterson enlists the

assistance of Inspector Newcomen of Scotland Yard to aid his search for Hyde (R.L. Stevenson 24). This is positive proof that the full weight of the state is behind Utterson's actions. To serve middle-class ends, 1869 saw the drastic increase in the number of detectives, whose methods changed to include the use of informants (Petrow 66) and plainclothes street-level surveillance (71). Other reforms contributed to the bureaucratization of the police forces. For example, criminals had to report monthly to the police long after their sentence was completed (75). A register containing criminal names and aliases was kept in every police station that included separate volumes for distinguishing marks such as tattoos (84). And The Prevention of Crimes Act of 1871 mandated photographing criminals (87). Policing served middle-class ends, especially when it came to groups of people that adopted a "peripatetic lifestyle" (99). The largely sedentary middle-classes feared and hated those vagrants and gypsies that comprised, in their terms, "the travelling criminal," requiring even more record-keeping devices to track their movements (99-100).

Utterson's efforts on behalf of his friends are not only vaguely suspect, as in his stalking of Hyde, but are also violent. He will go to great lengths to see the social order restored. The final scene in the novella when Utterson and Poole push their way into Jekyll's chamber is deeply disturbing. Both men wield weapons: Poole an axe and Utterson a kitchen poker, which he places under his arm, with which he leads "the way into the yard. The scud had banked over the moon, and it was now quite dark. The wind, which only broke in puffs and draughts into that deep well of building, tossed the light of the candle to and fro about their steps, until they came into the shelter of the theatre" (38). The eerie scene is the perfect backdrop for what happens next. Utterson

wants no witness this night and employs no agent of the state to assist him, oddly, considering they fear for Jekyll's life. Poole pointedly tells Utterson that he fears there has been some "foul play," which, if anything, is the business of law enforcement (33).There are times apparently when even the bourgeois professional foregoes the requirement of transparency.

What happens next illuminates the extent to which the bourgeois professional and his accomplice will go in order to protect middle-class values from the vague threats they fear. The men violently break into Jekyll's private room. The narrator describes Utterson and Poole as "[t]he besiegers," similar to a gang that overruns a place in order to assert control (39). They are even "appalled by their own riot and the stillness that had succeeded" (39). Their uncharacteristic and brazen actions precipitate Jekyll/Hyde's suicide. Carol Margaret Davison in "A Battle of Wills: Solving *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*" (2007) sees Utterson as being as guilty of wrongdoing when she avers that "Gabriel John Utterson not only vies for and successfully obtains Jekyll's inheritance but is, ultimately, indictable for his murder" (139). According to Davison, Utterson acts "with the full knowledge that Jekyll *is* Hyde and that breaking down the cabinet door leaves Jekyll no other choice than to commit suicide . . . The final horror of the story is that, in the hands of Utterson, the episode will probably be repressed and hidden in silence for the sake of decorum: nothing will be learned and the errors of bourgeois culture will be repeated" (157). In essence, Davison exposes the (criminal) lengths to which Utterson goes in order to protect bourgeois values. I dispute whether Utterson knows it is his friend who writhes in pain behind the door. However, the fact that Jekyll's cries for mercy go unheeded is deeply troubling.

So what are these errors to which Davison refers exactly? As I have endeavored to show, they are inconsistency and hypocrisy resulting in injustice.

The walking habits of those who are in charge in this society reveal much about their character and actual beliefs, which are at odds with their asserted values. For example, Utterson appears to be, on the surface, a committed adherent to stern forbearance, restraint and asceticism. He walks in silent, religious contemplation and holds himself up as a model to others. However, when his values and way of life are threatened by the underground *flâneur*, he seems to change character entirely, unleashing his own Hyde in response. Utterson's steps quicken and he takes to the more scurrilous East End streets to stalk strangers. He can tell himself that he does this in service to his friends, but the lengths to which he goes tell us that, in fact, he is serving his own ends. He, as middle-class representative, must maintain control and quell the threats to the social order. Consequently, he violently besieges his friend's home, committing property damage in the process. Utterson's actions drive Jekyll to suicide. In the end, Utterson is more like a vigilante than hero.

Bourgeois Conversation

Similarly, conversation, which often accompanies walking in the text, reveals much about middle-class commitments. Here, I am not as focused on *what* is said, as on *how* information is communicated, and indeed, on what should, but is not, said. As seen, aspiring professionals bask in Utterson's "rich silence" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 19). In spite of these quiet interludes, the text is full of chat through legal documents, witness statements, and letters of various kinds. In what follows, I examine

the self-serving fiction of bourgeois conversation, which advocates, on its surface, restraint and purposiveness. Again, however, the ways in which characters talk to each other often fly in the face of these asserted values, and the improving bourgeois conversational manner bears little scrutiny. Mischievous gossip precipitates Utterson's relentless hounding. Additionally, Utterson will lie when necessary and speculate wildly to justify himself. And finally, Dr. Lanyon's silence is a contributing factor in Hyde's escape and Jekyll's death.

Gossip has a powerful effect on the text's characters. Enfield tells Utterson the story of Hyde's trampling of the child during one of their Sunday walks. The matter has already been settled to the satisfaction of all parties but Enfield paints a vivid picture of Hyde's apathy that prompts Utterson to ask his companion whether he investigated further (11). Enfield responds, "No, sir: I had a delicacy…I feel very strongly about putting questions; it partakes too much of the style of the day of judgment. You start a question, and it's like starting a stone. You sit quietly on the top of a hill; and away the stone goes, starting others; and presently some bland old bird (the last you would have thought of) is knocked on the head in his own back garden and the family have to change their name" (11). Enfield is disgusted by the ways in which people judge others from a position of superiority, resulting in the type of harm that makes it necessary for the object of gossip to hide his identity. However, Enfield also fails to see—or to care about—the fact that his reticence privileges peaceful appearances over the truth. Premature judgment is, as he dismissively says, "the style of the day"; however, he is blind, at first, to the fact that his gossiping has had a similar effect when it motivates Utterson to question Dr. Lanyon, who, in turn, gossips vaguely about how Jekyll "began

to go wrong, wrong in the mind" (14). Lanyon's statements, coupled with Enfield's story, make Utterson deeply paranoid about Hyde.

But Hyde is a bad guy, so gossip serves a positive function in the novel when it ferrets out malign forces. Gossip, as it turns out, has a number of ends it serves. Patricia Meyer Spacks' *Gossip* (1985) is still cited in current scholarship on the subject.[7] According to Spacks, gossip can take multiple forms: "distilled malice" of the type that "plays with reputations, circulating truths and half-truths and falsehoods about the activities, sometimes about the motives and feelings, of others" (4). Hyde's servant, for example, joyously asks for "news" that her master is in some sort of trouble (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 24). More common, however, is the type of "idle talk" that issues "from unconsidered desire to say something without having to ponder too deeply. Without purposeful intent, gossipers bandy words and anecdotes about people, thus protecting themselves from serious engagement with one another" (Spacks 5). Finally, there is a species of "serious" gossip that occurs during leisurely, intimate discourse and serves as a "crucial means of self-expression, a crucial form of solidarity" among those who occupy a subordinate position within the social system (5). Enfield and Utterson are cultural leaders and not in a subordinate position. However, they are rarely seen engaging seriously with one another conversationally. Enfield, for his part, engages in idle talk with this conversant, as opposed to malicious or serious gossip. He is later chastened and tells Utterson, "I am ashamed of my long tongue. Let us make a bargain never to refer to this again" (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 12). However, Utterson has a job to do. He must protect the social order at all cost. Gossip about Hyde

[7] See, for example, Erin M. Gross's "Homespun Gossip: Jane West, Jane Austen, and the Task of Literary Criticism" *The Eighteenth Century* 56.2 (2015).

transitions from idle talk to a form of community surveillance. Its community-building function takes a dark turn when Utterson questions Lanyon about Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and, receiving little satisfaction, begins to speculate wildly.

Speculation drives Utterson to use the full weight of his position, his considerable resources, and dubious conversational tactics to understand and eradicate the Hyde threat. Enfield supposes that Hyde's power over Jekyll emanates from guilt: "Black mail, I suppose; an honest man paying through the nose for some of the capers of his youth. Black Mail House is what I call the place with the door, in consequence" (10-11). The possibility of blackmail is troubling because Jekyll is an accepted member of the middle classes. In fact, he is "celebrated and "one of your fellows who do what they call good" (10). In addition, he is thought to be "honest" even though there might be some blackmail-worthy offense in his past. In any event, Enfield's unfounded accusation leads Utterson to re-examine a perfectly legitimate will that he executed at Jekyll's behest. Retroactively, the lawyer decides that there was something wrong all along that "swelled his indignation" precisely because there are vast sums at stake.

These thoughts, coupled with fears about the future of Jekyll's wealth, impel Utterson to engage in some morally dubious conversational moves. For example, he outright lies to Hyde when the latter asks how Utterson came to know about him. Utterson responds that Jekyll had provided a description, to which Hyde responds, "I did not think you would lie" (17). So caught, Utterson attempts to shift responsibility to Hyde by stating, "That is not fitting language" (17). Additionally, Utterson self-consciously violates conversational norms by engaging in inappropriate subjects at inappropriate times. For example, he cross-examines his friend at a social gathering,

asking Jekyll to justify his choice of Hyde as legatee. Jekyll only responds, "[T]his is a private matter, and I beg of you to let it sleep" (20). Jekyll fails to understand just how seriously Utterson takes his responsibilities for wealth transmission and how far he is willing to go to protect the status quo. In fact, Utterson and Enfield continue their harassment of Jekyll when they assail him at his window when he is clearly ill and terrified (32).

One person could have cleared up the mystery earlier and perhaps have saved Jekyll's life. Dr. Lanyon learns Hyde's true identity when Hyde transforms back into Jekyll in front of him. Lanyon, however, remains silent because of an oath. Hyde reminds Lanyon to respect his vows, asserting that "what follows is under the seal of [their] profession" (46). Professional obligation purportedly requires Lanyon to hold his tongue. However, Lanyon confesses he knew that Hyde had murdered Sir Danvers. Consequently, he obstructs justice and allows a murderer to go free. Middle-class silence is therefore not the unambiguous good that Utterson models in the beginning of the novella. Lanyon takes his professional responsibilities entirely too seriously, thereby contravening the dictates of common sense. This is, for Stevenson, a hallmark of the perpetually busy man. In his "Apology" Stevenson argues that the idler's way "takes him along a by-road, not much frequented, but very even and pleasant, which is called Commonplace Lane, and leads to the Belvedere of Common-sense" (81). In contrast, Lanyon's devotion to the dictates of middle-class professionalism delays justice for Sir Danvers, endangers the city, destroys Jekyll, and ultimately costs Dr. Lanyon his own life.

The professional Victorian male tells himself a self-serving story of moral superiority, which he feels entitled to do since he has worked so hard to suppress his instincts for pleasure. He consequently reproduces this fiction for other people by holding himself up as a model of virtue. Utterson's "rich silence" and dry demeanor serve to temper the gaiety of party-goers; however, it also puts enormous pressure on Henry Jekyll. Utterson fails completely to understand the effects of his example. He attempts to perform the expected behaviors of his class by coming to the assistance of his friends. However, his walking habits come to resemble those of Hyde. Utterson's patrols look more like the movements of a stalker who ultimately pushes Jekyll to suicide. Additionally, Utterson employs some morally problematic conversational moves to achieve his ends. His lies, speculations, and harassment reveal the extent to which Hyde lurks somewhere in everyone.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused its attention on middle-class pedestrianism and conversation as hallmarks of civilized values. *Jekyll and Hyde* examines those values in great detail first by illuminating the benefits of a thriving part of town in contrast to the degradations of another section of the city. The West End is healthy because individuals can see and emulate each other, and they keep their environment free from dirt. Conversely, the East End inhabitants are transitory, private, and neglectful. The underground *flâneur* is most comfortable walking these streets because he has things to hide. Hyde lives in the East part of London where filth and crime thrive. He wanders the city at night, seeking ingredients for his potion and pursuing his degraded pleasures. His distinctive habits of walking and conversation mark him unambiguously as threatening

Other, embodying contemporary fears about Jews, de-evolved humans, and the underground *flâneurs* who threaten the status quo. Hyde's rough tread draws the professional man's attention, and his rude conversational style reinforces existing prejudices. When others impose social expectations on him, he breaks out in animal-like fury. Hyde clearly cannot be allowed to walk free.

The bourgeois professional is on the case. He appears to be everything Hyde is not. Utterson, as middle-class representative, holds himself out as a model of piety, restraint, and self-denial. He works hard to suppress his baser instincts, the result of which makes him a largely unattractive character to the narrator, who describes Utterson as dry and dusty. Jekyll fails miserably to live up to Utterson's example and, under this extreme pressure, turns to extreme measures. On the surface, it appears as though the text establishes crude binaries, rewarding the virtuous Utterson as hero and the most natural, appropriate heir to the nation's wealth. However, Stevenson's novella does not just compare and contrast the underground *flâneur* to the bourgeois professional. Instead, *Jekyll and Hyde* exposes the ease with which the bourgeois professional will sacrifice his superior virtues when he feels threatened. The result is that the professional begins to look more and more akin to the deviant. Utterson's walking habits, which are so contemplative in nature when he is in a state of leisure, change entirely when pursuing Hyde. The lawyer stalks Hyde at all hours of the day and night and hounds his friend to death. Similarly, upstanding citizens engage in harmful conversational practices under stress. Enfield indulges in idle talk gossip while Utterson gossips maliciously. Both characters speculate wildly about why Jekyll associates with Hyde. Utterson takes his conversational vices further by lying and harassing other

characters in service of the public good. Dr. Lanyon, for his part, is culpably silent, endangering the society further and obstructing justice. In short, the text reveals what it truly means to be an upstanding member of the middle classes. One must be a sanctimonious bore under normal circumstances and willing to sacrifice those hard-won "virtues" in service to the status quo when necessary.

Chapter Two: Artistic Self-Fashioning and Conversation in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*

Introduction

Oscar Wilde's diverse *oeuvre* of children's stories, plays, poetry, and essays of varying lengths and content have, at their core, a common set of values. They all attest to their author's sustained romance with good conversation, which, according to Wilde, forms the basis of mutual human regard. In *Epistola: In Carcere Et Vinculis* Wilde wrote to Bosie that "the bond of all companionship, whether in marriage or in friendship, is conversation" (432). Wilde's characters routinely engage in witty verbal exchange, which, in turn, leads to some epiphany. By eavesdropping on the conversation between Cyril and Vivian in "The Decay of Lying," for example, we learn about the failures of modern literature and what fiction should do instead. Realism is characterized by its strict adherence to the most banal facts of daily life and reflects badly upon the middle classes whose dreams cannot produce "even a fine nightmare among them" (940). Their impoverished imagination disgusts Vivian's artistic sensibility for its threatening dullness. The danger of the bourgeois obsession with art that mimics the most mundane features of day-to-day existence is readily apparent to those who understand that "life imitates art far more than art imitates life" (941). Dullness in art will influence real-world interactions; however, the telling of "beautiful untrue things," posits Vivian, serves as a remedy to the modern condition (943). Consequently, Vivian calls for a return to lying in literature (923). Characters should live in a fictional universe that is home to fanciful creatures and gives rise to impossible events. In short, the artist's function is primarily to initiate and sustain great, entertainingly imaginative conversations.

Despite this appeal to the imagination in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891), which, according to Wilde's principles, could easily lend itself to tedium, the text musters the forces of genre and advantageous rhetorical maneuvering to communicate observations and concerns about modernity. His contempt for bourgeois realism proved to be no obstacle to Wilde's social engagement, which has been well-documented. For example, Kerry Powell and Peter Raby note that "Wilde's work, and indeed his remarkable life, was carried on in perpetual dialogue with the social conditions of his time" (xxiii). Powell and Raby use the term "dialogue" to describe Wilde's approach, which aptly describes the conversational nature of Wilde's style. *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is a political text that engages verbally with turn-of-the-century modern ideologies. Some characters are, for instance, deeply concerned about dandyism and idleness that they perceive as arresting social progress. They consequently engage in moralizing speeches. In "The Critic as Artist" Gilbert dismisses "improving conversation" because it is "merely the foolish method by which the still more foolish philanthropist feebly tries to disarm the just rancor of the criminal classes" (Wilde 971). Moreover, the text itself frustrates the earnestness with which these discussions normally take place. There is a certain amount of flippancy about highly connected philanthropists and middle-class gossips in the novel. Major characters employ humor, pithy witticisms, and insouciance in response to the serious, heartfelt reflections of more conventional characters. However, although conversations of this type are class-bound and a product of leisure, they have an earnestness of their own. Leisured men have the time and ease with which to observe their surroundings and define themselves in opposition to the status quo.

Proceeding from such observations, Chapter Two supplements the issues raised in Chapter One. There, I argued that *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* describes, in part, the self-serving fictions of respectability that the professional man tells himself and models for others. In his leisure hours, he walks and talks a certain way that lends itself to the demands for transparency and that governs his conduct while at work. In short, there is no time off for the man of business, who enjoys a type of false leisure because his time is never his own. However, any middle-class aspirant can endorse and attempt to follow this example. The text also suggests that doing so is a means of attaining middle-class respectability. Yet *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* ultimately reveals the true nature of bourgeois values to be closer to those of the underground *flâneur*, whom the middle-class man despises and seeks to eradicate. There are, in fact, times when the professional man must alter his conduct to protect his way of life. Consequently, the novella reveals the hypocrisies of middle-class morality. For its part, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is also critical of bourgeois values. However, I suggest that the text illuminates what it means to live and converse while enjoying true leisure. Only those with enough money and status can afford to live a life of their own making, independent of the prying, judgmental middle-class gaze. Aristocrats therefore have the opportunity, whether they capitalize on it or not, to truly engage in and model for others innovative culture-shaping work. I argue that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* defines through example what that kind of culture-shaping leisure does and does not look like through characters' conversational values and their personal responses to art.

The similarities between the two texts are well documented, and my discussion of these texts in tandem provides a more complete picture of *fin de siècle* social

concerns. First, many of the incidents in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* parallel those found in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. For example, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, like its literary predecessor, employs a doubling trope. Dr. Jekyll completely transforms his body, voice, and physical routines. Dorian Gray also alters his physical characteristics after imbibing a poison. While Jekyll takes a liquid concoction, Dorian, for his part, reads a poisonous book. Furthermore, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, like *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, takes a step back to view broadly the realities of London life. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* describes the realities of the thriving business district in sharp contrast to the fearsome East End. Occasionally, aristocratic characters in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* wander out in the tawdry, dangerous London backways. For example, after confronting Sibyl, Dorian walks the London streets as a *flâneur* and observes the comings and goings of people around him. He sees drunkards cursing and "chattering to themselves like *monstrous apes*," and children, grotesque in aspect, "huddled upon door-steps" (75, emphasis mine). Dorian, like Hyde, often retreats to the shadowy parts of town and frequents the London backways in search of sordid pleasures. His footsteps quicken and his furtive glances check to see if he is followed (155). Additionally, Dorian murders Basil in a savage act just as Hyde murders Sir Danvers, and both murderers avoid, at all cost, the illuminating "beam" of the policeman's lantern (R.L. Stevenson, *Jekyll and Hyde* 133). Finally, Dorian, like Jekyll, is found dead in his locked room, unrecognizably altered at the close of his narrative.

Secondly, scholars have noted the thematic similarities between the two texts. Linda Dryden in *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles* (2003), for example,

discusses the two works in tandem. She notes that "[a]s with *Jekyll and Hyde, The Picture of Dorian Gray* uses the geography of late nineteenth-century London to figuratively underpin the thematic dualism of the text" (124). The divided city serves as the perfect setting for the torn modern psyche. Gothic conventions such as the doubling motif express anxieties about the modern condition with its frightening "blurring of boundaries" (118). Shifting identities and new views of human history gave rise to a need for means of making sense of the dread that accompanied precipitous social changes. The Gothic serves as an artistic form that admits "new perceptions of human history and human nature" (20). According to Dryden, the dualism in these two texts "is predicated upon the existence of a transcendent evil in the modern world, an evil that is manifest in the corrupt bodies like Jekyll and Hyde, and in the transference of corruption from Dorian Gray to his picture" (134). That evil found a form in the real world in the Ripper murders. Additionally, bourgeois anxieties about social vice were fueled by public scandals such as the Maiden Tribute and the Cleveland Street Affair.[8] The Gothic, as I argued in the last chapter, serves as a means of exploring and expressing the nature of these fears.

However, there are important differences between these texts that makes *The Picture of Dorian Gray* a distinctive product of its time. For example, the story is set largely in aristocratic haunts such as drawing rooms and clubs that, according to Dryden, make the text "more overtly subversive of Victorian society than *Jekyll and Hyde* . . . holding a mirror up to the world of upper-class corruption" (121). There are

[8] "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" was a series of articles in the *Pall Mall Gazette* documenting underage female prostitution. The Cleveland Street Scandal brought to light a male brothel that prostituted underage boys.

certainly depictions of upper-class corruption; however, corruption among the lower orders gets its due attention and recognition as well. My interest is, in part, in upper-class failures; however, it is specifically attuned to the social failures to use one's leisure and resources productively. There is, I posit, a stark divide in the depictions of leisure practices along class lines. Where *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is focused on middle-class leisure, such as habits of walking and social communication, to illuminate the true nature of the bourgeois cultural project, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* examines upper-class art appreciation and discourse.

In essence, the socially powerful aristocrat, who can enjoy true leisure, can also operate independently of the bourgeois cultural agenda. His or her life can be a work of art that suggests hitherto unconsidered alternatives. Only the socially powerful and independently wealthy can touch on any subject without fear of reprisal. In fact, proper conversation, according to Gilbert in "The Critic as Artist, "should touch everything but should concentrate itself on nothing" (Wilde 989). The artistic conversationalist, through his or her use of well-timed epigrams, unveils the hypocrisies and futility of those who claim to live by improving moral platitudes. Dorian, who initially strives for a "serious" life of charitable acts, is undoubtedly changed as a result of his many discussions with Lord Henry. Indeed, a great deal of character talk in the novel has a life-shaping effect. However, some characters never change or, after engaging once, disengage from the process entirely. I posit that the text finds problematic the individual who ceases to respond to his or her environment artistically and takes his or her own commitments too seriously. The text's fine nightmare therefore is the life-shaping process interrupted by earnestness, quotidian concerns, and failures of imagination.

Social interaction, as an integral part of that environment, can be a form of artistic expression. Conversation has, to a large extent, taken a backseat in the critical discourse to other cultural concerns in the novel; however, its central role as a leisure activity that changes characters attests to its cultural significance. J.L. Wisenthal in "Wilde, Shaw, and the Play of Conversation" (1994) argues that conversation as employed in "Critic as Artist" and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* highlights both texts' commitment to "the free play of the mind on all subjects" (207). This value is illustrated in *Dorian* by Lord Henry, who "plays with ideas, tossing them into the air and transforming them, letting them escape and recapturing them, making them iridescent with fancy, and winging them with paradox" (208). Furthermore, Lucy McDiarmid, in "Oscar Wilde, Lady Gregory, and Late-Victorian Table-Talk," discusses the role of table-talk as a "part of the taxonomy of 'conversation'" in which one performs at dinner parties for an audience comprised of elites with great social influence (48-49). These aristocratic affairs were private enough to allow guests a certain amount of conversational risk-taking (50). McDiarmind avers that Wilde considered table-talk an effective tool in the sense that it had the "power to charm, and its charm was oppositional"; the talker acts as a valuable "corrupting force" positing social alternatives (57). These values find their way into *Dorian* through Lord Henry's epigrams, whose use "creates a witty, beautiful alternative reality" (59). McDiarmid focuses her analysis on conversation as a means of exerting social influence in a relatively risk-free environment. Conversation's social potential is also an important feature of my discussion. However, I do not restrict my analysis to the self-enclosed

aristocratic world. The term "beautiful" as McDiarmid uses it implies that conversation is also an artistic activity that has the ability to shape the course of an entire civilization.

Consequently, this chapter analyzes the ways in which conversation functions as art. It also concerns the ways in which the text envisions the most socially productive responses to artistic expression. There are three types of conversationalists in the novel. First, there are the tedious talkers who espouse earnest declarations and moral platitudes. These characters cannot produce, nor can they appreciate, conversation on artistic grounds. In the opening sections of this chapter, I examine what the novel means by the life that fails to engage creatively with art. Some characters remain limited precisely because they fail to respond to their environment, thinking they have insight into proper conduct and holding others accountable for failing to live up to those unchanging standards. Other characters, which I also include in this section, have crude and purely commercial attitudes about art. The novel depicts these business-oriented figures as downright grotesque and monstrous.

Next, I analyze the text's commitment to change. Lord Henry, for example, employs rhetoric to shape his own personality and relationships with others. He and others like him are, in short, the agents of creative engagement by producing art. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, I posit, construes the term "art" broadly. According to Kelly Comfort, art is "an all-encompassing word for any object of aesthetic production—from painting to poetry; from music to sculpture; from prose to interior design . . . not limited to one particular artistic medium" (4). Conversation is, I argue, a means of aesthetic production in the novel. And traditional modes of artistic expression, whether they be painting or theater, have the potential to initiate great conversations. The England of

Wilde's imagination is home to an embarrassment of artistic riches. However, only a few characters realize and take advantage of these gifts in the text. Finally, this chapter reads closely the figure of Dorian Gray, who is initially static but who changes radically because of a thought-provoking discussion. However, he ultimately chooses the unchanging and unchanged life over perpetual creative engagement, thereby squandering his potential. Ultimately, the text privileges responses to art, construed broadly, that provoke contemplation, self-fashioning, and change.

Inherent to my analysis are the concepts of aestheticism as a view of art and as a view of life. Proper conversation as a view of art under the theory of aestheticism means, for my analysis, attaching "an unusually high value to the form of the artwork as opposed to the subject matter" (Comfort 2). I employ this sense of aestheticism when discussing Lord Henry's epigrams as well as his method of delivery. Lord Henry also adopts a distinctive personal style and response to artistic expression in his daily life that invokes a different notion of aetheticism. Aestheticism as a view of life involves "the act of treating life in the spirit of art" (3). Under this definition "[w]hat emerges *in art* as the self-contained and self-sufficient artwork manifests itself *in life* in the figure of the solipsistic aesthete or dandy who creates himself in a similarly conceived form of artistic expression and chooses an equally unique and independent existence" (3). The individual views his or her life as a work of art similar to any other. The key concepts, inherent in this definition and which I focus on in my analysis of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* include the sense of uniqueness and the commitment to independence as characteristics of creative responses to art in the novel. Characters that embody these traits are necessarily oppositional to the status quo because they privilege art "as an

alternative to the materialist ethic of industrial-capitalist society that undermined the place of art and the artist in the changing marketplace" (3). However, its independence does not presuppose isolation. Linda Dowling argues that "[d]ecadence emerges, in short, as a counterpoetics of disruption" (*Language* x). Art certainly maintains its autonomy but also "oversteps the boundaries of the other spheres, trespasses on their terrain, and proceeds to determine their content" (Comfort 11). I therefore posit that *Dorian* envisions a particularly robust version of aestheticism that is essentially generative.

Stagnant Attitudes and Commercial Responses to Art

In this first section of Chapter Two, I define, through example, what *Dorian* means by the life that fails to engage with its environment artistically. This failure is exemplified, in part, by those who hold a theory of life that celebrates constancy, and which adherents cling to and defend avidly. Characters that exhibit these attitudes include upper-class luncheon guests and Lord Henry's uncle, Lord Fermor. As I endeavor to show, these characters have simple views and overwrought outbursts. In short, moralists privilege content over form and end up boring everyone. This attitude is easily dismissed and ridiculed by characters with more sophisticated responses to life and art. For instance, Lord Henry is quick to remark on his uncle's hypocrisies. Less obviously ridiculous, perhaps, are the party-goers' earnest discussions about social reform, which never result in real-world action. These ineffectual aristocrats are irreparably wedded to their self-delusion and complaisance. Finally, the novel criticizes commercial responses to art. The text finds troubling those characters that employ art instrumentally. The Jewish theater owner, for example, embraces middle-class business

values and uses art to serve his profit-making ends. He also suggests that his artists, notably Sybil, are commodities that he can essentially pimp in exchange for Dorian's continued patronage. The Jew, as fully engaged in the market and committed to market-driven values to the exclusion of other responses to art, is depicted as a monstrous grotesque and a perversion of art connoisseurship.

The Art of Self-Delusion and Complaisance

Complaisant characters in *Dorian Gray* are the objects of ridicule precisely because they isolate themselves, never change, and are far too earnest. Early in the book, Lord Henry visits his uncle, Lord Fermor, who is the very definition of complaisance. He is certainly leisured, having "set himself to the serious study of the great aristocratic art of doing absolutely nothing" (Wilde 30). However, his practice of doing nothing includes a certain amount of social disengagement and an even greater quantity of self-delusion. The narrator tells us that he is an "old bachelor, whom the outside world called selfish because it derived no particular benefit from him" (29). His political commitments are as routinized as his habits of going to his club and consulting his English Blue-Book. The narrator notes that "[i]n politics he was a Tory, except when the Tories were in office, during which period he roundly abused them for being a pack of Radicals" (30). Both positions, however, are rooted in conservative values. Lord Fermor fears for the future of his country from the solitude and safety of his armchair, where "he always said that the country was going to the dogs. His principles were out of date, but there was a good deal to be said for his prejudices" (30). His prejudices, in fact, are his principles, which also include a deep suspicion of Lord Henry's dandyism.

He asks, "[W]hat brings you out so early? I thought you dandies never got up till two, and were not visible till five" (3). Dandies like Lord Henry, according to Lord Fermor, waste most of the day and have a disturbing preoccupation with middle-class values as they "imagine that money is everything" (31). Lord Henry does not pass up the opportunity to illuminate the hypocrisy of his uncle's assertion by retorting that "when they grow older they know [that money is everything]" (31). Lord Fermor's prejudices are the product of his remaining a disengaged bachelor, with too much money and too many unchallenged opinions.

Similarly, the guests at Lord Henry's aunt's luncheon hold their prejudices dear, do little self-reflection, follow popular trends, and are socially sterile. The company is, to Lord Henry's amusement, largely immovably earnest. For example, the narrator notes that the politically Radical Sir Thomas Burdon "followed his leader in public life, and in private life followed the best cooks, dining with the Tories, and thinking with the Liberals, in accordance with a wise and well-known rule" (35). Sir Thomas, while espousing social reform, socializes comfortably with conservatives. His opinions clearly conflict with his way of life; however, they are nonetheless unremarkable in that they follow popular trends, which have become acceptable rules of conduct. Next to Sir Thomas sits Mr. Erskine, who remains largely silent because "as he once explained to Lady Agatha, [he had] said everything that he had to say before he was thirty" (35). He is not an evolving human but is committed to remaining stagnant and silent. One wonders why this makes for a desirable companion at such a gathering in the first place. Finally, and by slight contrast, there is Lord Faudel, who is described as "a most intelligent middle-aged mediocrity, as bald as a Ministerial statement in the House of

Commons" (35). Although Lord Faudel is uninspiring, he intelligently reflects on the conversational manner of his neighbor, Mrs. Vandeleur, who talks "in that intensely earnest manner which is the one unpardonable error, as he remarked once himself, that all really good people fall into, and from which none of them ever quite escape" (35). Their ineffectual discussion about East End reforms provokes Lord Henry's contempt. He remarks that "the nineteenth century has gone bankrupt through an over-expenditure of sympathy" (37). These lunch-party philanthropists pour out their souls about the evils of poverty in a performance of sympathy to each other, resulting in a type of catharsis after which nothing gets done to alleviate actual suffering.

Art and Middle-Class Ideology

Although the well-intentioned aristocrat is socially ineffectual, those who ascribe to middle-class values can be just as static. In fact, many have the opportunity to do actual harm. The major characters in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* quip about middle-class ideology. For example, Lord Henry accuses the middle classes of not being modern, especially when it comes to marriage proposals (66). Additionally, Dorian avers that "[a]s a rule, people who act lead the most commonplace lives. They are good husbands, or faithful wives, or something tedious. You know what I mean—middle-class virtue, and all that kind of thing" (91). According to Dorian, middle-class virtue entails performing a certain predetermined and immutable role. This certainly was a message included in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.* Class is something that is performed and not into which one is born. However, the predictability of middle-class lives makes them boring and unworthy of serious attention. Finally, Dorian

dismisses the gossip about him on class grounds. He tells Basil, "The middle classes air their moral prejudices over their gross dinner-tables, and whisper about what they call the profligacies of their betters in order to try and pretend that they are in smart society, and on intimate terms with the people they slander. In this country, it is enough for a man to have distinction and brains for every common tongue to wag against him" (127). Here, Dorian casts aspersions against middle-class conversational manners, which they use as a means of showing off. Dorian employs the term "gross" to describe eating habits that parallel their propensity to wag their tongues against men of distinction like himself. Their opinions, according to Dorian, usually have a moral cast and take the form of blatant prejudice.

Sometimes, however, those who ascribe to middle-class profit-making values are, according to the text, downright monstrous. The figure of the Jew, for example, encapsulates all that is wrong with mercantile responses to art. While wandering the East End, Dorian comes across a theater run by "[a] hideous Jew" (44). The Jew-manager's appearance draws Dorian's attention. He tells Lord Henry that Isaacs was wearing "the most amazing waistcoat [and]. . . was standing at the entrance, smoking a vile cigar. He had greasy ringlets, and an enormous diamond blazed in the centre of a soiled shirt . . . He was a monster" (44). He sports an unwashed shirt and locks that Dorian describes as "greasy." He is, in one sense, physically repulsive. In "Oscar Wilde's 'Jewish Problem': Salomé, The Ancient Hebrew and the Modern Jewess" (2012). S.I. Salamensky argues that Isaacs "is personally unaesthetic, both in inclination and appearance . . . he threatens to corrode, pervert, and, as it were, degrade decadence by yoking fashion to flash and high art to the crass vernacular . . . Evil combined with

material ugliness is unforgivable" (208). He is vile in part because his personal style purports to reflect fashion but is, in fact, only the product of bad taste. But this is not the only sense in which Isaacs is repellent. His uncleanliness is an image that parallels *fin de siècle* views of Jews as sexually perverse and, consequently, the origin of syphilis, as well as other types of plague (Davison 125-26). The reader learns later on that he may be exploiting Mrs. Vane sexually. She tells Sibyl, "Mr. Isaacs advanced us fifty pounds to pay off our debts, and to get a proper outfit for James" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 53). And he turns his attention to Sibyl, who detests the way he talks to her (53). The Jew, as the repository of Victorian anxieties about sexually transmitted disease and "deviant" sexual practices (Davison 125), is the threatening sexual predator in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*.

These sexually based fears are related to cultural concerns about an emerging credit economy. The Jew in late nineteenth-century Gothic fiction also embodies distrust of "monopoly capitalism" (Dryden *The Modern Gothic*, 125), which, like sexual "depravity," was taken to be a symptom of national decline grounded in moral turpitude (123). The theater owner is also "greasy" in the sense that he attempts to solicit Dorian's patronage in a slick manner. The narrator reports that he greets Dorian, Basil, and Lord Henry "with an oily, tremulous smile" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 69). Furthermore, his over-the-top diamond and "fat jeweled hands" are not only bad fashion choices, but are signs of conspicuous consumption that mark him as fully ensconced in the market (69). These attributes make him a fearsome monster indeed. Gothic turn-of-the-century fictions, like *Dracula* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray,* feature Jewish vampire villains as a displacement tactic, whereby the dominant culture shifted concerns about its own

activities onto a "Jewish doppelgänger" (Davison 124). These fears included suspicion of the emergent credit economy in which the "vampiric Wandering Jew" was thought to possess demonic powers of converting paper (stocks) into real wealth (4). Consequently, Jewish stockbroker usurers were often portrayed as "low, shady characters engaged in despicable dealings" (122-23). Isaac's engagement with art is particularly problematic. There is something very wrong in the way that the manager appropriates Shakespeare. Dorian remarks that he "was rather annoyed at the idea of seeing Shakespeare done in such a wretched hole of a place" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 45). Isaacs attempts to justify himself by appealing to his "passion" for "the Bard"; however, he lays the vicissitudes of the market in the form of his five bankruptcies squarely at Shakespeare's feet (48).

The vampiric Jew-manager in *Dorian* sucks the life from art and uses his artists to serve his own ends. Isaacs stands at the front of his grimy theater to solicit an audience as a pimp would seek out custom. Additionally, he approaches Dorian after his first theater-going event and offers to "introduce" him to Sibyl Vane (Wilde *Dorian Gray* 47). He wishes to secure Dorian's continued patronage essentially by prostituting Sibyl. A common theme in *Dracula* and other fictions of the time is the lascivious Jewish man "who may convert Christian women into prostitutes" (Davison 132). By offering to serve as a conduit in this way, the Jew manager "reduces both art and women to their commercial exchange value" (133). Unsurprisingly, the manager is confused by Dorian's repugnance and his response that "Juliet had been dead for hundreds of years" (Wilde *Dorian Gray* 47). Dorian responds aesthetically to Sibyl's

performance. Conversely, the Jew manager responds purely to his actor's commercial potential.

The effects of the manager's attitude are palpable. The productions he oversees are tawdry, tacky affairs. Dorian's first experience at the theater is to see a production of Romeo and Juliet. The gaudy décor and "vulgar" drop scene stare Dorian "in the face" as though defiantly challenging his aesthetic sensibility (45). The production itself is a festival of bad taste. Dorian explains to Lord Henry that "Romeo was a stout elderly gentleman, with corked eyebrows, a husky tragedy voice, and a figure like a beer-barrel. Mercutio was almost as bad. He was played by a low-comedian, who had introduced gags of his own and was on most friendly terms with the pit. They were both as grotesque as the scenery, and that looked as if it had come out of a country-booth" (45). The aged and unattractive Romeo is too miscast and repulsive a specimen for Dorian's imaginative engagement. The actor who portrays Mercutio is even worse. He ad-libs because, in his mind at least, he is much more humorous than Shakespeare. One can only imagine the improvements this Mercutio makes to the text. He panders to the masses in the pit, who carry oranges and drink ginger-beer, and engage in the "terrible consumption of nuts" (45). Lord Henry perhaps articulates this type of repulsion best when he says, "I quite sympathize with the rage of the English democracy against what they call the vices of the upper orders. The masses feel that drunkenness, stupidity, and immorality should be their own special property" (12). Both classes exhibit most of the same vices; however, leisured men like Dorian and Lord Henry have the ability to appreciate and respond to great art, and they know bad art when they see it. Conversely,

most of the actors and certainly the audience largely reflect the Jewish manager's insensibility to art.

This section has argued that *Dorian* defines what it means by complaisance through the habits and conversational peculiarities of certain aristocratic characters. Additionally, the text examines the harm done by characters who have a purely instrumental response to art. Lord Fermor is the quintessential complaisant aristocrat who, from the comfort of his club or home, vaguely grumbles about the decline of the country and decries the habits of modern men. However, this is anecdotal evidence. Consequently, the text transitions to a larger view of the earnest but ineffectual aristocrat or hanger-on when it examines closely the types of conversations and interactions that take place at Aunt Agatha's luncheon. Lord Henry's insight is profound when he observes the catharsis exacted by earnest, armchair philanthropists. Their sentimental outbursts fizzle and lead to no real social change. These ineffectual philanthropists theorize about East End suffering but have little insight into the evils that lurk in the dark London corners. A dangerous predator is stalking the streets, siphoning life from art and artists alike. The Jew, as represented in *Dorian* has a purely commercial attitude to art. He solicits, like a pimp, custom for his theater and offers his artists to the highest bidder for sexual gratification. This anti-Semitic stereotype of the Jew-manager is the embodiment of displaced social anxieties about disease, sexual perversion, and a credit-based economy, as well as other cultural changes. Through the Jew, the text illuminates the destructive effects of mercantile responses to art. Commercial attitudes, such as Isaacs's, degrade the work as well as the artist, who becomes, under the Jew's management, an object with an exchange-value.

Insight, Artistic Self-Fashioning, and Conversational Facility

In this section, I argue that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* emphasizes the life in communion with and shaped by art. By this, I mean the life that is continually undergoing a process of invention and development in response to aesthetic stimuli. Again, however, the text illuminates what it means by this through example. Two major characters model, in different ways, this mode of living in the text: Lord Henry Wotton and Basil Hallward. Basil believes in the value of conversation, produces great art, and engages productively with it; however, he is a tad too earnest. Earnestness is likely what leads to his downfall. He becomes obsessed with one subject, returning to it time and again, unable to break from its seductive pull. Ultimately, this obsession leads to his death. Lord Henry's great charm, on the other hand, is perhaps his lack of commitment to anything but change. His life and demeanor are aesthetic creations in themselves. He carefully controls his voice and gestures for maximum effect. Through him, the text broadly construes the term "art" to concern certain theater productions, acting, and fine art. However, it also includes personal invention under this category. Furthermore, *Dorian* contemplates great conversations as works of art with inherent value. Lord Henry tells Dorian, "Our grand-mothers painted in order to try and talk brilliantly. *Rouge and esprit* used to go together" (43). Painting their faces inspired these women to great conversational heights, and their *esprit* had to match the vibrancy of their outward appearance. Great personalities and conversations work closely in a similar fashion and can have a powerful effect on those who are properly receptive to art. Lord Henry champions the virtues of conversation as a means of stimulating change in Dorian Gray.

Even though he claims that he eschews influence, Lord Henry is not himself immune to the effects of art.

Basil Hallward's One Brilliant Moment

Basil Hallward, although a generally boring conversationalist, has his moments of brilliance. Consequently, I contend that he belongs in this section as a character that has, essentially and intuitively, a productive attitude about art. However, conventional conversation is certainly not his forte. Lord Henry tells Dorian that "Basil was really rather dull" (175). Furthermore, he speculates that Basil and Dorian cut ties because Basil bored the young man and because, as a bore, he "never forgave" Dorian, which is "a habit bores have" (176). Indeed, Dorian calls him a "prater" (128). Basil's dull conversational manner is perhaps due, in part, to having to earn his living by pandering to wealthy patrons. He tells Lord Henry, "[W]e poor artists have to show ourselves in society from time to time, just to remind the public that we are not savages. With an evening coat and a white tie, as you told me once, anybody, even a stock-broker, can gain a reputation for being civilized" (9). He must seek patronage and talk to the wealthy in such a way as to sell himself as "civilized." As I have shown earlier, many aristocrats in *The Picture of Dorian Gray's* world talk to others by employing earnest moral platitudes. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that Basil must do the same in order to ingratiate himself to them.

However, Basil's own ideas of appropriate discourse also involve a certain earnestness. This is evident in his propensity to make heartfelt speeches mostly to Dorian about morality and art. For example, Basil is concerned about the ways in which

Dorian's name is bandied about in society. He asserts that "[e]very gentleman is interested in his good name. You don't want people to talk of you as something vile and degraded" (126). Basil recognizes the fact that conversation has a profound impact on one's ability to move fluidly in society and advises Dorian to give up his dubious connections. Additionally, he lectures his former protégé on what art is and should be when he avers that it is "unconscious, ideal, and remote . . . it is a mistake to think that the passion one feels in creation is ever really shown in the work one creates. Art is always more abstract than we fancy" (95-96). However, Basil's earnest reflections fail to reach Dorian, who is obsessed with keeping his crimes secret. Finally, there is also the sense that Basil is afraid of language. He begs Lord Henry, "Don't spoil him. Don't try to influence him. Your influence would be bad" (16). He does not want his young friend to change and knows that Lord Henry's skillful use of language could "spoil" his subject.

Although Basil is fearful of some forms of discourse and he is generally not fun to be around, his one moment of brilliant insight redeems his general conversational failures. Lord Henry tells Dorian, "[Basil] only interested me once, and that was when he told me, years ago, that he had a wild adoration for you, and that you were the dominant motive of his art" (175). Essentially, Basil's conversation with Lord Henry at the beginning of the text acts in ways akin to works of art. Basil's sympathetic attempts to explain the nature of Dorian's influence on him reveal a full theory of art and life that the text endorses. For Basil, the purpose of art is to initiate change like the way he is changed when in the presence of Dorian's beauty. He explains, "I knew that I had come face to face with some one whose mere personality was so fascinating that, if I allowed

it to do so, it would absorb my whole nature, my whole soul, my very art itself" (10). Basil means something specific when speaking of Dorian's "personality." Dorian is, for the artist, much more than his physical beauty. To Basil, Dorian's body and soul are in perfect harmony (13). He has a distinctive presence that reminds Basil of "the romantic spirit, all the perfection of the spirit that is Greek" (13). Dorian's personality constitutes for Basil "a suggestion . . . of a new manner" (14). The influence of great personalities, like Dorian's, leads one "to see things differently" and to "think of them differently" (13). The sensitive, artistic perceiver is attuned to and receptive of influence; however, he or she imaginatively engages in and completes the transformation process him- or herself.

Yet, Basil lets Dorian's personality overtake, not just influence, him. Consequently, the artist remains stuck, failing to develop his personality or his craft further. He tells Dorian, "[Y]our personality had the most extraordinary influence over me. I was dominated, soul, brain, and power by you. You became to me the visible incarnation of that unseen ideal whose memory haunts us artists like an exquisite dream" (95). Dorian is a Platonic form come to earth, and Basil is blinded by his brilliance. Basil is a receptive perceiver but he is, perhaps, too receptive. Dorian inspires Basil; however, he becomes obsessed, unable to continue evolving. Consequently, he paints the same subject over again in different guises, including "Paris in dainty armour" and an "Adonis with huntsman's cloak and polished boar-spear." Basil also paints Dorian "[c]rowned with heavy lotus-blossoms . . . on the prow of Adrian's barge," and finally, "leant over the still pool of some Greek woodland, and see[ing] in the water's silent silver the marvel of [his] own face" (95). The artist

recognizes the spirit of art in each of these productions. However, his continual return to the same subject leads to his downfall. He goes back one last time to confront Dorian about his reputation and begs to see the state of his protégé's soul. Dorian shows him one final incarnation of himself as an artistic subject: the grotesque, transformed portrait of Dorian's own making that now only inspires revulsion.

Lord Henry and the Art of the Epigram

Lord Henry has a distinctive style that highlights his conversational facility and aesthetic response to language. He believes that language has great power and taps into that potential in order to augment his sense of self. Verbal exchange can have a musical quality of its own, which makes it an effective form of artistic expression. Dorian sees this when he compliments his new friend on his beautiful voice (18) and notes that "[t]here was something in his low, languid voice that was absolutely fascinating" (21). The melodic tones of Lord Henry's voice resonate with Dorian, who is hypnotized by the very sounds. This is not an accident. Lord Henry self-consciously employs the power of language not only in order to seduce Dorian into a continued companionship, but to perform his dandy persona.

The dandy is necessarily a man of leisure, who seeks to impress his audience by his very appearance and way of life. Charles Baudelaire explains that he is *"[l]'homme riche, oisif, et qui, même blasé, n'a pas d'autre occupation que de courir à la piste du bonheur; l'homme élevé dans le luxe et . . . celui enfin qui n'a pas d'autres profession*

que l'élégance, jouir a toujours" (67).[9] Lord Fermor certainly disdainfully considers his nephew the embodiment of idleness. However, Lord Henry celebrates idleness when he tells Dorian, "You will always be loved, and you will always be in love with love. A *grande passion* is the privilege of people who have nothing to do. That is one use of the idle classes of a country" (44). Those who have the ability to feel, and to feel passionately, are of immense value. However, the dandy does not occupy just any position in the society in which he lives. Others can learn from his example. He is necessarily a man of leisure who has the time and means to cultivate his distinctive aesthetic by using his position to cultivate the air of detached worldliness and mystery (Simpson 17). He does this to achieve a reaction from others. The dandy "effectively creates an impression upon the viewer that [he] is, in fact, superior and worthy of reverence. It is only as a work of art that the dandy receives or attains value—the dandy's worth is measured only inasmuch as [he] can create the vivid impression of aristocratic, intellectual, and social grace while also forcing the viewer, like a work of art, into detached appreciation" (18). Rita Felski further explains that "the dandy can be perceived in aestheticist doctrine as quite useless; exalting appearance over essence, decoration over function, he voices a protest against prevailing bourgeois values that associate masculinity with rationality, industry, utility, and thrift" (1096). In essence, the dandy persona is a carefully crafted work of art meant to impress and inspire others as would any other work of art.

[9] The rich man, idle, even jaded, who has no other occupation than to seek happiness; a man of high luxury . . . one who has no other profession than elegance and the continual pursuit of enjoyment (translation mine).

There is ample evidence to show that Lord Henry holds this attitude about himself and art generally. For example, he studies Dorian as he would a sculpture or painting, and he analyzes, in particular, Dorian's reactions to him. Lord Henry's thoughts are private, and hence, more concrete than the witticisms he espouses in social situations. About art, he reflects that "to the few, to the elect, the mysteries of life were revealed before the veil was drawn away . . . [N]ow and then a complex personality took the place and assumed the office of art, was indeed, in its way, a real work of art, Life having its elaborate masterpieces, just as poetry has, or sculpture, or paintings" (51). The artistic personality reveals the mysteries of life to those who are attuned and receptive to its lessons. Lord Henry finds that "it was through certain words of his, musical words said with musical utterance, that Dorian Gray's soul had turned to this white girl," Sybil Vane (51). He therefore has chosen his method of communication very carefully and watches the effects of his influence to see what Dorian will make of it. However, Lord Henry does not just observe Dorian. The narrator explains that "[o]ur weakest motives were those of whose nature we were conscious. It often happened that when we thought we were experimenting on others we were really experimenting on ourselves" (53). Lord Henry thinks he is observing his friend in a purely scientific manner as the detached observer; however, he is also moved by him, and so his experiments stimulate self-reflection and further action.

Lord Henry's conversational manner is closely tied to his views about himself, and is an essential feature of his persona. Consequently, conversation is its own work of art in the text. Lord Henry's personal conversational style is unique for its almost complete reliance on epigrams, which he uses to rearrange life and people to his liking.

Dorian complains, "You cut life to pieces with your epigrams" (82). While he readily perceives vulnerabilities in his unsuspecting audience, Lord Henry's insouciant dandy persona makes his own commitments notoriously difficult to pin down. However, the artistic epigram in Wilde's works has, until fairly recently, escaped critical attention. In "Oscar Wilde and the Epigram" (2006), Rebecca Lane notes that while Wilde himself preferred to call his memorable phrases aphorisms and paradoxes, the epigram as a "short poem with a witty turn of thought; or a wittily condensed expression in prose" more aptly describes the nature of these expressions (33). The epigrammatic formula requires the speaker to begin with a general statement in the third person, followed by a striking personal comment (35). Indeed, Wilde crafted his epigrams carefully. Lane observes that there is a "pleasing rhythm" to these expressions whereby Wilde pays careful attention to syllabic stress and assonance to create "phrases that are pleasurable to speak and enjoyable to hear because they have a mellifluous quality." (37). Consequently, they are appropriate to Lord Henry's seductive style of discourse. Epigrams are also, in their musicality, works of art. Furthermore, they make suggestions in the same light as any other art form. Lane observes that "[t]he epigram as a contrived form serves as a disguise for Wilde's characters but it is simultaneously a vehicle for truth" in the sense that they highlight their own artifice in order to expose poses for what they are (42-43). The blunt, overt, and heavy-handed moralizing of some characters in *Dorian* is a crude tool next to the delicate, artistic use of language embodied in the epigram.

In this section, I have argued that the text has an expanded view of what constitutes art as well as productive responses to its power. As Basil says and Lord

Henry reflects, that inherent value of art is its ability to act as a "suggestion" of something beyond the self. Dorian's personality suggests to Basil a new subject about which to paint. Additionally, Basil's reflections about the ways in which Dorian inspires him suggests something to Lord Henry, who, in turn, suggests a different mode of life to his young friend. Lord Henry's persona and conversational manner are works of art in themselves that stimulate transformation in others. Consequently, conversation can, according to the text, be an artistic form that has a life-shaping effect. However, Lord Henry is not, as we have seen, immune to influence. He responds to Basil's speech by working his artistic influence on Dorian. Additionally, Dorian's emergent personality is a source of inspiration in the sense that Lord Henry reflects on the changes he sees in his young friend and adjusts to them.

Characters in Transition

In this final section of my chapter, I examine Dorian Gray's responses to art. I first analyze his reactions to Lord Henry's persona and conversational style. I note that when Dorian meets Lord Henry for the first time, he is highly receptive to the arts his new friend and mentor employs. Dorian's receptivity leads him to change dramatically in response to the power of language-as-art. However, he exhibits less productive and even potentially harmful attitudes to art when he mistakes Lord Henry's epigrammatic style for earnestness. As the story progresses, it becomes clear that, instead of basking in the musical quality of his new friend's discourse for its own sake, Dorian takes the content of what he says to heart. He commits his crimes with Lord Henry's words upon his own lips. Consequently, Dorian, after having positive responses to the influence of

art, turns earnest himself, opting to remain static as opposed to living up to his full potential.

Dorian is young and wealthy, and he has the leisure and autonomy to develop his capacities. He is a member of the leisured aristocracy and answers to no one. Through Dorian, the text examines class relationships and the ability of the aristocracy to exert positive influence and examples on those lower down on the socio-economic ladder. There is an example of positive class interaction in his own family tree. Lord Fermor explains to Lord Henry that Dorian's mother was aristocratic by birth; however, she chose to marry beneath her class for love. Margaret Devereux married a "penniless young fellow, a mere nobody, a subaltern in a foot regiment" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 32). We do not even learn Dorian's father's name. He is a "nobody," a "pigeon," a bird that no one notices. His grandfather was the late Lord Kelso, who is suspected of having Dorian's father killed and who draws a great deal of attention for quarrelling over cab fares (32). Consequently, Margaret's positive association is undermined by the mean-spirited aristocrat who cannot even pay for the services he owes. Yet, Dorian's affections are not class-bound. He leads Sibyl Vane to think class mobility feasible by courting the young actress. Her brother James worries about his sister's mysterious suitor, thinking that this "young dandy who was making love to her could mean her no good" (58). James has good reason to worry, given the fact that he and his sister are themselves the illegitimate offspring of an illicit relationship between their mother and an aristocrat. James melodramatically "longs to break the bonds of class domination" (Hultgren 217). But Mrs. Vane reassures her son that his father was "a gentleman. Indeed he was highly connected" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 62). When James suggests his

father was a scoundrel, Mrs. Vane reminds him that she had no mother for guidance and protection (62). By implication, Sybil has Mrs. Vane to protect her. However well-intentioned she is, Mrs. Vane is no match for the leisured aristocratic male.

Dorian's Receptiveness

Dorian seems to be a promising young man with potential initially because he responds positively to the influence of good art. In fact, Lord Henry's conversation has a profound influence on Dorian. Lord Henry engages in a certain amount of flattery concerning Dorian's beauty. However, he also has profound things to say about conversation-as-art when he advises Dorian, "Don't squander the gold of your days, listening to the tedious, trying to improve the hopeless failure, or giving away your life to the ignorant, the common, and the vulgar" (23). Dorian should, instead, spend his time in the company of good conversationalists. The young man learns his lessons well. He tells Lady Henry, "If one hears bad music, it is one's duty to drown it in conversation" (42). Dorian is generally receptive to and acknowledges the power of language. The narrator reports, "Words! Mere words! How terrible they were! How clear, and vivid, and cruel! One could not escape from them. And yet what a subtle magic there was in them! They seemed to be able to give a plastic form to formless things, and to have a music of their own as sweet as that of viol or lute" (20). Lord Henry's discourse has a keen effect in the sense that he uses language to paint the tragedy of Dorian's youth and beauty clearly and vividly with language. Words also have, for Dorian, a musical quality that gives them substance and weight. He recognizes and, as we will see, capitalizes on his observations about the magical qualities of

language. In essence, Dorian is awakened to the immense power of art and, in particular, of language to paint and musically express mental images and, consequently, to stir the imagination to action.

This power frightens Dorian at first for its ability to challenge his conception of self. The narrator observes that Dorian "felt afraid of him [Lord Henry], and ashamed of being afraid. Why had it been left for a stranger to reveal to him to himself? He had known Basil Hallward for months, but the friendship between them had never altered him" (22). The passage illuminates the extent to which masculine identity is not a natural kind but "might be a mode of performance, a set of social scripts to be perpetually enacted and revised" (Adams 220). Lord Henry's conversation prompts Dorian to alter and expand his worldview and engage in a modicum of introspection. Dorian reflects angrily on his sterile friendship with Basil, who wants to keep him stagnant. Consequently, Dorian comes to understand that the true value of art lies in its ability to stimulate change. This beautiful stranger with his musical voice has planted the seeds of self-doubt, which is necessary for growth. Dorian no longer smugly and ignorantly passes through life but begins to reflect on his own nature. His response is an appropriate reaction to art as he listens "open-eyed and wondering" to these new ideas (Wilde *Dorian Gray* 23). Additionally, he continues to seek Lord Henry's conversation. He asks his new mentor, "And you will promise to talk to me all the time? No one talks so wonderfully as you do" (40). Dorian is frightened when he first comes to understand the power of conversation. However, instead of eschewing this new influence in his life, he seeks its continual influence. In essence, Dorian is moved to make art a permanent feature in his life.

Taking Control of Artistic Power

Dorian soon learns to harness this power for himself when he employs language to change his fate and that of others. The ways in which he employs art to serve his own ends, however, are essentially problematic because he *treats* art instrumentally. The narrator reports that the young man uses the magical qualities inherent in language to alter his own physical properties. He notes that Dorian "had uttered a mad wish that he himself might remain young, and the portrait grow old; that his own beauty might be untarnished, and the face on the canvas bear the burden of his passion and his sins; that the painted image might be seared with the lines of suffering and thought, and that he might keep all the delicate bloom and loveliness of his then just conscious boyhood" (77). In wishing himself to remain an unsullied work of art in this way, Dorian alters the painting. He treats art as a means of serving his own ends when he asks for changes to Basil's masterpiece, which seem to parallel the degradations of Shakespeare committed by the actors at the Jewish manager's theater. The Jewish manager views art as a means of making money and altering it to suit his audience. Dorian, for his part, wishes to retain his social value as a living *objet d'art*. It is at this point that Dorian ceases to have appropriate and productive responses to art. When he uses the painting to serve his own ends instead of appreciating it for its own sake, he remains stagnant while the portrait continues to age and bear the scars of his sins.

In claiming that Dorian perverts the ends of art, I also argue that the text espouses a view of the nature and purpose of art in accord with Wilde's own critical treatises on the subject. In "The Critic As Artist," Wilde writes that "when the work is

finished it has, as it were, an independent life of its own, and may deliver a message for other than that which was put into its lips to say" (985). The finished work of art becomes its own life form that works upon the world in its own organic and unpredictable ways. Dorian's painting, according to the artist, is finished by the opening chapters of the novel. Basil definitively says, "It is quite finished" (Wilde *Dorian Gray* 24). Furthermore, Dorian understands the fact that this finished masterpiece is a kind of living entity. When Basil threatens to destroy the painting, Dorian cries, "Don't Basil, don't . . . It would be murder!" (27). However, by altering it as he does, Dorian fails to respect that independent life form.

The ideal of artistic independence was fashionable at the time. Aestheticism is a philosophy of life that does essential culture-shaping work. Ruth Livesey notes that Aestheticism generally is "perhaps best captured as a belief that taste and the pursuit of beauty should be chief principles in not only art, but also life" (261). In fact, people can inspire creativity in others as a painting or concerto does. In *Modernist Aesthetics and Consumer Culture in the Writings of Oscar Wilde* (2007), Paul L. Fortunato argues that art, for Wilde, "is concerned with the development of a tradition, the shaping of culture" (107). Additionally, according to Fortunato, Wilde conceives of art, in part, as "beauty, and beautiful people, as culture-shapers, as being at the heart of what culture is" (106). Those I have identified as having productive responses to art understand this fact. Through the cultivation of his personal style and seductive musicality, Lord Henry, for example, has an effect on his culture. His very being poses an alternative to existing modes of life. While some readers respond negatively to Lord Henry's aesthetic on moral grounds, "*Dorian Gray* explores the risks of transposing art and life, or applying

aesthetic judgements to people and conflating beauty with virtue" (Livesey 266). Dorian is clear that he finds a kind of attraction in ugliness when he asserts that "[u]gliness was the one reality. The coarse brawl, the loathsome den, the crude violence of disordered life, the very vileness of thief and outcast, were more vivid, in their intense actuality of impression, than all the gracious shapes of Art, the dreamy shadows of Song" (155). The problem is not necessarily that the types of aesthetic Dorian pursues are low, but that his instrumental attitude constitutes an aesthetic dead-end. Dorian cannot create anything new because he is far too jealous of his own image. He confesses to Basil, "I am jealous of everything whose beauty does not die. I am jealous of the portrait you have painted of me" (26). The Dorian of Basil's painting was made at a much earlier stage of in the sitter's development. Dorian, therefore, is forever caught in the reflections of his past and can have little creative impact on the future of his culture.

Dorian's misguided, problematic response corrupts his ability to engage creatively with history. Wilde's eponymous character has a static response to Basil's masterpiece; he cannot let it go and admit change. In fact, he wants to always remain as he once was. This response is at odds with an appropriate appreciation, which always entails creative engagement. Wilde insists in "The Decay of Lying" that "[t]he one duty we owe to history is to rewrite it" (979). In fact, Wilde's view of history was highly influenced by Walter Pater, whose essay "Winckelmann" "presents ancient Greek culture both as a mythical past . . . [are] as alive and able to affect the present" (Evangelista 24). The past, according to Pater, gives "the modern reader a vantage point of view from which the moral strictures of the nineteenth century and even Christianity can be criticized with strong cultural authority" (24). The same type of engagement

happens with language. In *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford* (1994), Linda Dowling argues that Greek studies at Oxford helped Wilde, among others, to develop a "homosexual code" that acted as a "counterdiscourse able to justify male love in ideal or transcendental terms" (xiii). The Oxford reform movement looked to Hellenism as a means of positing an alternative to Christian theology to allay the cultural anxiety of "stagnation and paralysis threatening to leave England isolated within a system of dying or outmoded ideas" (xiii). Creative engagement with the past therefore allows one the authority and confidence to posit alternatives to existing strictures.

The text clearly indicates that the mysterious book Lord Henry gave to the young man influences his perceptions in a negative, cyclical way, observing that "Dorian Gray had been poisoned by a book. There were moments when he looked on evil simply as a mode through which he could realize his conception of the beautiful" (Wilde *Dorian Gray* 123). The hero of this book has a similar response to his past. Consequently, it is not an open and shut case that *Dorian* endorses determinism rather than interrogating it. Dorian has a propensity to mimic others instead of taking their experiences for what they are: suggestions for new ways of living. The narrator notes that Dorian "could not free himself from the influence of this book" just as Basil cannot free himself from Dorian's influence (105). Dorian himself uses his past as a means to excuse his present actions instead of employing them as a springboard or suggestion of new ways of living.

Some readers want to excuse the impressionistic Dorian by placing the blame for his failures squarely on Lord Henry's shoulders, while others also see Dorian as a

manifestation of evil. For example, Julian Hawthorne, an early reviewer, writes that "Lord Harry plays the part of Old Harry in the story, and lives to witness the destruction of every other person in it. He may be taken as an imaginative type of all that is most evil and most refined in the modern civilization, --a charming, gentle, witty, euphemistic Mephistopheles" (376). More recently, Andrew Eastham in "Aesthetic Vampirism: Pater, Wilde, and the Concept of Irony" (2008) argues that "*Dorian Gray* is a tale of two vampires and an innocent Hegelian Hellenist, Basil Hallward, whose earnest ideals of the sensuous manifestation of artistic spirit can be seen to fail as the vampiric ironists transform the culture of aestheticism" (89). The two vampires to which Eastham refers are, of course, Lord Henry and Dorian Gray. Eastham explains that "[b]y insisting on its autonomy, aestheticism risked the identification of art as an aristocratic posture of irony, its detachment manifested as an icy reserve, a refusal to manifest itself in the public sphere comparable to the vampire's refusal of daylight" (79). Aesthetic autonomy is, at its core, inhuman. However, I and others have argued for aestheticism's capacities for re-engagement with the society in which it is produced. Art's capacities of suggestion leave the possibilities of re-humanization up to the individual. Dorian, of course, fails at this. Lee O'Brien, in "Wilde Words: The Aesthetics of Crime and the Play of Genre in E.W. Hornung's Raffles Stories," (2015) expands on Dorian's limitations, which admit the capacity for evil. Hornung writes that "the perfectly beautiful Dorian . . . is sterile, but his surface conceals the monstrously ugly consequence of action. It is *because* he has the portrait that Dorian can become evil, and evil signified by action . . . The desires he enacts are as limited and trivial as Raffles' felonious depredation. They are conventional: opium addition, sensation fiction

seductions and corruption of both men and women" (665). Hornung's critique is perhaps the most condemning because of its insistence that Dorian seeks the same tired symbols of opposition and is consequently unable to transcend the conventional. Hornung insists that these acts "rely on existing social strictures to guarantee the taboo, the forbidden that is the sole source of their attraction. Dorian's aesthetic sensibilities and aristocratic habits preclude political or revolutionary zeal" (665). Dorian's deterministic worldview and his over-reliance on existing forms are why he fails to develop. His initial positive engagement with art gives way to base mimicry.

As a result of these failures, Dorian's ability to communicate and stimulate creative change in others is severely compromised. His influence is, in fact, largely destructive as he tarnishes reputations and destroys lives. For example, his invective against Sybil Vane motivates the girl to commit suicide. He tells his betrothed, "You used to stir my imagination. Now you don't even stir my curiosity . . . You have spoiled the romance of my life. How little you can know of love, if you say it mars your art! Without your art you are nothing" (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 74). Here, Dorian employs forceful language to communicate the lengths to which Sybil has disappointed him. Sybil, who was once the embodiment of art, provided him with an opportunity to exhibit appropriate responses to art, which should enliven the imagination to a state of romance. Dorian's complaints against Sybil are so harsh, overwrought and melodramatic that he comes to regret his own bad performance and writes Sybil a letter of apology the next day, "imploring her forgiveness, and accusing himself of madness" (81). However, when Lord Henry tells him of Sybil's death, he muses how strange it is that his "first passionate love-letter should have been addressed to a dead girl" (83). His

hope of love and marriage dies as a result of his own artistic failures. In essence, I contend that his language and life become sterile.

It is, perhaps, no wonder that women get very little attention in *Dorian Gray*, and the women who do make an appearance are, by and large, a source of verbal humor or rancor. We learn, for example, little about Lady Henry apart from the fact that she is a messy dresser with an even more untidy emotional life (43). And Lord Henry takes the occasion of Sibyl's death to cut women generally. He remarks that "women never know when the curtain has fallen . . . If they were allowed their own way, every comedy would have a tragic ending, and every tragedy would culminate in a farce. They are charmingly artificial, but they have no sense of art" in their daily lives (85-86). Sibyl has, at least, done Dorian the service of committing suicide instead of insisting on a sixth act. Lady Narborough he describes as "a very clever women" but also "as the remains of really remarkable ugliness" (146). These and other women suffer by mere association with Dorian. Basil complains to Dorian that during dinner with Lord Staveley, "Your name happened to come up in conversation . . . Staveley curled his lip, and said that you might have the most artistic tastes, but that you were a man whom no pure-minded girl should be allowed to know, and whom no chaste woman should sit in the same room with" (126). And he shows little allegiance to Lord Henry when he makes his "sister's name a by-word" (127). In essence, Dorian's conversation is so toxic that even talking to him can ruin a woman socially. Women in the novel are generally vehicles for Lord Henry's wit and ineffectual foils to Dorian's depravity.

The novel certainly highlights male aesthetic culture and art. However, gender divisions are not clear cut in *Dorian.* Felski argues that Dorian's feminization

exemplifies the "blurring of gender roles" as part of "a larger destabilization of conceptions of authenticity within a society whose cultural expressions are increasingly shaped by commodity aesthetics and the logic of technological reproduction" (1097). She points to the *fin de siècle* "preoccupation with style and appearance" and "the mediation of experience and identity through the consumption of mass-produced images, texts, and commodities that renders any appeal to a true self merely another fiction" (1097). Consequently, the text criticizes those who respond badly to the influence of art and who cannot transcend the conventional. This is not just a female problem. Men with whom Dorian associates also fail. For example, the young man is suspected of having a hand in the suicide of a boy in the Guards, and "Sir Henry Ashton . . . had to leave England, with a tarnished name" as a result of his association with the eponymous protagonist (Wilde, *Dorian Gray* 127). He also ruins Adrian Singleton, Lord Kent's only son, and the Duke of Perth (127). These men, attracted to Dorian's physical presence and company, do not engage critically with Dorian but allow him to dictate their actions and responses. Consequently, the focus is not on women per se but on problematic responses to the influence of beauty. This is also a fair critique of Dorian, whose life is essentially marked by a series of toxic relationships and failed love affairs because he allows art too much of an overbearing influence in his life.

His betrayal of art is symbolically realized in his act of murdering Basil. The artist approaches his former friend Utterson-like, begging Dorian to reclaim his "clean name" by getting "rid of the dreadful people" with whom Dorian associates (128). Dorian, motivated to show Basil the state of his soul as expressed in his painting, takes the artist to see his portrait. Basil's reaction to the altered painting before him is one of

astonishment and horror, the full extent of which he describes chiefly in terms of linguistic forms of expression. The painting appeared to be "some foul parody, some infamous, ignoble satire" (130). Here, Basil recognizes the fact that his art has been perverted. What appears before him now is some exaggerated, mocking version that bears little recognizable resemblance to the original. Dorian's response is that the painting reflects on the extent to which "[e]ach of us has Heaven and Hell in him" (131). Indeed, the portrait continues to speak to Dorian as the narrative describes how he "glanced at the picture, and suddenly an uncontrollable feeling of hatred for Basil Hallward came over him, as though it had been suggested to him by the image on the canvas, whispered into his ear by those grinning lips" (132). The feeling Dorian experiences when he looks at the portrait is more than a mere suggestion. The influence of the portrait is overwhelming and interested. It ceases to be the unconscious and remote ideal but instead dictates each step of Dorian's responses to events.

Consequences of Failed Potential

Dorian's failed potential finds expression in earnest conversation and unfulfilled promises. Near the end of the novel, Dorian makes a moral declaration of his resolve to be good (179). He tells Lord Henry, "Yet you poisoned me with a book once. I should not forgive that. Harry, promise me that you will never lend that book to any one. It does harm" (180). Dorian believes that he has been corrupted by art and does not wish to see the same happen to anyone else. In essence, he blames his friend and literature for his misdeeds. The speech is a final example of Dorian's propensity to shift responsibility. Instead of owning his own decisions and directing the course of his own

life, Dorian has been allowing other people and things to rule him. Lord Henry responds that "[a]rt has no influence upon action . . . It is superbly sterile. The books that the world calls immoral are books that show the world its own shame. That is all" (180). Art is, to Lord Henry, that remote and unconscious ideal that reflects truth. What people do with that information is ultimately up to them.

The lame, unfulfilled promises Dorian makes reflect his incomplete development. A significant broken promise frames Dorian's narrative. First, he reneges on his promise to marry Sybil, after which Dorian notices the painting begin to alter. When reflecting on his cruelty, he repeats in his mind things that Lord Henry said to him. For example, the narrator explains that Dorian rationalizes that "women were better suited to bear sorrow than men. They lived on their emotions. They only thought of their emotions. When they took lovers, it was merely to have some one with whom they could have scenes. Lord Henry had told him that, and Lord Henry knew what women were" (78). Dorian can absolve himself of responsibility because Sibyl, as a female prone to drama, uses Dorian and will find another outlet for her needs. In short, Dorian mistakes Lord Henry's overgeneralizations for earnestness. There are other instances in the text where Dorian repeats Lord Henry's opinions. For example, when Dorian kills Basil, he is described as looking upon "the sordid shame of the great city, and now and then he repeated to himself the words that Lord Henry had said to him on the first day they had met, 'To cure the soul by means of the sense, and the senses by means of the soul'" (153). Finally, at the close of his life, Dorian makes a promise to meet Lord Henry at his club, an appointment he has no intention of keeping. The narrator reports that, as Dorian reached the door, "he hesitated for a moment, as if he

had something more to say. Then he sighed and went out" (180). Dorian can no longer speak. None of Lord Henry's epigrams are on his lips to guide his actions. The sensuous life, espoused by Lord Henry, has ultimately left Dorian unfulfilled. He has been living someone else's ideals instead of developing his own nature and aesthetic.

Dorian, who was so intent on saving the life of his painting in the beginning of the novel from Basil's threat, ends up destroying it himself. The narrator reports that Dorian seized the knife with which he killed Basil and stabbed the picture (183). Dorian's last verbal act is a cry "so horrible in its agony that the frightened servants woke" to find their master lying on the floor in his aspect as a man "withered, wrinkled, and loathsome of visage" (183-84). Dorian, who has murdered the artist and alters the work of art to serve his own ends, meets his grisly end. The true nature of his failed life is revealed as a monstrosity.

As I have endeavored to show in this final section of my chapter, Dorian Gray embodies the great promise of the life in communion with art and receptive to its suggestions. Additionally, he represents the manifest disappointment of lost potential. He changes dramatically when he allows art to stir his imagination and work her subtle magic. Lord Henry's melodic voice and conversational facility have a dramatic effect on the young man, causing him to change the way he sees himself and the world. However, Dorian fails to appreciate his new mentor's talents for their own sake as a work of artistic expression "unconscious, ideal and remote." Instead, he takes the content of Lord Henry's speeches to heart and allows art too heavy a hand in his life. Consequently, Dorian's actions are guided by content as opposed to form. In fact, every move he makes is guided by his interpretation of something Lord Henry has said. As a

result, the young man lives someone else's interpretations of and responses to art. Dorian illuminates the extent to which base mimicry, the hallmark of the bourgeois realist tradition, is unsatisfying and unfulfilling. Dorian runs out of subject matter in the end and has nothing left to say.

Conclusion

The Picture of Dorian Gray, as a work of art, is also a profoundly political text. It describes in detail the nature of art production and appreciation as products of unencumbered leisure. Art is, according to the novel, an unconscious, remote ideal that suggests hitherto unconsidered alternative modes of expression and ways of living. Artistic expression is, construed broadly, autonomous; however, it has the capacity to influence and shape life events. In this sense, art is a view of life in which experience serves as the basis for aesthetic enjoyment. Characters adopt various responses to the works of art they encounter during the course of the narrative, and the novel, as I have endeavored to show, illuminates the least and most socially productive responses to the works of art. Conversation can also be a work of art that works its subtle magic on others. However, not everyone understands or appreciates it as a medium of artistic expression. Some characters are blithely complaisant while others are overwrought, yet ultimately ineffectual when engaged in social communication. Lord Fermor and the luncheon guests therefore respond to conversational artistic expression problematically. While these minor characters are largely passive and immune to art's influence, others are monstrous and harmful because they take an instrumental approach to art. In fact, bourgeois attitudes toward art produce the novel's most frightening monsters. Isaacs and some of his actors, for example, change Shakespeare to serve their own ends. The

venue is wrong and actors add their own lines, to Dorian's astonishment and horror. Furthermore, the Jewish manager treats Sibyl as a commodity, offering her up to Dorian in exchange for his continued patronage. The text itself here appears to be committing the same responsive errors it critiques. By demonizing the Jew, similar to the ways in which Dorian transfers his sins onto the portrait, the novel displaces onto the Other its own artistic sins. It therefore seems to embody and perform the instrumental use of artistic expression. The kind of idealism promoted by *The Picture of Dorian Gray* on a surface level is, arguably, bound to fail.

The text, however, seems to suggest that attempting to be receptive to art is worthwhile for a healthy society that wishes to evolve. The text's major characters succeed at least in part to live in harmony with art. Basil produces one great painting and accordingly has one moment of brilliance when he describes in conversation the influence Dorian has had on his life. He therefore succeeds in producing something of value. And although some readers find the content of Lord Henry's speeches repugnant, he takes art's subtle suggestions as a way of shaping his own life as a work of art. Lord Henry self-consciously adopts a distinctive personal style and mode of expression that are meant to be admired. His musical voice, conversation, and physical routines influence Dorian, who initially responds well. Lord Henry prompts Dorian to look at his own life and change his worldview. After his work is done, Lord Henry takes a step back to see what Dorian will make of his life.

However, Dorian, after responding well to Lord Henry's influence, regresses. He asks art to serve his own ends when making his fateful wish. Consequently, Dorian perverts art and turns to middle-class responses. He can, after a time, only mimic what

others have done before him instead of harnessing the art's generative powers. Dorian nourishes himself on Lord Henry's epigrams and mimics the protagonist of the "poisonous book." As a result, he turns into an inhuman vampire, siphoning life from others, including those most dear to him. He is never caught and punished by bourgeois institutions; however, he fails nonetheless. His sterile existence proves tiresome. Dorian runs out of stimuli and subject matter, and his shadow-life proves ultimately unsatisfying. At this point, his painting is, in Basil's words, a "foul parody" and "ignoble satire." However, so is his life, which has turned into a monstrous incarnation in contrast to the life properly lived in accord and in friendship with beauty.

Chapter Three: Colonization, Conversation and the Art of Effective Gaming in *The Golden Bowl*

Introduction

It is difficult to miss the Ververs's colonial project in Henry James's *The Golden Bowl* (1904). These Americans, with their vast wealth, cross the Atlantic in search of Europe's finest treasures. Much as they appropriate objects, Adam and Maggie collect rare personality types and socially useful people. Maggie succeeds in obtaining a title through marriage, aligning herself with both European royalty and America's original discoverers. Her husband, purportedly a descendent of Amerigo Vespucci, comes from a long line of Italian aristocrats whose extravagances and dissipations have left the young man impoverished and susceptible to the temptations of the Verver fortune. Adam Verver's wealth is vast and he seems to use it beneficently when he buys European art to display in an American museum. In so doing, he indoctrinates his countrymen in European art and history, and Europe is where we find him and his daughter at the beginning of the novel. When Adam completes his project, he will also secure his position as a cultural leader, effectively directing his country's development. In essence, Adam loots European treasures in order to secure his role as a cultural founding father. His colonial methods are subtle and the veneer of altruism obscures a darker side of his project that is only revealed when the text takes a closer look at his personal affairs. My aim in this chapter is to show that the Ververs's methods ultimately serve as a model of business-class success for middle-class aspirants who seek class promotion. Maggie learns from her father and reproduces, with a keener sensibility, his techniques, upon which she ultimately improves.

In another apparent philanthropic act, Adam rescues the beautiful, reflective, and independent Charlotte Stant from her financial difficulties when he marries her. Charlotte agrees to the union, which takes a great deal of financial stress off her shoulders. She values her freedom; however, her financial woes make her passion for traveling abroad difficult. Charlotte does not identify closely with her homeland. Instead, her sympathies lie with the European way of life. When she marries Adam, she no longer has to rely on the charity of others. However, marriage puts a unique set of restraints on Charlotte. Her time is not her own because she must constantly play the part of the dutiful wife and make herself ingratiating on a surface level. Things are fine as long as she keeps up appearances; however, Charlotte, who values her freedom immensely, rebels against these expectations by taking a lover. Her partner, Amergio, is also financially dependent on the Verver fortune, and he must be on his best behavior as well. His value emanates from his noble heritage; however, he initially refuses to be another collectable housed in the Verver vaults. Consequently, he, along with Charlotte, form their own illicit alliance in opposition to the Verver agenda.

Maggie becomes aware of her husband's infidelities, and the ways in which she and Adam bring their spouses back into line reveals a sophisticated form of colonization with more lasting effects than those produced by overt violence. Maggie and Adam manipulate conversational norms in game-like fashion to make Amerigo and Charlotte essentially complicit in their own colonization. The Ververs's methods are instructive, and *The Golden Bowl* in a sense teaches middle-class audiences effective ways of non-violent colonization through a gaming strategy. This tactic is helpful to middle-class aspirants because not everyone has Adam's type of wealth, yet the text shows that there

are still ways in which average middle-class people can achieve social dominance. With a little patience and cleverness, they can take a leadership role within their own set. The Ververs purposefully choose a less efficient but more lasting means of securing their interests by foregoing convenience and playing the game properly to its conclusion. In "What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl*, and the Possibilities of Knowledge" (2008), Jonathan Freedman admires Maggie, in particular, for her strategic genius (102). The Ververs successfully achieve their goal, not only by controlling the social conventions that govern conduct and conversations, but also by making their objects complicit in their own colonization, thereby ensuring a more lasting effect.

In this chapter, I first set the foundations for my discussion of the text by exploring the nineteenth-century preoccupation with empire, James's interest in the evolution of nations, and *The Golden Bowl's* emphasis on dead and ascendant empires respectively. The text is, in my view, largely focused on the distinctive style of American informal expansionism. Consequently, I examine closely Adam's altruism to show the self-serving, imperial nature of his project. He plunders Europe's treasures not through warfare but through the power of his pocketbook. This is not quite enough to achieving legitimacy and supremacy abroad. American ruling classes exist in all but name; however, names matter elsewhere in the world. Class is therefore a complicating factor in colonial agendas. Dealing with people is infinitely more complex than simply acquiring objects in straightforward business transactions. I therefore next take a microcosmic view of Adam and Maggie's personal relationships to illuminate the ways in which the text describes the quotidian interactions between colonizer and colonized. Amerigo and Charlotte resist the Ververs, yet Adam and Maggie subtly and masterfully

manage their spouses. The final section of this chapter dissects the strategies they employ, and I contend that their methods are game-like in nature. Engaging with resistance in this way is a slow process involving moves and counter-moves. It is a risk, and certainly the favorable results come at a cost. The Ververs are themselves forced to change in ways they had not foreseen but to which they readily adapt. Successful empires, it would seem, achieve a balance between national interest and cosmopolitan engagement.

Empire, Decline, and Literary Engagement

In this section of my chapter, I examine pertinent contemporary nineteenth-century views of empire and imperialism, James's engagement with colonial themes, and the distinctive American approach to empire that drives the action in *Golden*. British and American views of colonial expansion were dissimilar in ways that help readers of *The Golden Bowl* understand the Ververs's motivations and the disadvantages faced by other characters. James's focus on the concerns of empire is well-documented and his use of realism, a site of struggle between content and form, purports to be empirical but also conveys a constructed sense of progress. Progress is largely based on a business model. In fact, recent scholarship has examined James's interest in shopping and particularly the shop window as a metaphor for empire, as well as the complex relationships between colonizer and colonized. While Adam and Maggie shop for European works of art ostensibly to bring European culture to the United States as an act of charity, they also in essence loot these treasures, like conquering heroes, to put them on display in an American museum.

Contemporary Views of Empire and Imperialism

The concerns of empire permeated *fin de siècle* social life. Britain favored territorial gains evidenced by certain internal changes. Historians of the period have noted that "international exhibitions were replaced by colonial exhibitions; international *communications* become national and imperial ones; companies reorganized on an imperial basis; even education and patterns of travel to some extent became imperial, rather than cosmopolitan" (Bell 41, emphasis mine). In *The Golden Bowl*, The Prince finds that the commodities he encounters during his sojourn on Bond Street give London the air of history. He notes that "objects massive and lumpish, in silver and gold, in the forms to which precious stones contribute, or in leather, steel, brass, applied to a hundred uses and abuses, were as tumbled together as if, in the insolence of Empire, they had been the loot of far-off victories" (James 3). The term "victory" is significant for what it conveys about the nature of this empire and its insistence on mastery, and the taking and displaying of these purloined treasures are important symbolic acts. Although we are not told what these objects are exactly, the terms "massive" and "lumpish" imply something unrefined and indelicate—the products of a less artistic age at which spectators can gawk. They are valuable precisely because they are "loot" to be displayed as a symbol of power. The objects have been collected because of their representational merit, and they are useful in the sense of their serving the ends of empire. In short, the items are now a part of English culture, telling English people something about themselves.

However, contemporary notions of empire were complicated. To some Britons, "it meant simply the full array of British possessions throughout the world; for others, it

was used in a more differentiated sense, referring, for example, to the British empire in India, the empire of settlement [including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and parts of South Africa], and so forth" (Bell 5). The term "imperialism" by the latter half of the century referred largely to "aggressive policies of foreign conquest" (5). However, global competition was not limited to territorial disputes, encompassing in addition threatening economic encroachment (6). Robert Peel's vision of free trade virtue, as a means of "promoting civilization, of abating national jealousies and prejudices," proved utopian (Howe 26). Additionally, the British Fair Trade movement of the 1870s illuminated the extent to which free trade was antithetical to national interests (38). Other countries realized this as well, and international markets came to be marked by trade restrictions.

Certain countries, such as the United States and Germany, emerged as particularly economically threatening. The American Gilded Age (1880-1910) was characterized by "a dramatic surge in technological and business innovations," and the United States "underwent the most rapid economic expansion of any industrialized country" (Chung 228). America's dominance in manufacturing, corporate enterprise, and technological innovation caused some consternation abroad. For example, in 1901, G.H. Perris argued in *Ethical World* that The United States had excelled in commercial endeavors while Britain had squandered its advantage of industrial innovation "by funding territorial expansion" (Claeys 211). Some contemporary Britons therefore thought about the differences in American and British expansion in economic terms and worried for Britain's future.

Henry James, National Development, and Genre

Henry James routinely engages with the politics of empire. However, scholars have felt the need to defend political readings of James due to a tradition of criticism that categorized James as "essentially a nonpolitical novelist" (Seltzer 13). For example, Mark Seltzer in *Henry James & the Art of Power* (1984) famously argues that James "represents social movements of appropriation, supervision, and regulation" (13). *The Golden Bowl* is a prime example of these themes, and Seltzer devotes Chapter Two of the book to showing that "*The Golden Bowl* is a novel about power—conjugal, commercial, and imperial . . . [T]he name that James gives to the exercising of power in *The Golden Bowl* is love" (62). The Ververs exercise an "imperialism of sympathy and care" whereby colonial expansion takes the form of a civilizing mandate (72). Maggie's "domestic colonialism" works so well because it is difficult, if not impossible, to locate precisely the source of her power (72). In addition to these observations, John Carlos Rowe examines how James's fictions engage with the imperial agenda of nations between the Civil War and World War I and finds that "James interprets consistently the fall of the Roman Empire as a consequence of its failure to incorporate the new communities its rulers had conquered" (247). There is therefore solid ground upon which to base analysis in the politics of empire. While Rowe focuses on James's preoccupation with the broad cyclical nature of empires, Seltzer examines the power plays between the Ververs and others on a smaller, domestic scale.

James writes in the realist tradition, a genre that fits his themes of empire perfectly. Realism, largely viewed as mimetic, purports to get at some truth and acts as an "agent or reflection of scientific positivism and positivist historiography" (Baker 15).

While this is the popular conception of realism, scholars have revised this view by arguing that realism is, in fact, a "site of struggle" between form and content (16-17). While historical incident constitutes content, historiography and empiricism structure realist fictions (18). James employs, in line with this reading of realism, a "language of experience," in the empiricist tradition, which relies chiefly on "sensations and impressions" (Meissner 2). Essentially, James exposes the constructed nature of reality where the "experiencing subject" can exert control over his or her environment (2). For authors who employ realism, the result of the struggle between form and content creates a sense of progress, which, in fiction, is the basis of nation-building (Baker 19). Consequently, "realist narrative and the activity of empire-building can be partnered, to a degree" (3). This rewriting of cultural boundaries, as I hope to show later in this chapter, is exactly what James does in *The Golden Bowl* when, to a certain degree, he erases them.

American Economic Expansionism

The Golden Bowl makes observations about the nature of empires generally that convey a sense of progress. For example, Rowe's assertion that James interprets the fall of the Roman Empire finds expression in *The Golden Bowl* through the Prince, whose personal identity is closely tied to his national heritage. The text begins by linking these two senses of the term "identity" when the narrator explains that the Prince "was one of the modern Romans who find by the Thames a more convincing image of the truth of the ancient state than any they have left by the Tiber . . . [I]f one wished, as a Roman, to recover a little the sense of that, the place to do so was London Bridge" (James 3). The

Roman imperial heyday, like the Prince's wealth, is long lost. However, the vestiges of Roman influence are still apparent elsewhere within its former empire, giving the Prince a sense of nostalgia. Indeed, he is closely aligned to his ancestry. Amerigo has an ancient, royal if pauperized lineage, and, as the narrator tells us, he "was somehow full of his race. Its presence in him was like the consciousness of some inexpugnable scent in which his clothes, his whole person, his hands and the hair of his head, might have been steeped as in some chemical bath" (13). The term "full," according to the *OED*, comes from the Old Norse word for "cup, goblet; bumper." The Prince is replete with a distinct cultural presence making his moral and cultural allegiances clear. He and those like him are in some sense therefore, the eponymous golden bowl. His heritage is "inexpugnable," illumining the extent to which cultural influence is very difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate or change. This is certainly a source of strength to him, but it is also a flaw that haunts him later in the text.

In place of Roman rule, new empires have emerged, and *The Golden Bowl* examines the distinguishing features of British and American powers. In fact, the text carefully describes the clear differences between the American and English people along moral and cultural grounds. British morality is closely tied to acculturation. The Prince muses that "the tea of the English race was somehow their morality, 'made', with boiling water, in a little pot, so that the more of it one drank the more moral one would become" (24). The process of becoming a moral British person is largely mysterious and has to do with tradition and the aesthetics of place. Amerigo is acutely sensitive to the English sensibility and reflects about what it means to be English. For example, while at Matcham, he repeats the word "Gloucester," which seems to comfort him. It is

"quite as if the sharpest meaning of all the years just passed were intensely expressed in it. That meaning was really that his situation remained quite sublimely consistent with itself, and that they absolutely, he and Charlotte, stood there together in the very lustre of this truth" (262). Gloucester, like his friendship with Charlotte, is historically rich. He only needs to stand with her to get this overwhelming feeling of familiarity. Similarly, he only needs to mouth the word "Gloucester" to get the true sense of what it means to be English.

However, the Ververs have not drunk the tea and evince a desire to remain distinctly American. Amerigo realizes that "from the first of his marriage, he had tried with such patience for such *conformity*; he knew why he had given up so much and bored himself so much; he knew why he, at any rate, had gone in, on the basis of all forms, on the basis of his having, in a manner, sold himself" (262, emphasis mine). The Ververs are dedicated to "forms," or appearances, failing to invoke in the Prince the internal sense of mystery and beauty that characterizes the English cultural identity. Yet, Amerigo cannot help but feel some sense of complicity, for he knows that he has sold himself to them. He speculates, before his marriage, that "his future *might* be scientific" and that he "was allying himself to science, for what was science but the absence of prejudice backed by the presence of money? His life would be full of machinery . . . He thought of these things—of his not being at all events futile, and of his absolute acceptance of the developments of the coming age" (13). Americans, dedicated to cold hard facts and mechanical reproduction, eschew "prejudice," which is, among other things, a "[p]reconceived opinion not based on reason or actual experience . . . a feeling, favorable or unfavorable, towards a person, thing or class; an unreasoning

preference or objection" (OED). The Ververs and their ilk must be able to explain things rationally and do not simply adopt or accept a sense of affairs based on feelings as Prince does. One must take note of their approach because it has the force of money. *The Golden Bowl* is, in many ways, a novel that documents the full implications of this American "coming age."

The American "way" has, in many ways, a distinctly consumerist cast. Rowe avers that James, in his later fiction, "criticizes rampant commercialism from a transatlantic perspective" (254), which plays out in the text. The Prince's family is a valuable commodity. His heritage, itself, is a kind of "loot," housed in the British Museum as opposed to an Italian one, and it is where Maggie is first charmed by them (James, *The Golden Bowl* 61). The Prince's family is open to inspection, interpretation, and romantic associations. And, in fact, Maggie and Fanny have avidly consumed these records. Fanny tells Bob that she and Maggie "looked him up . . . The effect was produced, the charm began to work" (61). Like the glittering heaps found in Bond Street shop windows, the Prince's heritage is on display, and his noble lineage up for purchase. The Ververs are in the market for such a commodity and they do their homework before making a purchase. Maggie tells her lover that he is "a rarity, an object of beauty, an object of price. You're not perhaps absolutely unique, but you're so curious and eminent that there are very few others like you—you belong to a class about which everything is known" (10). The things that make the Prince charming include his "curiosity," which could refer either to his probing mind or to the fact that Maggie and her father find him a curious specimen for their own purposes. In addition,

his “eminence” is enticing, referring to his family’s history and “eminent” social position.

However, class is a complicating factor in American expansionist efforts. Britain, with its highly stratified class system, poses a significant challenge to characters from America’s Gilded Age, “a period that resulted in increased income inequality and the rise of a new middle class” (Chung 228). The American middle classes saw “increasing class mobility” because of the impressive economic growth at home (230). Britain also saw some new opportunities due to industrialization, which gave rise to a bevy of new occupations and professions. However, reports of the aristocracy’s decline have, according to some historians, been exaggerated because “very wealthy bankers and businessmen married and bought into the traditional aristocracy,” ensuring the aristocracy’s continued grip on the seats of power (Bell 235). Maggie is class-conscious and remarks to her husband at the end of the novel, “We’re distinctly *bourgeois*!” (556) The Verver empire is by extension distinctly American bourgeois. They acquire status through their money but do their research carefully before making an investment. They are comforted by the fact that they believe they “know” the Prince well after their researches. Maggie and her father value the Prince precisely because of his title and name, Amerigo, with its significance to American history. Furthermore, the Prince is a sure thing, and there are seemingly no doubts about his station, financial dependence, and character. The Ververs do their homework so assiduously because they want to know exactly who it is they are purchasing.

Consumerism in *Golden* has drawn some recent scholarly interest. In *Henry James and the Culture of Consumption* (2014), Miranda El-Rayess explores the act of

shopping in several of James's novels, including *The Golden Bowl*. For El-Rayess, the ways in which James represents shopping suggest "the growing significance of shopping as a leisure activity" (3). Here, El-Rayess explicitly identifies leisure practices as particularly important to James. She also makes a point to note that James was fluent in the strategies employed by commercial entities and their "significance in the construction of class, gender, national and artistic identities, as well as the formation of modern subjectivities" (2). The ways in which one spends his or her leisure hours strongly influence identity, a fact which commercial enterprises exploit.

The complex relationships between self and other in a colonial milieu drive the action in *The Golden Bowl*. El-Rayess's study examines, in part, the shop window as metaphor for the action/perception and self/other binaries. The act of browsing through shop windows "becomes a powerful and apt vehicle to explain the motivations that drive empire, as well as the unusual subject of commodification" (122). The shop window display works as a metaphor for the difficulty of assessing exactly who is captive and who is captor. For example, Amerigo observes that "[t]here was machinery again, just as the plate glass, all about him, was money, was power, the power of the rich peoples. Well, he was *of* them now, of the rich peoples; he was on their side—if it wasn't rather the pleasanter way of putting it that they were on his" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 14). Here, the Prince thinks of "sides:" he on one and his materialistic new relations on the other. However, he realizes that he is marrying into money and attempts to imaginatively engage with his new relations. As he does so, he also adopts their idiom. According to the Prince, Americans are particularly valuable for their romanticism, a view of the world that allows them to enjoy "innocent pleasures,

pleasures without penalties. Their enjoyment was a tribute to others without being a loss to themselves" (9). The ways in which his new American relations enjoy themselves during their leisure hours are what the Prince is drawn to when he wants to think well of them and convince himself that he has chosen wisely.

However, the Prince also feels acutely his own objectification as, in the next breath, Maggie articulates the basis of her attraction to Amerigo. She tells her fiancé that he is "a rarity, an object of beauty, an object of price . . .You're what they call a *Morceau de musée*" (10). Amerigo's value for the Ververs rests almost entirely in his name, and James explains that "some son, of every generation, was appointed to wear it . . . [and] the Prince was, from the start, helped with the dear Ververs by *his* wearing it" (60). Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian merchant and explorer, credited with discovering the new world, draws the Ververs to him. The allure of Amerigo's name indicates "a regard for sign over signified—or brand-name over substance and quality—that constitutes one of the most important characteristics of commodity culture" (El-Rayess 148). Essentially, the desire to tell a story about expansion drives the Ververs forward, and Amerigo's name lends itself nicely to myth-making about their own eminence in history. El-Rayess, however, problematizes the colonizer/colonized binaries in interesting ways specific to James.

Adam Verver not only embraces Amerigo's namesake, but also scavenges European treasures to display in American City, which will incidentally secure his position as a cultural leader. James tells us that Adam wishes to acquire the great works of art produced by other world powers to "endow" his collection to American City. Adam gifts his collection to his homeland; however, he is also investing in his

countrymen, presumably with the hope of some sort of return. Maggie certainly thinks her father's motives are purely charitable when she explains that "the place [American City] has grown . . . like the programme of a charity performance" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 10). Adam purchases, stores, and transports European works of art, an activity which is tragic for European culture, but these treasures go toward the shaping of a new culture. Ordinary Americans will have access to these masterpieces for the first time because Adam will house his acquisitions in a museum open to the public. The museum is generally a site of controversy. Some scholars consider it a symbol of the "decontextualization of artworks from the creative processes and settings that engendered them" (Follini 235). Its harshest critics consider the museum as "the material manifestation of a debased relation between aesthetics and commercialism, a monument of exclusionary politics, and a mausoleum destructive of artistic vitality, which entombs works of art, neutralizes culture and paralyzes new creativity" (235). Conversely, proponents find it an inspiration for democracy and enlightenment (237). In *The Golden Bowl*, Adam is obsessed with his project to the extent that he fails to perceive his surroundings, including the threats to his marriage, until he is enlightened. Rowe posits that Adam's collection "satirizes the wealthy tycoons of the American Gilded Age whose artistic tastes and philanthropic gestures were in the service of their monumental egos rather than democratic interests" (254). Adam myopically pursues his project, but he will also defend his values vehemently when threatened. Consequently, Adam seems less an object of ridicule than a frightening manifestation of American focus and drive.

The full implications of American expansionism through philanthropy have also been the subject of recent scholarship. In her study of nineteenth-century philanthropy, *The Difficult Art of Giving: Patronage, Philanthropy, and the American Literary Market* (2014), Francesca Sawaya examines James's depiction of the rise of American imperialism in contrast to the declining British empire, noting that *Golden* is a vivid portrait of the ways in which philanthropy is, in the novel, "a key expression of American imperial power" (10). In fact, the novel is centered on Adam and his apparent "selflessness" (62). According to Sawaya, charitable giving in *The Golden Bowl* is an expression of "American generosity—enacted as resentful philanthropy [that] illuminates the struggle between a new American empire and a declining European one" (41). Employing Nietzsche's notion of *ressentiment*, or "vengeance-driven hatred and envy posing as morality," Sawaya analyzes the distinctive, commercial nature of American empire (61). The figure of the Jew, represented through the Ververs and the shopkeeper who sells the golden bowl, illuminates the extent to which stereotypes about acquisitiveness and commercialism drive American expansionism. Furthermore, this connection seeks to show that "American power will be exerted through a pose of benevolent or moral generosity that attempts to hide its revengeful envy" (67). Adam's philanthropy obscures his jealousy of and will to power over competing empires. I agree with El-Rayess and Sawaya that *The Golden Bowl* documents the distinctive American commodity empire, and I find the ways in which Sawaya describes the robber baron *ethos* convincing. I seek to enhance these important overviews of American empire-building by examining the day-to-day interactions between colonizer and colonized.

This section of my chapter has argued that the ideologies of empire building during the *fin de siècle* affected how nations interacted with each other and what internal, domestic policies they adopted. Culture-shapers engaged directly with these realities. James, while previously thought to eschew political issues, in fact employs realism to convey a sense of social progress. As Rowe has noted James is particularly interested to show that failed empires are too insular. Successful ones, by contrast, incorporate the cultural values of the nations they absorb. Mark Seltzer examines the Ververs's colonial mindset in their daily personal interactions with others. As Seltzer shows, Maggie's power emanates from her *ethos* of sympathy and care. She and Adam are flawlessly polite to their spouses in the face of their infidelities, and father and daughter adopt an attitude of beneficence in their future dealings with the wayward couple. The Ververs's methods of attaining domestic dominance correlate to the distinctive, albeit informal brand of American imperial expansion. Acquisitiveness, under the guise of philanthropy, is the American way. However, Adam's altruistic efforts also betray his jealousy of other strong empires and a frightening will to power on a global scale. Similarly, Maggie's beneficence and ethic of care are a source of power in her domestic arrangements.

Gaming and *The Golden Bowl*

The emphasis on commercial practices, while important, leaves largely unexamined other ways in which American imperialists employ their leisure and appropriate the leisure of others to promote the imperial project informally. Additionally, a focus on economic acquisitiveness excludes a discussion of the ways in which ordinary middle-class aspirants can realize the same kind of social success. There

are, in fact, attainable ways that ordinary people can elevate themselves socially. Having money is not quite enough. The Ververs must observe certain conversational norms in order to realize their goals. After discovering what her husband and best friend have been up to, Maggie resolves to negotiate the situation, so to speak, in a subtle fashion. This is, however, certainly not her first intuition. She wants desperately to challenge and cross-examine the couple. However, she begins by watching Amerigo and Charlotte intently, and she realizes that she must teach herself "to wait" and observe the situation carefully (James, *The Golden Bowl* 353). She notices that "Charlotte was almost always there when Amerigo brought her to Eaton Square, where Amerigo was constantly bringing her; and Amerigo was almost always there when Charlotte brought her husband to Portand Place, where Charlotte was constantly bringing *him*" (354-55). It is clear that Amerigo and Charlotte have a physically close relationship with one another and are regularly in each other's company. In addition, and most strikingly, the couple have a subtle means of communicating. For example, Maggie notes the "mutual looks" they give each other (351). Additionally, they "could be silent together, at any time, beautifully, with much more comfort than hurriedly expressive" (355). Maggie also notices that they "might have been talking 'at' each other when they talked with their companions" (355). Finally, upon their return from Matcham, the Prince and Charlotte seem to look to each other for appropriate and matching explanations and behaviors. Maggie, while observing the pair, observes that it is as though her husband "was acting in short on a cue, the cue given to him by observation; it had been enough for him to see the shade of change in *her* [Charlotte's] behavior; his instinct for relations, the most exquisite conceivable, prompted him immediately to meet and match

the difference, to play somehow into his hands" (327). The ways in which the couple communicate with one another reveal the extent to which they are on intimate terms. All of these signs betray to Maggie that her husband and best friend are acting in concert to deceive her and her father.

Maggie's money does not help her deal with this situation, and so she must adapt her methods. She cannot explicitly accuse her husband of betraying her because to do so would betray jealousy, which would have "reached her father exactly in the form of a cry piercing the stillness of peaceful sleep" (354). To show her jealousy could cause her father pain, and, more importantly, it could backfire on her. Consequently, she resolves to observe and play along until she can rearrange the current situation. She explains to herself that to shift power back in her favor, she must adapt her behavior to their "cleverness, their amiability, their power to hold out, their complete possession" (352). Because she cannot separate Amerigo and Charlotte forcefully, she must employ their tactics and beat them at their own game. In this final section of my chapter, I argue that an examination of the text through the metaphor of gaming helps the reader understand American middle-class imperial tactics. Consequently, middle-class aspirants can reproduce these methods within their own spheres of influence.

Recent scholarship has analyzed James's interest in commercialism and acquisitiveness extensively, and this section of my chapter expands upon these observations about the informal methods that American expansionists employ in daily interactions. Jonathan Freedman also examines gaming in *The Golden Bowl*. Maggie, Freedman contends, "offers a version of the prisoner's dilemma choice" but only to the Prince ("What Maggie Knew," 108). He argues that the novel shows "how much of

what passes for responses to people we love and desire—our fathers, our lovers, our partners—is shaped by the same tactics that govern the actions of hedge fund managers, millionaire investors, entrepreneurs, and so on" (112). According to Freedman, Maggie alters the rules of the prisoner's dilemma "to fit her own agenda" when she offers Amerigo his fateful choice (112). I contend that this is where Freedman's argument collapses and that Maggie is not, in fact, playing a game when she alters the rules as Freedman believes she does.

As I aim to show, gaming is a complex activity, involving the right goals, means, rules, and attitudes. I argue that James employs a consistent gaming metaphor for colonialism to illuminate the ways in which these methods are reproducible. Consequently, I organize my discussion around a well-accepted definition of games. An inclusive definition must account for activities involving the prelusory goal, the lusory means, constitutive rules, and the lusory attitude (Suits 50). In *The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia* (2005), Bernard Suits argues that "[t]o play a game is to attempt to achieve a specific state of affairs [prelusory goal], using only means permitted by rules [lusory means], where the rules prohibit use of more efficient in favour of less efficient means [constitutive rules], and where the rules are accepted just because they make possible such activity [lusory attitude]" (54-55). In this final section of my chapter, I first analyze the goals of the game that Maggie, Adam, Adam, and Charlotte pursue. In essence, the games in which these players engage involve the prelusory goals of increasing one's power and influence over others. Maggie and her father wish to secure their preeminent place in history as moral and cultural authorities. Conversely, the Prince and Charlotte value their freedom and distinct identities. They

cannot escape the American "coming age" but also wish to maintain a private self that resists supervision. Adam, Maggie, Amerigo, and Charlotte seek the same prelusory goal but for different reasons and with distinct lusory goals in mind.

While the Ververs have a great deal of power already due to their great wealth, they must also negotiate the demands of contemporary civilized life because they have opted for informal imperialist methods. Consequently, they opt for a less efficient means of achieving their goals. I therefore next account for the lusory, or less efficient, means that constitute the game in which these players are engaged. The lusory means in this game include those mandated by custom and tradition instead of the more efficient use of overt force. Every game with goals and lusory means employs a set of rules that governs conduct. In the Ververs's game, the general rules of etiquette constitute the constitutive, or overarching set of rules. However, one can play this game well or badly. Individual skills-based rules, distinct from constitutive rules, necessitate that players refrain from overt accusations and redirect the conversation to hide information about themselves. Players may also change location to make it impossible for other players to work together. Finally, in this section, I show that characters have the necessary lusory attitude, or willingness to adopt a less efficient means, which identifies them as engaged in the activity of gaming. Amerigo and Charlotte do not simply run away together but engage with the Ververs, who do not force compliance. I contend that, without a willingness to play a game using less efficient means, the particularly American brand of informal colonization James describes in *Golden* would not be as effective.

The result of adopting this lusory attitude, in my view is a more transformative and lasting effect on characters. Characters in *The Golden Bowl* believe they are

engaged in a high-stakes enterprise with two opposed, yet equally matched sides. For example, Maggie considers that "they were proceeding with her—and, for that matter, with her father—by a plan that was the exact counterpart of her own" (James 328). She perceives that she and her father are on the same side, playing at opposite purposes against Charlotte and Amerigo. The gaming metaphor, however, illuminates the extent to which imperialism is not, as Maggie postulates, one side against the other, but a more nuanced series of exchanges. Players attempt to recast the narrative, and "winners" must even negotiate their position, thus becoming hybridized, as Homi Bhabha describes in *The Commitment to Theory* (1994). According to Bhabha, "[t]he concept of cultural difference focuses on the problem of the ambivalence of cultural authority: the attempt to dominate in the *name* of a cultural supremacy which is itself produced only in the moment of differentiation" (2368). The moment of differentiation, or enunciative process, as Bhabha calls it, comes with its own psychological complexities that make one cultural authority or voice, impossible. It, in effect, "introduces a split in the performative present of cultural identification; a split between the culturalist demand for a model, a tradition, a community, a stable system of reference, and the necessary negation of the certitude in the articulation of new cultural demands, meanings, strategies in the political present, as a practice of domination or resistance" (2368-69). The presence of the colonizer introduces these new cultural demands upon a subject whose commitments are already a historical amalgamation of influences. Even so, the colonizer insists on the stark binary, thinking him- or herself dominant. The "Self and Other" pass through what Bhabha calls a Third Space that emphasizes the "temporal dimension" of meaning production, and "[i]t is only when we understand that all

cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation, that we begin to understand why hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or 'purity' of cultures are untenable" (2371). The colonizer and colonized interact at a particular moment in time, which changes both parties, making claims to cultural integrity and purity nonsensical.

Transformation happens to all the characters in *The Golden Bowl*. The Prince *attempts* to maintain a separate identity from those who wish to appropriate him and impose their own ideas of proper conduct. The language of consumption, adopted by the American colonialists, which is tied to the language of empire, makes Amerigo's position difficult and ultimately unsuccessful. He is, in the end, forced to change and give up his previously formed ideas about freedom. Charlotte also wishes to reserve a distinct identity and plays alongside the Prince. Her transformation, however, is as painful for her as it is for readers to watch. Yet Amerigo and Charlotte are not the only ones who must adapt. Maggie and Adam undergo a traumatic separation to form new political alliances with their respective spouses, illumining the extent to which these parties form new partnerships and showing that "there is no given community or body . . . whose inherent, radical historicity emits the right signs" (Bhabha 2361). No single party can completely dominate and encompass the other. Instead, the colonization game forces all players to sacrifice and adapt to the strategies each party employs.

The Prelusory Goal

The goals that identify games as such are prelusory in nature. According to Suits, the term *prelusory* comes from the Latin *ludus,* meaning "game," and can be

"understood and achieved apart from the game" (Hurka 9). In essence, prelusory goals help identify an activity as a game in advance of knowing the lusory goals of any game in particular. A prelusory goal "can be determined before, independently of any game of which it may be, or come to be, a part" (Suits 51). Intuition dictates that winning is the goal of any game, but Suits argues that this is not, in fact, the case. For example, in long distance running, the goal is to cross the finish line before other contestants. Winning only figures in the specific game, and one does not have to win in order to be playing a game. The case is similar with participating. One can participate and then drop out thereby failing to play the game. Accordingly, Suits explains that there are three different possible goals in playing games: participating, winning, and "*a specific achievable state of affairs*" (50). The first is a general goal of life and not specific to games at all (51). The second is too inclusive in the sense that there are multiple ways to win inconsistent with the rules of the game. For example, one can realize the lusory goal of poker, which is to win, by incapacitating one's opponents and taking all their chips or money. Similarly, one may win at chess by making certain moves that violate the rules. However, winning cannot be a goal that characterizes all games. A prelusory goal of poker, on the other hand, consists in "increasing one's money by using only means permitted by the rules, although mere obedience to the rules does not by itself ensure victory" (38). Winning and, for that matter, participating are internal goals to the specific game one is playing; however, these goals do not form an element in game playing as a general activity. Instead, the lusory goal is "derivative, since achieving it involves achieving the prior prelusory goal in a specific way" (9). Consequently, the

prelusory goals to which Suits refers involve an achievable state of affairs that may be set out in advance.

Sawaya and others have identified the lusory goals of the American imperial project. These objectives include successfully acquiring control through commercialism and by elevating the robber baron's moral status. These robber baron philanthropists clearly win the games they are playing by successfully absconding with and displaying European art, thereby furthering their imperial project, elevating themselves in the process with the American public. In fact, their only object is to win, and they will do so by any means necessary. The goals of these games may even change in unpredictable ways. Conversely, a prelusory goal of this game can, I argue, be set out in advance and involves increasing one's power and influence and reducing the power and influence of other player characters by using a certain set of rules. Anyone can play this game, and it is not limited to one's ability to make heavy investments of capital.

A prelusory goal in the game depicted in *Golden* is to increase one's power and influence over others. Many characters in the novel lead, for the most part, double lives that betray their desires in this regard. There is a private self which other players may not be able to access that fights for room. For example, Maggie perpetuates a mystique of innocence and transparency. She is singularly concerned that her prince not think she has the capacity to "lie or dissemble or deceive" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 12). However, she is unwilling to engage seriously with certain subjects. During a conversation about honesty, the narrator tells us that the Prince "perceived on the spot that any *serious* discussion of veracity, of loyalty, or rather of the want of them, practically took her unprepared, as if it were quite new to her. He had noticed it before:

it was the English, the American sign that duplicity, like 'love', had to be joked about" (12). The fact that Maggie is unwilling to discuss important qualities such as loyalty seriously, opting instead to joke about these topics, is revealing. She sweeps them under the rug so that they are well hidden but lurking under the surface all the same. However, she spends a large proportion of the second book attempting to bring her husband into line with a preconceived notion of order and loyalty.

Maggie is, in fact, not quite the ingénue she pretends to be. There are clues that betray a calculating mind. For example, she does her research about Amerigo carefully and is not predisposed to much romanticism. Only after spending many hours over the Prince's family records does Maggie consider the Prince an appropriate partner. Additionally, she works behind the scenes to arrange people as she sees fit. Even Charlotte notes that Maggie "likes to arrange. it particularly suits her" (189). In fact, Maggie exerts her powerful influence over her father and others. The narrator's description of Maggie's conversation with her father about marrying Charlotte is telling. The narrator explains that Maggie "continued to smile, and he [Adam] took her smile; wondering again a little by this time, however; struck more and more by an intensity in it that belied a light tone. 'What do you want,' he demanded, 'to do to me?' And he added, as she didn't say: 'You've got something in your mind.' It had come to him within the minute that from the beginning of their session there she had been keeping something back" (131). Here, Maggie's simple surface smile masks the calculating mind at work.

The Prince is equally intent on maintaining a separate identity. In essence, he desires to remain master of himself in spite of the duties he owes to the Ververs.

Amerigo lays his cards on the table so to speak when he explains his bifurcated personality to Maggie. He explains that "[t]here are two parts of me . . . One is made up of the history, the doings, the marriages, the crimes, the follies, the boundless *bêtises* of other people—especially of their infamous waste of money that might have come to me. Those things are written—literally in rows of volumes, in libraries; are as public as they're abominable" (7). In short, the Prince tells Maggie that one side of him is knowable; however, there is another, secret self that is not so open to inspection. Giving advance warning of this secret self seems to be an ill-advised strategy. However, Suits explains that "the peculiarity of giving strategic information to an inferior opponent is not quite that peculiar . . . because he wants his own eventual victory to be more satisfying" (81). The Prince has another purpose for making this speech. In essence, he attempts to assuage any fears she may have of this "single self, the unknown, unimportant—unimportant save to *you*—personal quality" (7). Amerigo is up-front and honest about this private self. By implication therefore he must be generally honest. There is a danger in the sense that this "self" is as yet "unknown," which implies undiscovered and hence untamed. The Prince's mistake in giving this information is to perhaps assume Maggie is an inferior player and cannot see through his tactics.

It is this secret facet of the Prince to which Charlotte lays claim. She says to Amerigo, "Yet you're not . . . too different from *me.*" (227). Indeed, the Prince and Charlotte Stant have had a personal relationship in the past, a relationship about which Maggie is initially ignorant. Charlotte, like her husband, resists the Ververs. She wants to escape her poverty and maintain her freedom, and she is willing to use any and all of her charms to exert her influence. She is associated with freedom and adventure, and,

above all, she is distinctive for her artistic features. The narrator describes her as "a tall, strong, charming girl who wore . . . the look of her adventurous situation, a suggestion, in all her person, in motion and gesture, in free, vivid, yet altogether happy indications of dress" (34). In addition, her "free arms" are "completely rounded, the polished slimness that Florentine sculptors, in the great time, had loved, and of which the apparent firmness is expressed in their old silver and old bronze" (35). Her love of freedom makes her resistant to the imperialist agenda, which calls for strict adherence to the story of national exceptionalism. Charlotte is anything but a good acolyte when she says of her motherland, "It doesn't, I fear, seem particularly mine. And it doesn't in the least matter, over there, whether one likes it or not—that is to anyone but one's self. But I didn't like it" (42). In resistance to the story of national exceptionalism, Charlotte has a decidedly cosmopolitan cast.

Finally, her husband's mild manner, love of solitude, and charitable inclinations elide a darker side to his personality. Adam is the most overt symbol of surface American imperialism, and he is a key player/character in the novel. In fact, Sawaya demonstrates that Adam has a double nature as a philanthropist and robber baron which betrays the fact that he, too, has the prelusory goals in mind as he engages with other player/characters. Sawaya notes that "the selfless Adam is described as one of the most creepily violent characters" (62-63). He clearly has the means to exert power and influence. The narrator reports that "as he had money, he had force. It pressed upon him hard, and all round, assuredly, this attribution of power" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 96). Although we are told that Adam's power is an inconvenience to him and "[i]t pressed hard on him" (96), there is no hint that he gives it up. In addition, he uses it to the fullest

extent when appropriate. He, like the other player/characters, jockeys, or vies, for power. In particular, Adam wears a moral mask that eclipses his true nature to other characters until the denouement. We see Adam in his full terrifying powers near the end of the novel when he and Charlotte display their collection. Maggie observes that "Charlotte hung behind, with emphasized attention; she stopped when her husband stopped, but at the distance of a case or two, or of whatever other succession of objects; and the likeness of their connection would not have been wrongly figured if he had been thought of as holding in one of his pocketed hands the end of a long silken halter looped round her beautiful neck" (508). Although there is no literal silken halter, Charlotte bears the weight of her husband's impression. She walks as though "hung" by the throat and, like a marionette, mimics Adam's every move. Although he is, in a way, violent, his violence is not overt. Instead, he and Maggie get Charlotte to comply by informal, lusory means.

The Lusory Means

Players engaged in gaming must pursue a similar prelusory goal and must adopt the same lusory means. According to Suits, lusory means are those "which are *permitted*" (51). Many life activities, including those associated with work, are done as efficiently as possible. So what distinguishes gaming from working? A brutal example from Suits's book may be helpful. While one may achieve the prelusory goal of a boxing match—to put the opponent down—by shooting him or her in the head, this particular means is not permitted, thankfully, by the game. Shooting the opponent in the head is certainly a very efficient means of achieving the goal; however, "games are

goal-directed activities in which inefficient means are intentionally chosen" (37). The adoption of less efficient means to achieve the prelusory goal makes gaming a distinctive activity from working (38). It is another indicator that our activity, in fact, is a game. In *The Golden Bowl*, characters adopt less efficient means over more efficient ones. An effective and efficient means of exerting power and influence includes the use of overt force, similar to the shooting of the opponent-boxer. Accordingly, Charlotte and Amerigo could run away together. However, *Golden* depicts the effective informal methods of imperialism in which Americans also engaged. A distinguishing feature of informal imperialism is the adoption of less efficient means to realize the goal. In *The Golden Bowl* the less efficient means of employing mannered, customary behaviors prevails.

Maggie finds the lusory means challenging. She becomes aware of her passion for her husband and concludes that the best course of action is to maintain "the proper playing of one's part" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 303). Propriety is certainly the less efficient means of dealing with suspected infidelity. She could demand an explanation and have a scene; however, she is alarmed lest her husband have reason to demand in return. "'What in the world are you 'up to', and what do you mean?' any note of that sort would instantly have brought her low—and this all the more that heaven knew she hadn't any manner designed to be high. It was such a trifle, her small breach with custom, or at any rate with his natural presumption, that all magnitude of wonder had already had, before one could deprecate the shadow of it, the effect of a complication" (309). Maggie does not wish to appear "low" or "high" because extremes in behavior are uncharacteristic and too obvious. In short, adopting more efficient means would

utterly destroy any chances at success. The Prince must come to his own conclusions in order to be fully committed to Maggie's view. A "breach," or tearing, causes complications because she would have to repair the damage, if she could, in order to be on an equal footing with the other players again. By seeming too alarmed, she would be adopting efficient means when the situation demands otherwise. She therefore resolves to stay the course of "custom," which could refer to tradition or "a practice of customarily reporting to a particular shop . . . to make purchases or give orders; business patronage or support" (OED). Her union with the Prince is a done deal. Maggie must maintain balance because "their equilibrium was everything, and . . . it was practically precarious, a matter of a hair's breadth for the loss of the balance" (310). However, she is somewhat disingenuous here. The equilibrium is already tipped because she suspects the truth about Amerigo and Charlotte, and her power is diminished. Consequently, her real purpose is to tip it in the opposite direction, the thought of doing which gives her the self-discipline to pursue less efficient means of achieving her purpose.

The Rules of the Game

Any discussion of ends and means cannot take place without also analyzing the importance of rules to the activity of gaming. This is because "[r]ules in games . . . seem to be in some sense inseparable from ends, for to break a game rule is to render impossible the attainment of an end" (Suits 39). Rules make attaining the prelusory goal somewhat difficult since "[i]f the rules are broken the original end becomes impossible of attainment, since one cannot (really) win the game unless one plays it, and one

cannot (really) play the game unless one obeys the rules of the game" (39). The less efficient mannered avenues, of course, mean that players must abide by the rules of etiquette. There are, according to Suits, two types of rules involved in any game: "the kind associated with prelusory goals, the other with lusory goals" (51). Rules associated with the prelusory goals, or those rules which govern the playing of games qua games, are constitutive (51). Conversely, rules associated with lusory goals operate "*within* the area circumscribed by constitutive rules, and this kind of rule may be called a rule of skill" (51). Failing at a rule of skill does not mean that the player fails to play the game but the player is just bad at it. Constitutive rules by contrast are "rules which prohibit use of the most efficient means for reaching a prelusory goal" (52). The player who shoots his or her boxer-opponent fails to adopt the less efficient means. While that player participates and wins, he or she is not playing a game. Similarly, Maggie could, at any time, breach the rules of etiquette and compel compliance. However, she would not be playing the game, and the novel would have very little instructional value to middle-class aspirants who do not have wealth on the Ververs's scale.

The rules of this American colonization game prohibit the use of the most efficient means for reaching the prelusory goals of attaining the most amount of power and influence over the other players. The less efficient means are those good behaviors dictated by custom and tradition. The national affiliations in *Golden* are complex; however, the Ververs wish to fully convert Amerigo, with his proud sense of his Roman heritage, and Charlotte, the wayward American with continental sympathies. Maggie and Adam approach European society with the goal of perpetuating their own values and notions of morality. However, they cannot insist on their own way entirely but must

also keep European values in mind when interacting with others in this international milieu. Consequently, the Ververs must also appeal to the European sense of propriety to which Amerigo and Charlotte are committed. Generally, British Victorian conversation was to be detached, precise and instructive. There was a decidedly moral cast to conversational norms in the sense that Victorians considered conversation a means of intellectual improvement (Hitchings 247). Consequently, the English promoted conversational economy and disdained random noisiness. Henry Hitchings explains that "[s]ensitivity to noise was a way of demonstrating superiority" particularly because cacophony signified criminality, illness, and dullness (248). Conversely, purity of expression was a sign of moral health and patriotism (253). Conversational detachment, exactitude and reticence are some pertinent rules of etiquette to which these players are bound because so much of the novel is about what can and cannot be said to further prelusory goals.

The major players in *The Golden Bowl* are bound by conversational rules of etiquette as a set of constitutive rules, and the text supports this view of conversation. For example, Maggie's communiqués with Charlotte evince detachment and precise wording. It hardly seems possible that the two women are close childhood friends because their conversation is so mannered. Maggie informs Charlotte about her upcoming nuptials but does not invite her to the wedding because Maggie is concerned that the journey from America would be difficult and expensive (James 40). Charlotte certainly cannot invite herself or even drop a hint. The Prince muses that although Charlotte is "[o]lder and perhaps more intelligent, at any rate, why shouldn't Charlotte respond—and be quite *free* to respond—to such fidelities with something more than

mere formal good manners?" (40) Charlotte, however, is not at liberty to respond to her friend in any other way than that which accords with the dictates of custom. There is a distinct reason for this. Amerigo notes that his lover's "singleness, her solitude, her want of means, that is her want of ramifications and other advantages, contributed to enrich her somehow with an odd, precious neutrality, to constitute for her, so detached yet so aware, a sort of small social capital" (41). Her neutrality and detachment give her "capital," a modest amount of leverage and power that explains her ability to buy into this game.

While Charlotte uses her detachment for social advantage, Adam is detached and reserved for his own reasons. He is obsessed with his colonial project. However, his attention is largely on global concerns. Domestic affairs he leaves largely to his daughter. For example, when Maggie proposes Charlotte as a potential wife, the narrator remarks on Adam's "detached tone . . . detached as if innocently to amuse her by showing his desire to accommodate" (James 128). However, Adam is so detached that he fails to see or ignores Charlotte's infidelity. Sawaya argues that "even if Adam does know he has been cuckolded (which he probably does), he does not particularly care" (63). When alerted to the fact by Maggie, he is so detached that he treats his wife with astounding callousness. In fact, Adam has a non-verbal way of giving his wife direction. The narrator reports that "[i]t was part of the very inveteracy of his straw hat and his white waistcoat, of the trick of his hands in his pockets, of the *detachment* of the attention he fixed on his slow steps from behind his secure pince-nez" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 539, emphasis mine). It is as though Charlotte is led by a "silken noose" tied around her neck, which Adam holds and keeps largely "out of sight" (539). Maggie

thinks she perceives from her father a "wordless smile" as if to communicate, "Yes, you see—I lead her now by the neck . . . She thinks it may be her doom, the awful place over there—awful for her; but she's afraid to ask, don't you see? Just as she's afraid of not asking" (508-9). Adam's precise and subtle body language is designed to keep his wife compliant and to exert complete domination.

Maggie is passionate about and possessive of her husband; however, she is disturbingly detached from Charlotte's pain. From early on, Charlotte is keenly aware of her reduced freedom in her marriage. She wanders through town in her "shabby four-wheeler" (James 216) and "dull black dress" (218), the kind she used to wear in her single days because it makes her feel free. She explains, "It makes me feel as I used to—when I could do as I liked" (219). In the end, Charlotte's freedoms are indeed reduced, and Maggie is shockingly removed at the sight of Charlotte's confinement. It appears to her as though Charlotte is living in a cage, and, in a detached manner, Maggie "walked around . . . cautiously and in a very wide circle; and when, inevitably, they had to communicate she felt herself, comparatively, outside, on the breast of nature, and saw her companion's face as that of a prisoner looking through bars" (444). Maggie observes Charlotte's struggle as she would a curiosity at some pitiful show, giving the cage a wide berth. Charlotte clearly feels as though she has lived the life of a "prisoner" in a gilded case from the very beginning of her marriage. Poverty and the quest for liberation are like some criminal offense for which Charlotte must continue to pay. Her frantic attempts to escape this cage make the Princess draw back in horror lest Charlotte free herself (444).

Skills-based Rules

The specific skills-based rules of etiquette in *Golden* are in accord with the general conversational values of detachment and economy. Suits is largely unconcerned with skills-based rules because his goal is merely to define the nature of gaming in general. However, my argument entails a detailed discussion of skills-based rules because they are also important to the novel. Additionally, the rules, as delineated in the text, are instructive to everyday people who wish to climb socially. Common examples of skills-based rules include "injunctions to keep your eye on the ball, to refrain from trumping your partner's ace, and the like. To break a rule of skill is usually to fail, at least to that extent, to play the game well, but to break a constitutive rule is to fail (at least in that respect) to play the game at all" (Suits 51-52). They are specific prescriptions that naturally flow from the constitutive rules by which the player is bound. One's ability to perform well, in some measure, determines his or her ability to realize the lusory goals of the game, such as winning. Important skills-based rules in *The Golden Bowl* are largely conversational in nature. For example, players must refrain from overt accusations in order to redirect the discussion. They may also hide information about themselves or mislead other players. In addition to these rules that dictate conversation, players may change location to make it impossible for other players to work together. However, suggesting removal is harder than it first appears, given the other skills-based rules. How skillful character/players are at these lusory rules determines their level of success at the game.

First, a favorable outcome is dependent on the ability of major players in *Golden* to refrain from overt accusations. The lusory goal here is to successfully redirect the

conversation and hide damaging or compromising information about oneself. Although two of these players are unfaithful to their partners, there are no quarrels or violent scenes among the players. This is certainly one situation where violent scenes would be expected. Charlotte knows she can count on Maggie's reserve to preserve the status quo. Furthermore, Maggie is aware of Charlotte's understanding when she realizes that "[i]t was exactly as if she had known that her stepdaughter would be afraid to be summoned to say, under the least approach to cross-examination, why any change was desirable; and it was, for our young woman herself, still more prodigiously, as if her father had been capable of calculations to match, or judging it important he shouldn't be brought to demand of her what was the matter with her" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 364-65). She cannot suggest a separation because she does not wish to reveal her fears. Maggie gets her way nonetheless precisely because she avoids confrontations. An objection can be raised that Maggie overtly accuses her husband and Charlotte in front of Fanny when Maggie asks, "[W]hy did they keep from me everything I might have known?" (424) In addition, she asserts that "[t]hey pretended to love me . . . and they pretended to love *him*" (425). These examples seem to contradict my argument. Indeed, Fanny initiates the most shocking scene when she smashes the golden bowl dramatically. She "raised the cup in her two hands, raised it positively above her head, and from under it, solemnly, smiled at the Princess . . . and then, with due note taken of the margin of the polished floor, bare, fine and hard in the embrasure of her window, she dashed it boldly to the ground, where she had the thrill of seeing it, with the violence of the crash, lie shattered" (430). The look and the self-indulgent drama surely constitutes an overt statement of the facts. However, Fanny is an observer and sounding

board, and not a central player in this game. She can violate the rules with impunity because she does not participate and has very little at stake; she is certainly no imperialist.

Conversely, Maggie's response when her husband enters the room in time to see Fanny's act proves how embedded she is in this game and how she respects Amerigo as a fellow player by evincing sensitivity to the rules. The narrator reports that "Maggie, for the time, said nothing" (431). The Prince's response also makes it clear that he is an active participant as he "said nothing either—though it was true that his silence was the gloss of the warning she doubtless appeared to admonish him to take: it was as if her manner hushed him to the proper observation of what she was doing. He should have no doubt of it whatever: she *knew* . . . yet the least part of her desire was to make him waste words" (433). These silences communicate essential information, yet they also follow the rules of etiquette closely. Many of the quiet moments, in essence, allow players to remain taciturn while also communicating a great deal of information. When Maggie finally speaks, her monologue is fraught with ambiguity. She asserts, "[F]rom the night you came home so late from Matcham . . . that was the beginning of my being sure. Before it I had been sufficiently in doubt. Sure . . . of your having, and of your having for a long time had, *two* relations with Charlotte" (439). There are several things Maggie could mean by this. She most assuredly is describing the relations Charlotte and the Prince have as mother and son-in-law. She could also be alluding to the private friendship they had and about which Maggie knew nothing. She does tell Amerigo, "[Y]ou were older friends, and so much more intimate ones, than I had any reason to suppose when we married" (446). She could claim that she was simply referring to the

prior friendship. Conversely, she could be speaking of their sexual relationship. However, it is important to note that she is never explicit.

The Prince questions his wife about what she means by the phrase "two relations." Maggie's explanation is, however, unsatisfactory at first. She says, "One kind . . . was there before us; we took that fully for granted, as you saw, and accepted it. We never thought of there being another, kept out of our sight" (439). The term "relation" is worth unpacking. It certainly alludes to the sexual relations between two people. However, it also means "[t]he position which one person holds with another by means of social or other mutual connections; the connection of people by circumstances, feelings, etc." (OED). The Prince and Charlotte have a mutual affinity; they are freedom-loving cosmopolitans. It is as if Maggie is on the outside looking in or, perhaps more aptly, looking down. She and her father view themselves as "gods together, all careless of mankind" (365). They are powerful and detached. They can only look on genuine feelings between mortals in jealousy. This sense of the term "relation" flows nicely into the political context where relations exist between nations in "[t]he various ways by which a country, state, etc. maintains political or economic contact with another" (OED). Amerigo and Charlotte appear to Maggie and her father as independent, sovereign entities, desiring commerce with each other in an effort to enrich themselves and each other.

Maggie never overtly accuses the Prince, and what is important about this conversation for my purposes is that Maggie's use of the term "relation" is ambiguous enough to follow the skills-based rules in this game. Maggie wishes, in essence, to keep the Prince guessing, and by extension, to punish Charlotte. Amerigo blatantly asks his

wife, "[D]oes anyone else know?" (447) This is a question she fails to answer in any meaningful sense, and she instead calls for the maid. She does, however, envision "the two others alone together at Fawns, and Charlotte, as one of them, having gropingly to go on, always not knowing and not knowing!" (448) Maggie hides the full extent of her knowledge so that the Prince and Charlotte are kept terrified and, hence, compliant. Her plan works very well, for "[s]he had handed him over to an ignorance that couldn't even try to become indifferent . . . it had bitten into his spirit" (517). The Prince relies on his observational skills for information, which is essential when playing the social game in which he is engaged. However, Maggie is giving nothing away. Ignorance therefore puts Amerigo in a very uncomfortable position; he cannot react appropriately with the others if he does not have this central piece of intelligence.

Ignorance wreaks havoc on Charlotte, who has been an inconsistent player throughout the game. For example, upon the occasion of Charlotte's marriage, Fanny both congratulates her friend and tests Charlotte's discretion. Fanny asserts, "You ought to be absolutely happy. You live with such good people" (188). The qualitative judgment Fanny makes is overt; she positions herself as someone qualified to sit in judgment of others, presupposing her own goodness. In response, Charlotte asks, "Does one ever put into words anything so fatuously rash? It's a thing that must be said, in prudence, for one—by somebody who's so good as to take the responsibility: the more that it gives one always a chance to show one's best manners by not contradicting it. Certainly, you'll never have the distress, or whatever, of hearing me complain" (189). Here, Charlotte is harsh, noting that Fanny's assertions are "fatuous" and "rash" insofar as they betray a certain amount of silliness on the part of the speaker and indicate her

lack of reflection. However, Fanny is "responsible" for her ill manners. Charlotte, in contrast, has the good sense to refrain from agreeing or disagreeing. But hasn't Charlotte breached some rule of etiquette by enlightening Fanny in this way, using the language she does? It would matter more if Fanny were engaged in the same game. Major players take greater liberties with Fanny than they do each other precisely because Fanny is more of a sounding board than perceived competitor. Charlotte, who adheres strictly to the rules of etiquette, could never utter such a thing, not only because she wishes to bear the weight of it, but also because it blatantly transgresses the rules by which she is bound. Indeed, Fanny notes that Charlotte "observes the forms . . . But above all with Maggie. And the forms . . . are two-thirds of conduct" (286). Charlotte is sensitive to surface expectations, just as she is sensitive to Maggie's preference for them. Consequently, Charlotte speaks differently to Maggie, whom she perceives as sitting opposite at the gaming table.

This is fine as long as Charlotte feels as though she is in control and has all essential information. The Prince, however, says nothing about his conversation with Maggie to his lover, and Maggie postulates that Amerigo "had reassured and deceived her; so that our young woman . . . now found herself attaching her fancy to that side of the situation of the exposed pair which involved, for themselves at least, the sacrifice of the least fortunate" (464). Charlotte knows there is something wrong and most likely imagines herself the most expendable. Consequently, Maggie and her father employ this skills-based rule successfully to achieve their ends. They change Amerigo into their ideal. He becomes all surface as though he knew that "there was but one way in which a proud man reduced to abjection could hold himself" (465). Charlotte is so terrified that

she almost violates this skills-based rule irreparably. She asks Maggie, "[I]s there anything for which I'm in any degree responsible?" (479) Maggie's response is to say, "I accuse you—I accuse you of nothing" (480). Maggie continues to abide by the rules of the game; however, Charlotte reveals enough of her anxiety and exposes her suffering. She therefore plays the game badly and loses significant ground as a result.

Charlotte becomes an increasingly worse player. When Adam resolves to take his wife back to American City, she tells Maggie that it is, in fact, her idea and desire to return to her homeland. She asserts that she is "[t]ired of this life—the one we've been leading. You like it, I know, but I've dreamed another dream . . . I've an idea that greatly appeals to me—I've had it for a long time. It has come over me that we're wrong. Our real life isn't here" (528). When Maggie questions Charlotte about this statement, Charlotte responds, "I want . . . to have him at last a little to myself; I want, strange as it may seem to you . . . to *keep* the man I've married. And to do so, I see, I must act" (529). Her speeches sound more and more dramatic, and she externalizes too much of what should remain internal. The term "act" could mean that she is taking steps to ensure solitude with her husband. It could also mean that she is acting a part. Her goal, of course, is to maintain her dignity even though Maggie sees through her guise. Charlotte has never liked America and fled to Europe in the first place. However, she has her appearances to maintain even though Maggie is well acquainted with the truth of Charlotte's situation.

Amerigo and Charlotte are not the only ones who are changed; Maggie and her father cannot have a frank conversation either. When they speak about separating, their discourse is indirect. According to the narrator, "[t]hey were avoiding the serious,

standing off, anxiously, from the real" (485). There can be no scenes of any kind the effects of which, in a weak moment, may ripple to the others. Additionally, Maggie wants to hide the information that she is willing to sacrifice her father for the sake of her marriage. Adam says to himself, "She'll break down and name Amerigo; she'll say it's to him she's sacrificing me; and it's by what that will give me—with so many other things too—that my suspicion will be clinched" (494). Yet Maggie does not succumb. Instead, she thinks that "she could more easily have made him name his wife than he have made her name her husband" (494). However, Adam, as a central player, refrains from overt accusations in order to hide information about himself—the connections he has made and the knowledge of impending sacrifice.

In order to win at this game, players may not engage in overt accusations; however, they may and often do work together. Charlotte and the Prince keep a secret side of themselves in reserve, and they share it only with each other. In fact, they often meet in secret, which gives them an opportunity to practice their stories and develop their idiosyncratic methods of communication. For example, the pair dallies at Matcham, raising Maggie's suspicions. They work in concert to defend their leisure together and give a convincing account of their time. However, they do too good of a job and Maggie comes to realize that

> they were *treating* her, that they were proceeding with her—and, for that matter, with her father—by a plan that was the exact counterpart of her own. It was not from her that they took their cue, but—and this is what in particular made her sit up—from each other; and with a depth of unanimity, and exact coincidence of

> inspiration that, when once her attention had begun to fix it, struck her as staring out at her in recovered identities of behavior, expression and tone. (328)

The lovers act in such a way as to alert Maggie to the fact that they are acting together in opposition to her own arrangements. Maggie focuses specifically on their means of communicating with one another and notices that their very cadences and attitudes are so closely aligned that coincidence is improbable. Consequently, it becomes clear that they are acting by design. Maggie also relies on the close sympathy she has with her father when bringing Amerigo and Charlotte back into line. We have seen the subtle ways in which Maggie suggests marrying Charlotte to her father. Additionally, Maggie and her father acknowledge their own close alignment and resolve *together* to separate for the sake of their spouses.

A final skills-based rule in this game therefore permits players to separate their perceived competitors. Maggie, for example, desperately wishes to separate the lovers for a time. Consequently, she proposes that the Prince and Adam take a trip together, leaving Maggie alone with Charlotte. The Prince plays this hand perfectly when he suggests that, instead of asking Adam to accompany him on a trip, Charlotte should make the proposal. Maggie gives up the idea because "her stepmother might report her as above all concerned for the proposal, and this brought her back her need that her father shouldn't think her concerned in any degree for anything. She alighted the next instant with a slight sense of defeat" (347). Appearing "concerned" in any way would give too much information away, constituting bad game play. Silence, in this case, is a necessary concession in the circumstances. Although Maggie loses this hand, she has not yet lost the game.

However, there are times when silence works to her advantage, especially in realizing her lusory goal of separating Amerigo and Charlotte. After their unresolved confrontation over the smashed golden bowl, Maggie realizes that "[s]he had handed him over to ignorance" (517). The result of this ignorance based in silence and suggestion makes the Prince contemplative. The narrator reports that "[h]e struck her as caged" in his "more than monastic cell" (545). Amerigo, who relies so heavily on information to dictate his next move, is at a loss in a condition of ignorance. He adopts the air of defeat and shifts his allegiances completely. When he hands her Charlotte's telegram, she realizes that he was "hers in a degree and on a scale, with an intensity and an intimacy that were a new and strange quantity" (545). In sum, failing to share a key piece of information at the right moment secures Maggie her victory.

Even in victory, there is a kind of defeat, which is a necessary consequence of adopting less, as opposed to more, efficient means. Adam and Maggie's final separation at the climax of *The Golden Bowl* shows that necessarily, in any imperial setting, the colonizer is him- or herself altered. Although she has separated the lovers emotionally, Maggie knows that she must also distance Amerigo and Charlotte physically. The big separation at the end of the novel shows that the game can be won; however, as in chess, sacrifices must be made. Maggie notes, during her conversation about separating from her father, that "[h]e was doing what he had steadily been coming to; he was practically *offering* himself, pressing himself upon her, as a sacrifice" (494). Maggie and her father recognize their success as well as their failure. Adam tells Maggie that it would be inadvisable for her to stay at Fawns. She replies, "'To be back there without Charlotte is more than I think would do.' And as she smiled at him with it, so she saw

him the next instant take it—take it in a way that helped her smile to pass all for an allusion to what she didn't and couldn't say'" (563). Maggie would certainly miss her father and vice versa. So, when she calls the idea of the move a "success," Adam agrees but in the next breath notes "even this isn't altogether failure!" (565) However, it is a partial failure. So while Amerigo and Charlotte can never rekindle their relationship, Maggie and her father have also effectively lost each other. But this sacrifice is well-worth it to the Ververs, who have an imperial project at stake.

The Lusory Attitude

There is an important advantage to adopting less efficient means and holding a lusory attitude in spite of the disadvantages that *The Golden Bowl* documents. According to Suits, the lusory attitude involves "the acceptance of constitutive rules just so the activity made possible by such acceptance can occur" (54). This attitude is essential to games in general because "there has to be an explanation of that curious state of affairs wherein one adopts rules which require one to employ worse rather than better means for reaching an end" (52). For example, foot racers avoid shortcuts because to do so would violate the rules of the game. The adoption of inefficient means appears to be a decidedly irrational thing to do. Suits concedes that "in anything but a game the gratuitous introduction of unnecessary obstacles to the achievement of an end is regarded as a decidedly irrational thing to do, whereas in games it appears to be an absolutely essential thing to do" (53). However, the nature of informal imperialism, gaming and achievement necessitate the adoption of just such an attitude. Mona Domosh explains that studies of informal imperialism focus on the ways in which

"colonial pursuits reshaped imaginations, identities, and everyday practices" (8). The goal is not simply compliance but a shift in consciousness. The Ververs want Amerigo and Charlotte fully committed to their project. In order to make this happen, it is important for them to feel as though they have gained something, even in defeat. Suits explains that "failing to win the game by virtue of losing it implies an achievement, in the sense that the activity in question—playing the game—has been successfully, even though not victoriously, completed" (83). The sense of achievement in failure characterizes both Charlotte's aggrandizement and the Prince's subjugation.

The lovers convince themselves and truly may feel as though they have gained something of value. Amerigo recommits to his wife and son, and with Charlotte no longer in physical proximity, Amerigo can honestly say to his wife, "I see nothing but *you*" (James, *The Golden Bowl* 567). The other woman has literally been removed from the Prince's view, and he is ever watchful of Maggie's responses. However, his secret deceitful nature is cut away and there is every reason to believe he means it. Another plausible reading of the passage is that he respects her gaming abilities, has finally realized his wife's true worth, and so transfers his allegiances to her. Charlotte becomes highly defensive of her marriage and accuses Maggie of being unsupportive. She asserts, "How I see that you loathed our marriage!" (530) She claims, as we have seen, to have recommended a change of scenery to American City. Consequently, she recommits herself to her husband and his museum. Both Charlotte and Amerigo convince themselves that they now have a stake in the new economy, making them complicit in and fully supportive of the Ververs's project.

In this final section, I have argued that the inner workings of the Verver imperial project are detailed in their domestic arrangements. Maggie marries the Prince and, in so doing, acquires a title. The Ververs also insert themselves into history by marrying into the Vespucci family. Although Charlotte is American, her sympathies are decidedly cosmopolitan. Marrying into the Verver fortune certainly helps the couple financially, but they are not fully committed to their spouses or the American "way." Amerigo and Charlotte keep in reserve a private identity that they share only with one another and attempt to keep well hidden from Maggie and Adam. When Maggie becomes enlightened about the illicit relationship between her husband and mother-in-law, she employs a gaming strategy not only to bring the couple into line and restore order, but also to ensure their full commitment. She perceives a shift in power against her and acts with the goal of shifting it back in her favor. Paradoxically, she also self-consciously adopts less efficient means of realizing her goals and, in so doing, adopts a lusory attitude, or willingness to play the long game. The rules of etiquette constitute the constitutive rules, and certain conversational values determine whether one has been a skillful player or not. Amerigo and Charlotte do not play the game as well as Maggie does. However, even in defeat, the lovers are satisfied at having had the opportunity to play and, as a result, gain a new purpose in the Ververs's vision. Although Maggie is ultimately successful, she must sacrifice her close relationship with her father. In this sense, the Ververs are changed as a result of their imperial efforts. The gaming metaphor reveals the full implications of informal forms of imperialism. Additionally, it speaks to the ascendant middle classes that may not have the Verver wealth, but do have the Verver drive.

Conclusion

This discussion, I hope, has illuminated an additional way in which *The Golden Bowl* portrays the American informal imperial project in ways reproducible to the everyday middle-class aspirant. The concerns of empire permeated *fin de siècle* culture, and people thought about national interests at home and abroad, if somewhat vaguely or over-optimistically. Novelists, as important culture-shapers, can help clarify social realities and illuminate future consequences. James's emphasis on leisure and commercial acquisitiveness in the act of empire-building is well-documented. However, shopping and philanthropy as colonial methods are largely available only to the wealthy with a great deal of self-directed leisure at their disposal. *The Golden Bowl*, I have argued, portrays dominance as a social act in everyday interactions. Here, overt violence does not work. Instead, practitioners must adopt more subtle methods for achieving their ends. Dissecting the text through the lens of Suits's definition of games allows readers to see exactly how quotidian social negotiation should play out. Maggie games in order to correct a power imbalance when her husband and friend form an illicit alliance. Amerigo and Charlotte have seemingly reserved a private space for themselves in opposition to the Ververs. The couple communicates with each other by means of a secret language comprised of tone and body language. In this case, player/characters vie for power and influence in a contest of wills. By engaging with them and beating them at their own game of information withholding, Maggie attains her ends. The larger goal is, of course, to shift the power balance one way or another, and one can do this either well or badly.

The Golden Bowl explains why Maggie cannot insist on her way, and it is only after a great deal of anxiety and a false start that she prevails. Gaming is a roundabout way of securing her goals; however, the outcome of this game is, for all participants, significant. Adam and Maggie would like to ensure that their partners are fully committed to their imperial project. Conversely, Amerigo and Charlotte wish to reap the benefits of American entrepreneurship while also maintaining their freedom to do as they like during their leisure hours. This characterization, however, gives the impression that there are two diametrically opposed sides in a winner-take-all scenario. While this may appear to be the case, there are common values that all players hold. Suits's definition also illuminates the extent to which "winning" entails negotiation, compromise, and sacrifice. Amerigo deceives his "partner" at a certain point and Maggie sacrifices her father. Consequently, even in winning, Maggie can never be frank with her husband about the past. Hence, all parties are changed, revealing the fact that even the colonizers are altered as a result of their own endeavors. This is a risk of informal colonial methods that adopt a gaming strategy; however, the rewards are great. Maggie, the narrator is careful to note, "had thrown the dice" and gets most of what she desires (566). Her husband renegotiates his position and Charlotte is doomed to live in a perpetual state of anxiety, which will certainly keep her in line. In any event, the lovers willingly separate and adopt a new purpose. The gaming metaphor is therefore an effective means of illustrating the American "coming age," revealing the fearless and mechanistic pursuit of dominance around the world.

Chapter Four: Careful Listening, Class, and Conversation in *Howards End*

Introduction

E.M Forster's *Howards End* (1910) is a novel about the state of conversational values at the beginning of the twentieth century, during which significant social changes were occurring. Its famous epigraph, "Only connect...," sets the tone for this tale that examines the interpersonal relationships among people, including those within families and the various classes at the advent of modernity. Class relations are central to this novel in the sense that *Howards End* illuminates the harsh realities of nineteenth-century life for the lower middle-class worker. Leonard Bast is clearly vulnerable to the whims of the market, and his dire financial difficulties have a palpable effect, leading directly to a decline in his health. Leonard's plight gives readers direct insight into the struggles of ordinary people during a time of great industrial expansion. While this is an area of scholarly interest,[10] I focus my attention on the ways in which the novel attempts to communicate something about the psychological pressures the business classes exert on everyone, including the leisured classes. These pressures are manifest in the conversational habits of business people, which are often frivolous, self-assured, and functional. They hold themselves up to others as a model of success, and they reproduce and recognize in each other these traits. As a work of art with culture-shaping work to do, this text, like *The Picture of Dorian Gray,* posits an alternative model of interpersonal communication. *Howards End* is ultimately nostalgic and didactic. The

[10] See, for example, Rose, Jonathan. "What Was Leonard Bast Really Like?" *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001. 393-438. Print.

inherently valuable arts of careful listening and conversational facility are under threat from a social focus on mercantilism. These values have their roots in aristocratic culture largely relegated to the distant past; however, anyone can adopt them with guidance and practice.

Two models of life in the novel exist in characters from the business and upper-middle classes. At first glance, the text seems to pit the business-oriented Wilcoxes and the artistically inclined Schlegels against one another in a classic and reductive binary. In fact, early responses to the novel saw a stark divide between the Wilcoxes and Schlegels. However, a binary reading of this type obscures certain important tensions. David Bradshaw argues that the Wilcoxes and Schlegels are more similar than might at first appear in the ways in which they communicate and deal with others, and this insight is important to my analysis. Bradshaw avers that the two parties communicate in a similar way. For example, they both send impersonal telegrams to other people (155). Furthermore, Bradshaw notes that Margaret sends a "well-meaning but discourteous letter to Ruth Wilcox" in an egregious breach of etiquette (155). These similarities in communication style highlight the importance of communication. Bradshaw contends that the commonalities illuminate the frailty of Forster's liberal values and *Howards End* as a novel of "contradictions" (171). In fact, Bradshaw finds that the novel's "hesitations, tensions, rich ambiguity" result in a "fundamental *irresolution*," making it impossible to tell exactly where Forster's sympathies ultimately lie (151). In this project, I am largely unconcerned with where Forster's sympathies lie *per se*, which is a daunting task indeed to discern to any degree of certainty. I focus instead on the text's attitudes about communication generally. The similarities between the Wilcoxes and

Schlegels may just be a matter of the pressure exerted by the bourgeoisie that have changed the way people communicate and interact with one another.

Some characters largely associated with middle-class business values, I contend, are rarely able to connect conversationally because their discourse is terse, ill-informed, and, at times, dictatorial. However, these are not vices of the Wilcoxes alone. One can find characters that ascribe, at certain points, to these values even in the leisured classes. For example, Helen Schlegel praises the Wilcox way of life when she writes to Margaret at the beginning of the novel, "I like them all . . . The fun of it is that they think me a noodle, and say so—at least, Mr. Wilcox does—and when that happens, and one doesn't mind, it's a pretty sure test, isn't it?" (Forster 6) Helen enjoys their family dynamic and the jovial condescension they employ when speaking to her. Henry Wilcox objects to Helen's political views and "says the most horrid things about women's suffrage" (6). As a result, she thinks that she needs to amend her ways and asks her sister, "*[S]hall we ever learn to talk less*? I never felt so ashamed of myself in my life" (7, emphasis mine). Here, Helen understands that less talk is a key component of the Wilcox, bourgeois model. Their lives are busy and noisy, much like the developing urban landscape. Yet those who never connect with others in a meaningful sense ultimately fail. Consequently, the novel, I argue, takes a largely pessimistic view of this character type.

Conversely, Forster associates the aristocratic view with meaningful conversation and careful listening. Characters in sympathy with this view value conversation for its own sake and listen carefully to their surroundings and others. While the term "aristocracy" is traditionally relegated to a class of persons born to their

position, the novel envisions an expanded definition. *Howards End* proposes that some characters of low birth exhibit an aristocratic temperament. They have, by some means, attained the ability to connect with others. The novel suggests therefore that one can acquire an aristocratic worldview. Leonard Bast, for example, is a character who recognizes the value of connection and tries his best to improve his conversational skills. He listens carefully to his conversants' modes of speech and tries to imitate them. Although Leonard dies at the end of the novel, his life is not a failure. His progeny will have a better life as a result of his efforts. Again, we see that values are tied to place; Howard End is the spiritual mecca for those who have developed the capacity to connect. The text therefore appears to take an approving stance towards these values and characters.

However, these values are under serious threat. Business people exert tremendous physical and psychological pressures on their countrymen in a struggle for power. *Howards End* fears this influence. It does not perceive England as belonging properly to the business classes. Instead, it illuminates the values that uplift England's people most, which are aristocratic in nature. Consequently, *Howards End* is a story about inheritance in a greater sense than simply who will get the eponymous house. It also asks who will inherit England's true way of life, and who will carry that way to successive generations. Ruth Wilcox does not choose any of her children to inherit Howards End but instead leaves her home to Margaret Schlegel. An important question, therefore, considering the brevity of her encounter with Mrs. Wilcox, is what makes Margaret so special.

There is good reason to focus on communication in this novel. There is a specific cultural context that informs the novel's preoccupation with conversational virtues. Forster belonged to two important discussion societies: The Cambridge Apostles and The Bloomsbury Group. The Cambridge Conversazione Society, founded at Cambridge University in 1820, was later renamed simply The Society. Each Saturday night, members met in a private room. One member would read an essay and the others would debate the question the author posed, with the debate culminating in a vote (Deacon 3). Members developed their own argot, communicating with one another in coded language (5). They were subsequently dubbed Apostles because they were "concerned to propagate and explain the Gospels and in so doing this honestly and sincerely to resolve all doubts concerning . . . respective interpretations by debating them in secret" (3). However, they were also attracted to philosophy, and several later members became famous philosophers, including Bertrand Russell and G. E. Moore. Early members held Coleridge in high esteem for his philosophical ideas and brilliant conversational manner (10). E.M. Forster, elected on February 9, 1901 (Levy 226), was a "strong force," and hosted readings in his rooms (Deacon 96).

One Apostle, Toby Stephen, wanted to keep Apostle-style conversations alive after leaving Cambridge in 1905, so he began hosting Thursday night discussions at his home in Bloomsbury (Rosner 3), along with this sisters Virginia and Vanessa. These conversations, however, were generally not as they had been at Cambridge. Instead of whole group discussions, groups of two or three people at a time gathered in private corners to have their intimate talks. Forster became an integral member of the Bloomsbury Group, and it was in this environment that he composed *Howards End.*

Group members seemed to agree about various issues. For example, members, according to Maynard Keynes, read, interpreted, and idealized G.E. Moore's *Principia Ethica* and "derived from Moore a belief in the moral priorities of cultivating a sensitive sensibility, of analyzing reflectively one's own state of mind, and of paying utmost attention to personal relations," which plays out in *Howards End* as a statement of public responsibility (Sidorsky 246).

In writing *Howards* End, Forster asserted that he wished to write "a condition of England novel" that would be "a national allegory in which interactions between various English types analyse England's unhealthy condition and project a better future" (Peppis 47). What, however, does Forster mean by the phrase "unhealthy condition" and "a better future"? I argue that the unhealthy condition to which the novel refers is the inability to connect, and the primary value the novel is concerned to promote is the ability of making appropriate connections through conversation and careful listening that foster empathy. In this chapter, I first illuminate the central role conversation plays in the text. I next examine the novel's stance on the English mercantile class and its effects on English society. Business values have complicated implications in the novel, but they ultimately have a degenerative effect on conversation. Some characters, who adopt aristocratic values push back against business types like the Wilcoxes and other characters who have succumbed to the pressures of bourgeois thinking. Third, I examine an entirely different set of conversational values embodied by the upper-middle leisured classes. They are intellectual, curious, social, and entertaining, and they take an interest in the health of their society; however, they too have their vices. They can be remote, self-absorbed, and indulgent. However, they

learn and change. The final section of this chapter argues that readers can, in fact, discern a stance from the novel, and that connection and empathy are possible for the modern subject but only in dialogue with the past. The novel asks readers to reclaim aristocratic values of connection embodied in Ruth Wilcox and Miss Avery, neither of whom is high born but both of whom have an intuitive sense of these values.

Conversation as a Central Concern in *Howards End*

I argue in this section of my chapter that conversation is an important feature of *Howards End*. The story begins in epistolary style with Helen's tales of her visit to the Wilcoxes. These communiqués stimulate further attempts at communication between two distinct families. Unsurprisingly, egregious misunderstandings separate people and impede their ability to connect. In what follows, I analyze the beginning scene in *Howards End* in order to show how central communication is to the action and how the text reveals character through conversation. The scene is rich with both verbal and non-verbal forms of exchange. It also shows how susceptible characters are to the influence of others. Finally, it illuminates in detail the consequences of miscommunication which engenders unhealthy relationships among people.

Helen's letters reveal her keen observational skills and her susceptibility to influence. She is, at first, charmed by the Wilcoxes whom she is visiting. She finds that "the energy of the Wilcoxes had fascinated her, had created new images of beauty in her responsive mind" (Forster 19). Their ways are seductive, and she finds that "[s]he had liked giving in" to their rhetoric and propaganda (19). She describes each member of the family in turn to her sister largely in terms of their discourse. Mr. Wilcox, for example, bullies porters (5), and Charles believes that being polite to servants is wasted

effort (19). The Wilcox household is always busy and noisy. She tells Meg, "Later on I heard the noise of croquet balls, and looked out again, and it was Charles Wilcox practising . . . Presently he started sneezing and had to stop. Then I hear more clicking, and it is Mr. Wilcox practicing, and then, 'a-tissue, a-tissue': he has to stop too" (6). The constant noise crowds out time for quiet contemplation, and Helen is carried along to her detriment. She attempts to explain her ideological views to Mr. Wilcox, who, she says, "just folded his arms and gave me such a setting down as I've never had" (6). The body language and tone indicate he is most comfortable infantilizing women. She is literally mute when pressed to respond. She confesses to Margaret, "I couldn't say a word" (7). When Mr. Wilcox asserted that "one sound man of business did more good to the world than a dozen of your social reformers," Helen merely "swallowed the curious assertion without a gasp, and . . . leant back luxuriously among the cushions of the motor car" (19). The Wilcox influence is comforting; their opinions seem solid, and they take all care from Helen so that she does not have to shoulder the responsibility of having independent thought. She is happy, at least for a time, to be treated in this manner. The association of this rhetoric and the motor car illuminates the extent to which modernist cant is quick and easy. It is the language of haste to get somewhere by the most expedient means possible without taking the time to reflect. Clearly, all of the haste and noise have had an effect on the impressionable and imaginative Helen. She fails to defend herself conversationally. More importantly, however, she writes an extremely ill-advised note to Margaret, informing her of her engagement to Paul.

Helen's haste has its effect on other family members. Aunt Juley rushes to Howards End. Margaret wants to go; however, Mrs. Munt objects on the grounds of

what she might say. She tells Margaret, "You would say the wrong thing; to a certainty you would. In your anxiety for Helen's happiness you would offend the whole of these Wilcoxes by asking one of your impetuous questions" (9). Aunt Juley, who is concerned that Margaret will make a verbal blunder, ends up being the one to put her foot in her mouth when she mistakes Charles for Paul and inadvertently lets slip the secret engagement (16). The misunderstanding is a result of ambiguous communication. Mrs. Munt asks Charles, "[A]re you the younger Mr. Wilcox or the elder?" to which Charles appropriately responds, "The younger" (14). She thinks that he means he is Paul, and in failing to follow Margaret's advice in only speaking to Helen of the matter, Mrs. Munt commits her *faux pas*.

Anger and an unwillingness to listen further distance people. The discourse between Mrs. Munt and Charles becomes a cacophony of wrath and righteous indignation leading the parties to take sides against one another. Charles inveighs against his younger sibling for being a fool and for not telling the rest of the family about the engagement. He castigates Helen for her loose tongue, as he didn't need to do, certainly in front of her aunt. When Mrs. Munt responds, Charles cuts her off. She asks, "Might I finish my sentence, please?" He responds simply, "No" (17). The only perspective that matters is Charles's.

In "Dialogue and Power in E.M. Forster's *Howards End*" (1995), R.A. But and Timothy R. Austin employ some concepts from discourse theory to explore the "function" of dialogue in *Howards End*. These authors focus on a small part of the text, a single encounter between Henry and Margaret at a restaurant on the Strand to illustrate that "Forster's characters are seeking continuously to empower themselves

through the language they use and to modify the status that society has assigned them to better suit their aspirations" (71). According to these authors, conversation is more akin to a battle characterized by attack and counter-attack in verbal form. As seen, combative talk is certainly one type of verbal encounter that takes place in the novel among characters who cannot connect with one another. Evidently, it is a feature of human intercourse and characterizes the modern condition; however, it is not the most noteworthy type of speech in the text.

The quiet moments are just as important as the noisy ones. As it turns out, Helen and Paul are no longer engaged by the time Mrs. Munt and Charles arrive at Howards End, a fact they never explicitly communicate to each other. Helen goes downstairs the next morning after Paul's confession of love under the influence of the wych-elm. In the clear light of day, "he looked frightened" (Forster 21). This situation illuminates the extent to which the Wilcoxes and those who adopt their values are, in essence, all "panic and emptiness" (21). Charles certainly panics when he believes his younger brother to be engaged. He asks Paul if there is anything to the rumor that he and Helen are engaged: "Yes or no, man; plain question, plain answer" (18). However, Mrs. Wilcox responds, "Charles, dear Charles, one doesn't ask plain questions. There aren't such things" (18). Here, Mrs. Wilcox notes the complexity of language and meaning, and espouses consequentialist values when she tells her son that Helen and Paul are no longer in love, which is all that matters in the end (19).

The text illuminates the different approaches to life that are later discussed at length in the novel. Helen, as a representative of the upper middle leisured classes, is idealistic and romantic, educated and opinionated. She is fascinated by the Wilcoxes,

who exhibit a distinctive way of life. The text describes them as having conversational virtues: "They talked to each other and to other people, they filled the tall thin house at Wickham Place with whom they liked or could befriend" (22). Helen is at first charmed and seduced by the Wilcoxes, their noise, and their need for constant activity. Mr. Wilcox is self-assured and dictatorial, and Charles follows suit. Charles barks out orders and threats to the train-station workers, and mutters about them under his breath indignantly. These characters seem so confident and decisive, and they definitely embody a distinctive way of living. Conversely, the text describes in loving detail Ruth Wilcox, who "seemed to belong not to the young people and their motor, but to the house, and to the tree that overshadowed it" (18). She does not belong to modernity, as indicated by the reference to the motor car, but to solid, immovable things such as the tree and the house. In fact, the past speaks to her and advises her to "[s]eparate those human beings who will hurt each other most. The rest can wait" (18). She listens carefully and obeys blindly, and she succeeds in soothing tensions. The other characters pay little heed to her—at least initially; however, the text itself is greatly interested in her aristocratic conversational style. Consequently, the diegetic elements point to a mistrust of bourgeois modernity and modern discourse, and nostalgia for the wisdom of past ages.

This section has argued that the opening scene illustrates the importance of conversation to the text. It identifies various character types by their conversational values. The noisy and busy Wilcoxes are conversational bullies. They are largely insular as a family and talk down to Helen and her aunt. Helen's idealism is a source of amusement to the Wilcoxes who loses her tongue when called upon to defend her

opinions. Helen entertains the Wilcox way but ultimately discovers the emptiness of their values. Thus, the text takes a negative view of business-class discourse. The Schlegels, on the other hand, are far from insular and seek out new people with whom they can converse. The text takes a more sympathetic view of these values. The Wilcoxes also entertain, but Ruth Wilcox notes, "I hear a great deal of chatter at home, for we, like you, entertain a great deal. With us it is more sport and politics" (59). There is little, if any, time for quiet contemplation, and the Schlegels are too susceptible to the pressures of bourgeois thinking. A third model, embodied by Ruth Wilcox, proposes that listening to the lessons of the past and dealing conversationally with people according to those dictates is the path to connection.

Business Values in *Howards End* and the Language of Hurry

There are forces in the England of Forster's day that undervalue and subvert interpersonal connection. These values, I contend, are most embodied by the business classes that are rushed, ambitious, and restless. However, they can be found in all strata and in most other characters in the novel. This is due, I believe, to the enormous psychological pressures on people to conform. In this section, I analyze the ways in which *Howards End* presents these business values through character. The primary business-oriented characters are of course Mr. Wilcox and his children. They employ a specific conversational manner toward which the novel takes a largely negative view. Readers have picked up on this attitude and have found the Wilcoxes largely "vulgar, blatant and brutal . . . they stand for all that is worst" (Bradshaw 153). I also think that the novel identifies some of their important virtues. Even so, their effect is largely

destructive. In what follows, I analyze the crucial ways in which the business classes fail to listen and engage in hasty discourse, and I examine their effects on other characters. I next detail the ways in which their conversational vices have affected the conversational lives of other influential characters without their realizing it.

Mr. Wilcox and his children have significant conversational vices. Their interaction with others is, at times, curt, accusatory, dismissive, conspiratorial, and often rude. Henry is condescending to women in particular. The family's business conversations are more akin to lectures than any sort of mutual exchange. I have, in the previous section, illuminated the extent to which the Wilcoxes demean Helen for her political views. The text asserts that they self-assuredly proclaim equality, votes for women, Socialism, and art and literature as all "nonsense" (19). Additionally, upon his father's marriage to Margaret, Charles worries about "their artistic beastliness" in their family affairs (134). This attitude comes from the top. Henry self-assuredly proclaims "that one sound man of business did more good to the world than a dozen of your social reformers" (19). The exact nature of this "good" is largely unclear, but Henry speaks of it with such conviction that nobody challenges it. For example, Henry says, "None of you girls have any nerves, really" (145) and tells Henry, "[T]o comment is unfeminine" (172). He expects Margaret to do her duty by him no matter what, and he betrays his conventional values when Helen asks to stay at Howards End for one night when her pregnancy is discovered. Margaret rightly identifies the source of the problem: Henry does not want to accommodate Helen's request because he judges her for having an affair out of wedlock. However, he can hardly say this in front of Margaret and waffles on a bit about how the house is damp and reminds her of certain duties she has to him.

The thinly—veiled sexism is a necessary consequence of the constant need to be right and authoritative

The "sound man of business" is also constantly moving. Modern living is fast-paced and transitory. The Wilcoxes love their modern means of transportation and choose to live in the city instead of Howards End. Those who embrace modern values, like the Wilcoxes, live in accord with "the architecture of hurry" (80) and physical restlessness. Helen is amazed at the constant level of physical activity in which the Wilcox children engage. Evie does "callisthenic exercises on a machine that is tacked on to a greengage tree—they put everything to use" (6). Meanwhile, the Schlegels are compelled to move from their home because their lease has expired. Margaret remarks that "modern ownership of movables is reducing us again to a nomadic horde . . . historians of the future will note how the middle classes accreted possessions without taking root in the earth, and may find in this the secret of their imaginative poverty" (109). The constant shifting means that connection with others is difficult. Modern individuals also have a distinctive means of communication that impedes connection with others. They employ the "language of hurry . . . clipped words, formless sentences, potted expressions of approval or disgust" (80). In the developing urban landscape, "human beings heard each other speak with greater difficulty" (79). Charles is short with the train station workers and Mrs. Munt, Mr. Wilcox dismisses Helen with pithy statements, and Paul's assertions of love are based on temporary feelings that fall apart in the clear light of day.

Henry is certainly guilty of a type of rushed, careless and disingenuous speech that, in many cases, harms other people. Margaret gets a hint of this when Henry

describes the character of his business acquaintances. According to the narrator, "[s]he would be told, Oh, So-and-so's a good sort—a thundering good sort, and find, on meeting him, that he was a brute or a bore . . . The thundering good sort might at any moment become a fellow for whom I never did have much use, and have less now. And be shaken off cheerily into oblivion" (149). Henry thinks about people in terms of their immediate use-value, making rushed assertions of character. When they cease to have such value, he casts them off, denying any affection he may have espoused formerly. Henry's attitude costs Leonard his position at the Porphyrion. He had previously advised the Schlegels to warn their friend to clear out of the company, as he does. However, when Margaret communicates this development to Henry, his response is unsettling: "[N]ot a bad business that Porphyrion,' he said *absently*, as he took his own letter out of his pocket" (135, emphasis mine). When Margaret questions his assertion, he simply explains, "A clerk who clears out of any concern, good or bad, without securing a berth somewhere else first, is a fool, and I've no pity for him" (136). Here, Henry simply shifts the blame for his bad advice. Leonard has a new situation but at a significantly reduced salary, which causes him a great deal of financial hardship. The Schlegel sisters feel the responsibility of this, but Henry shrugs it off because it has no impact on him, and he advises Margaret and Helen to do the same. Margaret concludes that his is a "slap-dash method" (165). Finally, Henry's marriage proposal is surprisingly inarticulate for such a self-assured man, as the following dialogue demonstrates: "Could you be induced to share my—is it probable—," he begins, followed by, "Miss Schlegel—Margaret—you don't understand . . . I am asking you to be my wife" (119). There is no flowery language of courtship in this proposal. Indeed,

he begins formally, with "Miss Schlegel," and then corrects himself. The stuttering betrays panic that sits underneath the confident exterior. Margaret remarks that he "desired comradeship and affection, but he feared them" (119) as well. She promises to write him a response, and their good-byes are stilted and business-like.

The seeds Henry sows bear ill fruit. Charles, like his father, is a bully conversationally. He does not talk to servants so much as order them around. For example, Mrs. Munt notes that he is accustomed to command, a fact of which Forster gives ample evidence. Charles's encounter with his father's chauffeur, Crane, comes to mind. Charles believes that someone has driven his new car because there is a bit of mud on it. Charles says, "Whoever's driven it hasn't cleaned it properly, for there's mud on the axle. Take it off. The man went for the cloths without a word . . . Well, Crane, who's been driving it, do you suppose? Don't know, I'm sure sir. No one's driven it since I've been back, but, of course, there's the fortnight I've been away with the other car in Yorkshire" (70). Charles continues to question Crane about who could have taken the car out but is angry because he believes "[t]he man was treating him as a fool" (70). The tone Charles takes is condescending, and his insistent questioning, unrelenting. The mud on the car seems like a slight matter; however, Charles takes it as a personal affront that the car should have been driven and even more so that he should be contradicted.

He is, perhaps unsurprisingly, the immediate cause of Leonard's death. Charles believes his family has been disgraced and lists the Schlegel women's offenses in his head: "the attempt to compromise his brother, his mother's legacy, his father's marriage, the introduction of the furniture, the unpacking of the same" (220). Charles's

inner monologue reveals his obsession with family honor. In order to reclaim that honor, he confronts Tibby and essentially bullies him into divulging information about Helen. The narrator recounts that Charles "pressed" for these details (220). The bullying tone subsequently turns into a progressively rough appeal: "If a man played about with my sister, I'd send a bullet through him, but perhaps you don't mind . . . You are hiding something . . . 'When you saw her last, did she mention anyone's name? Yes or no" (220). When he learns from Tibby that Helen has had dealings with the Basts and considers Tibby's secretive demeanor, he surmises that Leonard is probably Helen's "seducer." During the confrontation at Howards End, Charles hits Leonard, just as he would an animal. He purportedly does so to take back his family's honor, but this attack is also the natural consequence of his upbringing and ways of relating to people he considers beneath him. He is self-entitled but lacks ability. The narrator tells us that "[h]e lacked his father's ability in business, and so had an even higher regard for money" (155). His father, however had "brought up his children with expensive tastes" and "believed in letting them shift for themselves" (188). The confluence of privilege, high expectations, and failure has led Charles to this moment.

He, like his father, has regressive attitudes about women. Henry Wilcox believes that "[m]an is for war, woman for the recreation of the warrior" (185). He appreciates her attention to his every need and clearly thinks she is an inferior being. His children follow suit. Charles scolds his wife Dolly on occasion as though she were a child (133). Furthermore, during the discussion about Howards End, Charles questions whether the note is actually written in his mother's hand. Dolly responds, "Why, you just said it was!" to which her husband blazes, "Never mind if I did . . . and hold your tongue"

(72). Charles's regressive attitudes are not limited to the family circle; he has simplistic ideas about women generally. He believes in "temptresses," even to the point of thinking that Margaret wishes to seduce him (155). The narrator reports that "Charles believed in temptresses, who are indeed the strong man's necessary complement, and having no sense of humour, he could not purge himself of the thought by a smile" (155). Charles clearly takes himself entirely too seriously and believes himself a strong man, a character which gives him license to treat women as he does. He takes this attitude too far when he feels as though he has to defend his family honor against the pregnant, licentious temptress Helen, whom he considers "the most dangerous of the Schlegels . . . the girl must be got out of the way before she disgraced them farther" (219). He manipulates Tibby into telling him whom Helen's seducer is. He says, "I suppose you realize that you are your sister's protector? . . . If a man played about with my sister, I'd send a bullet through him, but perhaps you don't mind" (22). The sexist attitude and bullying tone work, and Tibby is shamed into revealing Leonard's identity.

Finally, modern bourgeois speech as conducted by the Wilcoxes is often conspiratorial and paranoid. The Wilcoxes are disgusted when they discover Ruth has left Howards End to Margaret. They interrupt each other and fling vacuous accusations and threats. Charles even suggests that Margaret may have unduly influenced his mother (72). All of the Wilcoxes also think badly of Ruth and tell themselves that "[s]he was not as true, as dear, as [they] supposed;" they come to believe "Mrs. Wilcox had been treacherous to the family, to the laws of property, to her own written word" (74). Ruth is treacherous for leaving Howards End to Margaret and taking the property out of the family. This is not the last time that Henry questions family loyalty. At Evie's

wedding, he thinks that Margaret has invited Mrs. Bast on purpose to humiliate him. He says, "Allow me to congratulate you on the success of your plan" (166). He believes that she wishes to be released from her engagement to him even though she clearly does not understand what is happening. When she brings the subject up again, he says, "I perceive you are attempting blackmail" (219). Margaret was, however, only asking Henry to see the connection between his own and Helen's actions when he denies her request for Helen to stay one night at Howards End. Henry cannot see connections, nor can he understand those who do.

Paranoia finds its way into the lower middle classes as an economic necessity. When Helen makes off with Leonard Bast's umbrella, Leonard refuses to give Margaret his address so that she can return it. His voice turns "dead and cold" when dismissing the suggestion but communicates enough about his thoughts to Margaret, who surmises that "this fool of a young man thought that she and Helen and Tibby had been playing the confidence trick on him, and that if he gave his address they would break into his rooms some midnight or other and steal his walking-stick too" (28). Margaret invites him to their home so that he may retrieve his property, and Leonard's tone changes as his trust increases. His conversation becomes easier as he tells Margaret how he spends his leisure hours. He reflects on the quality of their conversation, no longer concerned about whether or not the Schlegels are out to get him.

Leonard is affected in other ways as well. He has a modern sense of ambition and restlessness. The narrator reports, "Had he lived some centuries ago, in the brightly coloured civilizations of the past, he would have had a definite status, his rank and his income would have corresponded" (35). The implication here is, of course, that Leonard

would have been happy with the situation he was born into, but the promises of democracy have made him unsatisfied. In the current economic climate, "he was obliged to assert gentility, lest he slip into the abyss where nothing counts, and the statements of Democracy are inaudible" (35-36). Leonard's ambition marks him as a sad case because, in this economy, he is given the promise of elevation through industry; however, he is described as having significant deficiencies when compared to his "betters." For instance, the narrator views Leonard as not being as "courteous as the average rich man, nor as intelligent, nor as healthy, nor as lovable" (35). Here the narrator implies that the presence of money can make a man more intelligent, healthy and lovable than those without money.

Bradshaw argues that the narrator's tone and clear class bias give us reason to question Forster's liberal reputation. He posits that "some readers might wish to reconsider whether, on the evidence of *Howards End*, Forster's status as a liberal icon is really as secure as some critics would have us believe" due, in large part, to the similarity between the Wilcoxes and Schlegels (153). Randall Stevenson argues that *Howards End* "treats patronizingly or implausibly characters from outside the middle class, excluding anyone from further down the social scale, barely ironically" (219). I disagree that we can tell anything about Forster's sympathies from his narrator. In fact, there are hints from the text that we are not to take this narrator at face value. For example, the narrator's problematic assertion about money contradicts the action in the novel itself. When Henry's past connection to Jacky is revealed, Henry fears blackmail because "[h]e was rich and supposed to be moral;" however, "the Basts knew that he was not, and might find it profitable to hint as much" (Forster 177). While the narrator

has asserted that rich men are superior in various ways, Henry knows the truth, and the Basts never capitalize on this information. The narrator merely reports and is unable to reflect on Henry's fears. The novel, however, is far from disparaging of Leonard in my reading. He is a plausible character in the sense that he is powerless but strives to better himself. The only model of business success he has is Henry Wilcox.

Leonard has conversational vices similar to the Wilcoxes'. For example, on his way home from his first encounter with the Schlegels, Leonard meets a colleague on the train. Their discourse is pedestrian, simple, functional, and rushed. The following constitutes one example: "Evening, Mr. Bast. Evening, Mr. Dealtry. Nice evening. Evening" (36). The conversation with another colleague he meets outside his home is similarly pedestrian: "Evening, Mr. Bast. Evening, Mr. Cunningham. Very serious thing this decline of the birth-rate in Manchester" (36). It is as though conversation is at best an obligation and at worst a necessary evil rather than a source of pleasure or communion with others. Talk is even more problematic at home. Leonard's attempts at communication with his lady friend, Jacky, are strained. He tells her that he has been to a concert, but instead of inquiring further, she changes the subject when she asks, "Anyone been around to our place? . . . Not that I've seen. I met Mr. Cunningham outside, and we passed a few remarks. What, not Mr. Cunningham? Yes. Oh, you mean Mr. Cunningham. Yes. Mr. Cunningham." (40). This short exchange is repetitive and betrays Jacky's superficiality and small attention span. In fact, this is about the limit of her conversational repertoire. The narrator tells us that after this exchange, "Jacky made no further experiments in the difficult and tiring art of conversation . . . she was not likely to find her tongue. Occasional bursts of song . . . still issued from her lips, but the

spoken word was rare" (40). It is no wonder Leonard confesses his soul and says a bit too much when presented with the prospect of an intelligent conversant, like the undergraduate he meets, such a meeting being so rare an occurrence. He craves intelligent company once he has found it. And despite his professions of honor, he sleeps with Helen after they had stayed up late talking about Henry, Nietzsche, Jacky, the state of his marriage, and the unpleasant reality of having to make a living.

The Schlegels also reproduce conversational habits similar to those of the bourgeois man of business. Some critics find the Schlegels' behavior problematic. For example, Bradshaw says the important question "whether these families are really as different as chalk and cheese is a conundrum that grows in significance as Forster's fourth novel unfolds" (151). For example, Helen is hasty and sloppy. I have detailed at length the consequences of Helen's ill-advised telegram announcing her engagement. Margaret does not always get it right either. Leonard's first impressions are unfavorable. According to him, "Margaret, though not unkind was severe and remote" (Forster 169). Some scholars also see her as largely unsympathetic. For example, Barbara Rosecrance finds Margaret detached and withdrawn from the world, making her appear "unattractive" (147-48). Rosecrance further argues that "[t]he visible signs of her increased insight are indifference, irritation, and a proprietary concern for Howards End that focuses on matter rather than spirit" (148). Bradshaw avers that Margaret harbors "a number of less open-minded attitudes and an aptitude for gross insensitivity" (155). There is support for these views in the text. Ruth seeks a meeting with Margaret, who, in turn, proposes by telegram that their acquaintance should end (Forster 50). Margaret is discourteous a second time when Mrs. Wilcox invites her new friend to

Howards End but Margaret declines the invitation initially (63). Bourgeois conversational vices are clearly not limited to the business classes but seep into the mannerisms of people from all walks of life.

However, the text also shows some good qualities that characterize bourgeois conversation. Margaret appreciates the middle class's "grit as well as grittiness," and its members have virtues such as "neatness, decision, and obedience" (76). The Wilcox types comprise an important class of persons who form civilizations and, according to Margaret, they "form character, too . . . they keep the soul from becoming sloppy" (77). Margaret is right, and Henry Wilcox is nothing if not decisive. For example, the Wilcoxes make quick work of Ruth's note leaving Howards End to Margaret. Additionally, Margaret pleads with Henry to interview Leonard Bast for a job, as he agrees to do after asking her only a few quick questions (165). However, there is a dark side to this virtue. Henry just as promptly turns against the Basts when Jacky reveals the shame of Henry's past to Margaret. Quick action is preferable to endless dithering and inaction, but there is certainly a darker side to decisiveness, especially when coupled with haste and paranoia.

The Wilcoxes are also obedient, according to Margaret. They are obedient and loyal to one another certainly. More importantly, however, they listen to their intellectual superiors when things go badly. Margaret believes in and acts on the power of her influence. When she accepts Henry's proposal she understands that "she connected, though the connection might be bitter, and she hoped that some day Henry would do the same" (149). She uses all means at her disposal to facilitate her fiancé's ability to connect with others. For example, Henry is persuaded to interview Leonard

for a position because Margaret uses her influence effectively. When faith in his family values is shaken as a result of Charles's incarceration, he becomes almost completely dependent on Margaret. The narrator reports that "Henry's fortress gave way. He could bear no one but his wife, he shambled up to Margaret afterwards and asked her to do what she could with him" (237). This is an unsatisfying virtue in the novel because it does not evince the true connection that Margaret desires to see her husband develop. Even though Henry never makes the appropriate connections, he is suitably dependent on his wife, who has learned and grown throughout the novel.

These virtues, however, do not outweigh the destructive effects of middle-class speech, illuminating the extent to which the text disapproves of these conversational habits. Henry is careless and starts a chain of events that eventually leads to Leonard's death. Leonard leaves his job when Henry Wilcox irresponsibly advises Margaret that Porphyrion is an unstable company. The young clerk goes to another company that downsizes, and Leonard is reduced to begging from relatives. After his affair with Helen, he takes his ill-fated journey to Howards End to confess his sins to Margaret. Additionally, Henry loses the esteem of his wife because of his obstinacy. He refuses to allow Helen one night's stay at Howards End, because in his paranoid mind, "[i]f she wants to sleep one night, she may want to sleep two" (217). Margaret can stand no more. She lashes out at her husband for ruining lives as a result of his inability to connect. In her famous speech, she says, "You shall see the connection if it kills you, Henry! You have had a mistress—I forgave you. My sister has a lover—you drive her from the house" (219). Margaret's critiques are about the ways in which Henry uses language, which either help or hinder his ability to connect with others and recognize

the effects of his behavior. The novel is clear to show that Henry's ways are not optimal. Additionally, the example Henry sets for his children conversationally leads to their own destruction. Charles's unchecked bullying, which he learns from his father, eventually breaks family solidarity. Not only does Charles bully social inferiors, but he routinely bullies women and others to get what he wants. He wrangles the name of Helen's "seducer" from Tibby and assaults the hapless Leonard, who subsequently dies. Henry sees the outcome and "link[s] his arm in his son's" in a show of support, "but somehow like[s] him less" (231). Here, Henry feels a break in the tight connection he enjoyed formerly with his son.

This section of my chapter has argued that the novel takes a distinct stance on business-class conversation, which it portrays negatively to a large extent. Bourgeois conversation is hurried, bullying, and paranoid. It mimics, to a large extent, the ungainly development of the metropolis and its destructive effects on human interaction. Henry Wilcox and his children speak hastily, bully people, and have no problem communicating their paranoid theories about other characters. They and those like them have money, power, and influence. Consequently, they can and do exert pressure on others to adopt their values. In fact, people hardly speak to one another in any meaningful sense. Leonard's conversations with those he meets on the street are terse and vacant. Helen feels the pressure keenly and writes a hasty note to her relatives that leads to a separation between the families. Margaret also writes discourteous notes without thinking through the consequences of her actions thoroughly. Tibby is self-absorbed and uninterested in other people to such an extent that he betrays his sister's confidence and divulges Leonard's identity to Charles. There are some redeeming

virtues about middle-class talk, which is decisive—and obedient. However, decisiveness can be harmful when coupled with other vices. Obedience, when insular, only reinforces existing habits. Even when they work as virtues, decisiveness and obedience cannot counteract the negative features of bourgeois social interaction. The harm done is devastating to the Wilcoxes and others. This, I contend, is not the model the novel would like future generations to adopt.

Conversation, Listening, and Learning in *Howards End*

In this section of my chapter, I examine the conversational values embodied by the upper middle leisured classes exemplified most notably by the Schlegels. I have argued that all three siblings, to varying degrees, succumb to the pressures of middle-class conversational habits. However, they also feel the effects of their mistakes keenly and learn from them. In essence, they develop, to varying degrees, the capacity to listen and, in the end, connect with others. The Schlegels are, to varying degrees, generally intellectual, social, and entertaining, and they take an interest in the health of their society. While the text largely approves of these values, there is also a darker side to the Schlegel style. They can sometimes be remote, self-absorbed, and their discussions about social problems are largely ineffectual and frustrating. They are also condescending and indulgent of harmful conversational vices in other characters when they should, if true to their values, work for change.

Each of the Schlegels has a distinctive personality. Tibby's conversational character is revealed early on during a performance of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. The narrator observes that Tibby takes an academic interest in the technical features of the music. According to the narrator, Tibby "is profoundly versed in counterpoint, and

holds the full score open on his knee" (25) and on two occasions "implored the company generally to look out for the transitional passage on the drum" (26). He enjoys academic and technical conversations. However, he is generally remote and unapproachable. He is described as "dyspeptic and difficult" (24). Additionally, he is massively self-absorbed. For example, when Helen visits him at Oxford just before going away to Munich, she weeps as he eats his lunch and longs for his Chinese grammar. And he is partly guilty for what happens to Leonard because he betrays his sister's confidence, admittedly without meaning to do so; however, his clear lack of interest in human affairs (221) makes him susceptible to Charles's bullying ways. The narrator explains that Tibby's existence was "leisure without sympathy . . . Tibby gave all the praise to himself" for his wealth and "so despised the struggling and the submerged" (220). Consequently, Tibby mentions to Charles the scene at Evie's wedding concerning the Basts, and only when it is too late does he see what has happened. The narrator tells us that Tibby was "not enough interested in human life to see where things will lead to" (221). In essence, he is so fixed on his own work and has such a self-congratulatory nature that he has a great deal of trouble connecting initially.

Helen is generally more socially popular than her siblings. The narrator reports that she "resembled her sister, but she was pretty, and so apt to have a more amusing time. People gathered round her more readily, especially when they were new acquaintances, and she did enjoy a little homage very much" (24). Helen's easy and entertaining conversational manner is meant to elicit an effect. The narrator betrays the fact that she enjoys "homage." Her efforts are therefore largely focused on getting a certain amount of attention and not necessarily on connecting with others. This perhaps

explains why she doesn't mind it when the Wilcoxes bully her because their attention is giving her what she needs. She is certainly a guest in their home; however, she is also far too indulgent of their condescending attitude. Helen's difficulty in connecting is readily apparent from her first encounter with Leonard Bast. When searching for his umbrella, she finds one that is in bad shape. She asks, "What about this umbrella? . . . No, it's all gone along the seams. It's an appalling umbrella. It must be mine" (32). However, it is, in fact, Leonard's property. Embarrassed, he flees as soon as he retrieves it. Helen never connects her careless *faux pas* to Leonard's abrupt departure. Furthermore, Helen can be downright cruel conversationally. Leonard clearly lies when he returns to explain why Jacky had called on the Schlegels looking for him. Helen presses him for a coherent story because she "didn't see why he should get off. She had the cruelty of youth." She consequently continues to question him in a way designed to embarrass him (86). Consequently, Helen, like her brother, has trouble connecting with others at first.

Margaret is, from the beginning, better able to make connections than her siblings. For example, she is the first one to meet and have a civilized conversation with Leonard. She is able to empathize with him, employing her imagination when thinking what it must be like to be in his economic position. She is, in short, able to connect for most of the novel. She marries Henry Wilcox and hopes that he will one day learn to connect as she has done (149). However, she is far too indulgent of her husband. For example, the narrator reports that "[h]e had only to call, and she clapped the book up and was ready to do what he wished. Then they would argue so jollily, and once or twice she had him in quite a tight corner, but as soon as he grew really serious, she gave

in" (185). Margaret gives in because she understands Henry's ego and his attitudes about women. However, this habit of surrender is, in a sense, disrespectful of him because it infantilizes him. She even recognizes that she has been entirely too indulgent. She tells him, "I've spoiled you long enough. All your life you have been spoiled. Mrs. Wilcox spoiled you. No one has ever told what you are—muddled, criminally muddled" (219). Henry is muddled to the extent that he harms other people, and this harm makes his conduct criminal. Margaret utterly fails, until it is entirely too late, to exert the appropriate influence over him.

Leonard Bast also exhibits some of the best Schlegel conversational values. Although he has been denied their social advantages, he works to improve his ability to talk about books with his newfound friends. Leonard wonders, "[W]as it possible to catch up with leisured women, who had been reading steadily from childhood?" (31). He does not quite get it right upon his first attempt when he mentions a series of books, a failure which makes Helen and Tibby groan audibly (86). He engages their attention finally when he talks about the walk he took when inspired by E.V. Lucas's "Open Road." At the end of their conversation, he is overjoyed. The narrator explains that the fact that the "Schlegels had not thought him foolish became a permanent joy" (91). Leonard recognizes the value of the types of intellectual conversation in which the Schlegels engage. He just cannot participate fully at first and gets it wrong. However, their final discussion is something he will remember for the rest of his days precisely because it is inherently valuable.

Leonard's ability to discuss books coherently is compromised by modern life and business ideology. However, he is not alone in his struggles. While all of the

Schlegels have difficulty transcending the pressures of middle-class thinking, they also come to understand in their own way that they have made mistakes and learn from their faults. Tibby understands that he has betrayed his sister's confidence to Charles, reflects on this betrayal, and is finally able to connect his actions to the happiness of others. The narrator explains that "[h]e was deeply vexed, not only for the harm he had done Helen, but for the flaw he had discovered in his own equipment" (221). The hope and promise are that he will take this information and amend his future behavior. Helen has her own epiphany when Leonard tells his story of walking all night long. She takes an active interest in Leonard's case and champions their cause. In fact, she and Margaret join a discussion club that seeks to help people like Leonard. Members bandy about a number of uninspiring suggestions, from parting him from his wife to donating "food but no clothes, clothes but no food, a third return ticket to Venice, without either food or clothes when he arrived there" (92). Margaret makes an impassioned speech that Leonard should get the money itself; however, she is quickly shot down. Discussion coupled with inaction makes Margaret feel undue admiration for Henry's decisiveness. Margaret, I contend, also develops. In Bradshaw's condemnation of Margaret, we never hear of her attempts to rectify her mistakes. When Mrs. Wilcox chastises Margaret for her incivility, the narrator reports that "[s]he was on fire with shame" (51) and that she marches straight off to Mrs. Wilcox's rooms to make reparations. The Schlegels are certainly not perfect; however, they, unlike their business-class counterparts, learn from their blunders and adapt.

In this section, I have examined the conversational values of the upper middle leisured classes. Generally, they have a highly sophisticated intellectual manner but

suffer from their own set of vices. The Schlegels themselves sometimes have had difficulties connecting with other people and are sometimes cruel; however, the novel also shows them as having the capacity to reflect upon and often learn from those mistakes. Tibby, the most remote of the Schlegels, succumbs to Charles's bullying and betrays his sister's confidence, leading indirectly to the death of Leonard Bast. He reflects and knows he has failed and so, it is to be hoped, learns. Helen, who, at the beginning of the novel, seeks attention and is massively self-absorbed, fails to empathize initially with Leonard. However, her imaginative engagement with his story makes her a powerful champion of the Basts. Leonard, who is not leisured and has difficulty conversationally, understands the value of a good discussion, and he is overjoyed when engaging successfully with the Schlegels. From the beginning of the novel, Margaret has encouraged Leonard. She normally gets things right, but she makes the occasional mistake. She is clearly far too indulgent of her husband, but even that error has its limits. Margaret remedies unjust situations where she can and sees the spoken truth as the way of saving the world from the effects of business values.

Conversational Virtues, the Art of Listening, and the Aristocratic Past

The novel waxes nostalgic about a perhaps romanticized notion of Englishness. It promotes those values associated with a kind of natural aristocrat in tune with past values. I contend that Ruth Wilcox and Miss Avery exhibit these values most of the time; however, neither of them is high born. Even so, they both seem to have a mystical presence and demonstrate the ability to intuit the correct course of action or future events. Ruth Wilcox has a kind of instinct for making connections, and this ability mystifies other people. Misunderstandings can be remedied by taking advice from her

ancestors through a dialogue with the wisdom from the past. Ruth, as I will show, is not conventionally chatty. Her way of communicating is more about achieving a kind of spiritual connection. However, she is not alone in having this capacity. There are others who embody these values and help bring about Ruth's vision of the future even after she is long dead.

Ruth Wilcox does not impress others with her conversation. For example, a luncheon-party Margaret gives in Mrs. Wilcox's honor "was not a success" precisely because the elder lady does not participate much in the discussion. Participation should, I think, be more broadly construed than the narrator represents. The narrator explains this by telling us that "[h]er tastes were simple, her knowledge of culture slight" (55). But this is a distinctive type of talk, at odds with the quiet discussions Mrs. Wilcox has with her ancestors. The luncheon-party conversation is treated as a game, "the dividing-line between Journalism and Literature . . . was started as a conversational hare. The delightful people darted after it with cries of joy, Margaret leading them, and not till the meal was half over did they realize that the principal guest had taken no part in the chase" (56). The discussions, therefore, are more about winning than anything else, a condition which, as I have attempted to show in the previous chapter, is a defining characteristic of bourgeois speech patterns. Self-consciously clever talk startles Mrs. Wilcox because it is akin to the movements of a car with its "jerks" (56). Ruth, is somewhat bemused by great bouts of activity, and she tells Margaret, "[Y]ou younger people move so quickly that it dazes me" (59). Slow, conservative progress is Mrs. Wilcox's specialty. Her lack of participation puts a "chill" on their conversation (57), but not all conversations are created equal. The luncheon party discussions are designed

to display the speaker's wit and have very little to do with an active exchange with another person.

This scene does serve an important purpose in the sense that it shows the extent to which Mrs. Wilcox listens attentively. At one point, she is asked about her thoughts on German aesthetic appreciation and replies that "Miss Schlegel puts everything splendidly" (57). Her conversant chides her, saying, "Oh, Mrs. Wilcox, say something nicer than that. It's such a snub to be told you put things splendidly" (57). To this, Mrs. Wilcox highlights her desire to listen. She says, "I do not mean it as a snub. Your last speech interested me so much. Generally people do not seem quite to like Germany. I have long wanted to hear what is said on the other side" (57). She has heard and reflected on the merits of one side of the debate and would like the opportunity to do the same for the other side as well.

Even after death, Mrs. Wilcox attempts to communicate with Margaret. She unexpectedly leaves Howards End, which is her own property to dispense with as she pleases, to her newfound friend, a desire that is quickly discarded by the rest of the family. The house is so special, in the narrator's, words because "one might see life steadily and see it whole, group in one vision its transitoriness and its eternal youth, connect—connect without bitterness until all men are brothers" (191). Moran Cruz has argued that Ruth is motivated by revenge for having been left in a nursing home instead of being taken home to die (413). Ruth may be angry; however, I find it difficult to imagine that she would punish her children for her husband's decision. What the Wilcoxes cannot understand is the fact that Mrs. Wilcox considered Margaret her "spiritual heir" (73). She wants Margaret to connect to the house and thus to the past.

The bequest, however, is not the only instance of Ruth's continued presence in the novel. There are other instances where Mrs. Wilcox seems to be present and speaking to Margaret after death. For example, Mrs. Wilcox is present at Henry's marriage proposal. While deciding, Margaret imagines Mrs. Wilcox straying in and out, "ever a welcome ghost; surveying the scene . . . without one hint of bitterness" (120). After separating from Henry emotionally, Margaret does connect to the house and ultimately inherits it from him.

Mrs. Wilcox is not alone in having this capacity to connect. A servant, Miss Avery, seems to have the same ability. When she empties out Margaret's case and puts its contents throughout the house, she asserts that "[t]he house has been empty long enough" (193). Margaret attempts to explain that she and Henry are building a new marriage bower in Sussex; however, Miss Avery asserts, "You think that you won't come back to live here, Mrs. Wilcox, but you will" (194). And there are other instances where she seems to have an uncanny sense of the future. She sets up a nursery in the room Helen occupied while she was a guest at Howards End and displays a family sword prominently in the house for Charles to grab. After Charles hits Leonard with the weapon, she picks up the evidence and accuses Charles of murder, a degree of which he is ultimately convicted (230). Miss Avery, as a permanent resident at Howards End, seems to connect in a similarly mystical way similar to that of Ruth Wilcox.

This section of my chapter has argued that the novel promotes as pure and essentially unproblematic the natural aristocratic connection to the past and to the English countryside. The conversational manner of these natural aristocrats is unhurried, compassionate and decisive. They are very good at listening to others and

taking time to consider new ideas. Forster explains that "they are sensitive for others as well as for themselves, they are considerate without being fussy, their pluck is not swankiness but the power to endure, and they can take a joke" (315). Additionally, they largely avoid direct confrontation except when absolutely necessary for right action. Miss Avery contravenes Margaret's desires to leave her family's possessions packed away. Similarly, Ruth Wilcox gives Howards End to Margaret, an act that upsets the rest of the Wilcox family a great deal. There is more at stake for Ruth Wilcox than keeping her family happy. She is searching for and finds a spiritual heir. The conversations she has with Margaret reveal the younger lady to be such, a role she accepts and steps into comfortably by the end of the novel. She seems to have an epiphany of sorts when she learns that Ruth had left her Howards End. Something, reports the narrator, "shook her life in its inmost recesses, and she shivered" (242). She could be angry but instead comforts her broken husband, and she seems to acknowledge the way things unfolded is the way they had to go all along.

Conclusion

Making connections is, as it turns out, a very difficult thing for modern people to accomplish. The emphasis on the practical and efficient has brought the country many benefits, as Margaret notes; however, it has disconnected people from past values, the land, and each other. The business-oriented capitalist, who is at the forefront of these changes, is in constant motion, expanding and grabbing. He or she has the most difficulty connecting and finds it a hindrance in daily life. Their conversational style employs the language of hurry, speaking in terse, rushed tones. Henry, for example, cannot move beyond his own immediate, practical concerns, and his condescending,

bullying conversational manner costs him his relationship with Margaret. His attitudes are reproduced in his children, particularly in Charles, who embodies the worst business- class qualities. He is self-important, entitled, rushed, condescending, and, of course, bullying. Henry finally takes notice of his own failures in his son and surrenders to Margaret to make what she can of him.

The Schlegels, however, are not paragons of virtue. Tibby takes little interest in human affairs and would rather think about his studies. He exhibits a troubling lack of empathy for Helen when she visits his rooms at Oxford, and it is, perhaps, unsurprising that he betrays her confidence later. Essentially, Tibby is unprepared for Charles's conversational style and succumbs to the pressure of Charles's bullying tone. However, he recognizes the failure in himself and we hear no more of him. Helen is initially insensitive but she gets imaginatively engaged when Leonard tells the story of his adventures attempting to connect with nature. And finally, Margaret can connect very well most of the time. Occasionally she gets things wrong, but she learns from her mistakes and seeks to rectify injustice. Her advanced ability to connect makes her Ruth Wilcox's "spiritual" heir. So what does she inherit? Certainly the house and the wych-elm: a home where Helen can raise her child in peace.

She also inherits a way of relating to other people. Before, others tended to see her as cold and insensitive. She was the type of person to rattle off a discourteous note without even thinking twice about it. Margaret brings to the equation erudition, empathy, a sense of justice and capacity to learn from her mistakes seen in few other characters in the novel. She acquires this sensitivity, consideration, endurance, and pluck to which Forster refers when talking about the natural aristocrat. She is sensitive

to her sister's needs and plucky in the face of Henry's demands. She is even considerate of Henry's feelings and consoles him when she learns that Ruth had left Howards End to her much earlier. And we know that she will endure through an unknown future and in the face of the encroaching, threatening urban landscape.

Conclusion to the Study

Images of leisured and non-leisured conversation, as well as other non-verbal means of communicating, have been the focus of this project. I have argued that conversation deserves more scholarly attention than it has previously received in the works that are under discussion in this project. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, *The Golden Bowl*, and *Howards End* are helpful texts on which to center a discussion of conversational habits because they were written during a time of profound socio-economic change in Britain. Social changes find expression, for example, in the Eastside/Westside dichotomy in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. The eastern business district thrives, as do its inhabitants, who realize unprecedented opportunities for upward mobility. The bright, orderly, and attractive city streets are teeming with purpose and industry, and the seemingly positive light in which the text depicts the business quarter reflects a general sense of ambition and progress. In the expanding economy, people can and do realize class promotion by mimicking those who currently hold a higher position on the social scale. This heightened possibility, however, can also pose problems. *Howards End's* Leonard Bast, for example, who would have been satisfied with the position into which he was born generations ago, now "stood at the extreme verge of gentility," laboring in poverty, paralyzed with the hope of further advancement (35). In any case, the promise of class promotion means adopting specific habits represented in these texts and from which middle-class aspirants can learn.

In Stevenson's world, it means adopting a commitment to transparency. Additionally, it means employing very specific conversational cues. The commitment to transparency never expires. It is imperative therefore that social aspirants adopt and

monitor their behavior while in the public domain to meet social expectations. Certainly, social climbers need to stay on their guard during business hours; however, this is a project that concerns leisure. In the introduction to this project, I discussed a definition of leisure as "a certain kind of time spent in a certain kind of way. The time is that which lies outside the demands of work, direct social obligations and the routine activities of personal and domestic maintenance; the use of this time, though socially determined, is characterized by a high degree of personal freedom and choice" (Bailey 6). Unpacking this definition in considering the texts I have analyzed illuminates just how unsatisfactory it is. The phrase, "certain kind of time" makes leisure hours distinctive from the time devoted to other concerns. Bailey identifies these as work, and personal and domestic routines. Work, while mostly straightforward is, for some, indistinguishable from domestic obligations. Additionally, personal maintenance is, for some, characterized by a "high degree of personal freedom and choice." As these texts show, leisure is not a simple nor straightforward concept. In fact, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *The Golden Bowl* problematize traditional notions of leisure as a kind of free time.

I am interested in the ways in which characters are depicted in conversation with each other and how they conduct themselves throughout their working and, if there is such a thing, non-working hours. Conversation, I contend, was important to many of the characters in these texts in a way similar to how the art of conversation was an important cultural Enlightenment value, which I detailed in Chapter One. Obviously, talking to other people was a common and central part of public life, but it also took culturally and historically specific forms. Stephen Miller, for instance, has noted that

late nineteenth-century British people enjoyed conversation in clubs and in English-style salons. George Eliot, among others, facilitated a famous salon. Furthermore, evaluating the quality of one's conversation was commonplace. Churton Collins,[11] Miller notes, was mostly disappointed with Browning's conversational facility (181-82). As in this instance, characters in the novels I examine evaluate each other by speech patterns as well as by non-verbal cues.

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde reveals that class affiliation is known by the ways in which people communicate verbally and through their body language. In the opening scenes of the novella, working hours are bright and busy, and people are cheerfully transparent in their activities. Anyone who wishes to become similarly prosperous should certainly mimic these traits. However, the story does not end when the clock signals the end of business hours. I argue that this text and *The Golden Bowl* show the extent to which there is virtually no time outside of work and domestic obligations during which one has a great degree of freedom and personal choice. For example, Utterson, as guardian of middle-class values, never seems to be off the clock. He serves as a paragon of virtue while at social gatherings and rigorously regulates his appetites even while alone. He also stalks the city streets in the dead of the night to serve as moral enforcer against the vaguely threatening Hyde. Here, the text seems to undercut its opening vision of cheerful progress to reveal a darker side of the middle-class persona.

Hyde is the embodiment of unchecked leisure. He has no legitimate employment and means of income, yet he has access to a great deal of money. He has some

[11] Late nineteenth-century British journalist, essayist, and professor of English literature at Birmingham University.

mysterious business late at night in the city's dark recesses. His movements are largely mysterious; however, his means of communicating and conducting himself in public are, in some way, all wrong to everyone who encounters him. He is just a bit too forthright. He is also uncouth and, above all, secretive. Hyde is most comfortable skulking in the shadows, and when he does make a foray into the public domain, he is clearly out of sync with other people and does not belong. His physical demeanor is heavy and loud. He tramples anyone who gets in his way and is prone to frightening fits of rage. He eschews police involvement; however, he has attracted the attention of a much more fearsome enemy: the middle-class professional.

Utterson and his compatriots are more effective than traditional law enforcement because legal impediments do not constrain them. While there is no legitimate reason to suspect Hyde of criminal activity in the beginning of the novella, Utterson feels compelled to investigate based on hearsay and conjecture. The lawyer and his friends adopt the most effective means of ensuring that their power, vision of justice, and way of life prevail. In ways that are disconcertingly similar to Hyde, the lawyer stalks the London city streets in the dead of the night in search of his prey. He also breaks into others' dwellings and searches through their personal belongings without formal legal authority. I have argued that Utterson is morally problematic in the sense that he essentially harasses Hyde to death.

Champions of middle-class values in this novel also adopt conversational habits similar to those of their enemy. For instance, Utterson blatantly lies and rudely questions Jekyll at a dinner party. Enfield gossips and speculates to trigger Utterson's suspicions. Finally, Dr. Lanyon remain silent when he should speak, causing further

harm to the community. Readers can clearly see that the business professional is more like the underground *flâneur,* embodied by Hyde, than they would appear to be on the surface. Utterson's authority is backed certainly by the State and by those who, in their wish to improve their economic circumstances, admire their social betters. These aspirants, according to the text, need to keep their working hour activities above reproach and open to inspection. Above all, however, they should monitor themselves and be prepared to have their leisure hours monitored by others. They are also authorized to keep an eye on their neighbors in service to bourgeois values. As a result, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* reveals that there is no time that is truly free.

Similarly, there is little to no free time for characters in James's *The Golden Bowl*. The Ververs are like Utterson and his cohorts in many ways. The two parties adopt strikingly similar means of maintaining power. Utterson and Hyde play a game of hide-and-seek, as Utterson notes in the beginning of Stevenson's text. The Ververs also adopt a game-like strategy to maintain their power, even in their domestic relationships and during their leisure hours. Although business people have secured their social position, wealth is not enough to bring all others into line with their project. There are remnants of the old aristocracy and those who engage imaginatively with different ways of living that pose a threat to the establishment. The middle classes therefore need to get these others to imaginatively engage with their project. The bourgeois can easily lose control, and the first half of the novel reveals how fearful loss of control can be as Charlotte and Amerigo form their own illicit relationship in direct opposition to their patrons. Once made aware of their transgressions, Maggie, like Utterson, becomes

watchful and works continuously to re-establish the proper power relations among the couples. The maneuverings in which Maggie engages form a microcosm of larger social relationships. There are ways that the newly ensconced power establishment can keep a hold on its power other than through overt force. In essence, the message to readers who wish to climb the social ladder is that one must adopt less, as opposed to more, efficient means of maintaining power. Gaming is, for very specific reasons, the best way to bring others into line with middle-class ideology.

Maggie plays a social game with distinct rules. These rules govern, to a large extent, appropriate ways of speaking and acting. Conversation, therefore, continues to provide important cues in the new economy, even when the bourgeois has secured its position. According to the rules of this game, one must refrain from making overt accusations. However, people can work together to divide and separate their competitors. Maggie proves to be the more skilled player and ultimately succeeds in creating that same sense of internal watchfulness in Amerigo and Charlotte that is the hallmark of bourgeois living. Neither of these characters can be truly at ease while uncertainty exists. Self-surveillance is an important bourgeois tactic to ensure complete domination. This is a clear message in *Jekyll and Hyde* as well, but *The Golden Bowl* takes the analysis further. There are, according to *The Golden Bowl*, unforeseeable consequences of the imperialist agenda. The novel shows that the Ververs are themselves changed as a result of their victory. Maggie and her father must sacrifice each other and separate to cover more ground. Maggie remains in Europe while her father returns to the United States to continue their colonizing project. They win the game; however, they have to make important sacrifices to ensure long-term success.

The novel shows middle-class aspirants that they, too, may have to give up some important personal pleasures and relationships in order to achieve their ultimate goals.

The Golden Bowl's Prince is accustomed to an aristocratic mindset, and a closer approximation of true leisure is an aristocratic indulgence. The ends of true leisure are explored in depth in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, which illuminates the extent to which only those with enough free time and economic independence can experience time that is for their own use. Aristocrats are, at the waning half of the nineteenth century, still at the top of the social ladder, not having yet lost their land and wealth. They have access to exclusive clubs and rule in the halls of power. Aristocrats of the late nineteenth century appear to be the only ones who can resist the middle-class pressures to conform to the bourgeois ideal. In fact, Wilde's text warns against this type of conformity, and the text treats readers to the full implications of a life of mimicry. Benign stale and boring discourse is the best of all outcomes. These traits are best exemplified by Lord Fermor, who is the embodiment of complaisant, earnest self-satisfaction. Similarly, the partygoers hold the most fashionable opinions but do little else. While they are not helpful to the larger community, they do no obvious harm.

At worst, however, one is doomed to jealously protect a static existence that has a direct negative impact on the larger society. Dorian shows a great deal of promise at the beginning of the text because he is receptive to the influence of art. Not only does he respond well to Basil's masterpiece, but he is appropriately appreciative of Lord Henry's unique sense of self. There is so much talk in the novel that conversation is clearly a great pleasure to these characters. Dorian is motivated to examine his existence as a result of his discussions with Lord Henry. Consequently, conversation has a lot to

do with shaping personality. Because of his susceptibility, Dorian shows great potential at the beginning of the novel and Lord Henry is interested to see what his friend will make of his life. Money, position, and education are tremendous advantages which afford one true leisure independent of the prying, judgmental eyes of others.

The object of art is to realize change by suggesting new modes of being. Basil is aware of this as he finds inspiration in Dorian's beauty to create his own masterpiece that is unlike and superior to anything he has produced before. Basil gives the portrait to Dorian but later realizes that it should be shared with others. Basil and Lord Henry get along so well because they share a similar worldview. Aristocratic freedom allows Lord Henry to create a unique and imaginative life as an insouciant dandy with a cutting epigram always at the ready. His modes of life and speech are carefully cultivated works of art meant to inspire others, including Dorian. His epigrams are certainly designed to provoke thought and propose new ways of viewing life in opposition to the prevailing models. According to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, true leisure allows one to construct his or her own identity as a living work of art much as Lord Henry does. However, this fact, on the surface, does very little good to those who wish to improve their immediate economic circumstances. The text's response is that leisured individuals who create unique lives also improve society incrementally by proposing unimagined alternative modes of living for others. These alternatives serve as important counter balances to the bourgeois model.

Despite having everything in his favor, including status, wealth, good looks, alternative models, and sensitivity to art, Dorian chooses an unchanging and unimaginative life. He is a living warning to those who eschew development and favor

mimicry. For someone who is so sensitive to the effects of art and who understands what it is capable of, Dorian does little to foster its potential. The young man wishes his sins transferred to the portrait, thereby changing art. He also hides Basil's portrait from view. Finally, he fails to serve as an inspiration to others by remaining the same throughout time. He certainly always looks the same, and his pleasures never seem to evolve above the base. Additionally, Dorian adopts harmful conversational vices that reflect his incomplete development, such as broken promises, blame shifting, and exhaustion of subject matter. He wastes his potential and ultimately fails, but not before harming many other people in the process. He ruins reputations and commits cold-blooded murder. Dorian Gray's failed life of mimicry betrays a culpable failure of imagination that is the enemy of art.

The good news, however, is that anyone can adopt an aristocratic worldview. *Howards End* proposes that an aristocratic sensibility is available to anyone and not just those fortunate enough to be born into the highest social classes. Ruth Wilcox, for example, is not well-born, but she has an aristocratic temperament. She knows, for example, exactly how to ease tensions between people, and she has a powerful sense of propriety. She also chooses meaningful exchanges with other people and finds other kinds of discourse uninteresting and strange. However, she listens carefully and has a curious mind. She also knows when people can do better and when they cannot. Ruth simply tells Charles what to do when he confronts Paul at the beginning of the story. However, she reprimands Margaret for her breach of etiquette. Charles will not ever be able to make the connections that Margaret will one day make. Consequently, Ruth invests her time, effort, and property in her newfound friend.

Similarly, the old Howards End servant, Miss Avery, has a mystical sense of connections among people and events. She unpacks Margaret's belongings at Howards End because she knows she and not the Charles Wilcoxes belongs there. Similarly, she sets up the nursery for Helen. Miss Avery knows that Howards End is the right place for Helen's son, who is England's future. This future, the text hopes, will look very different from its current state. The London of *Howards End* is strikingly dissimilar to *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde's* busy and prosperous city streets. Margaret reflects on the language of hurry that characterizes modern city dwellers who are constantly on the move physically. It is no wonder modern people find making connections so difficult; they barely speak to each other.

It is unclear how Ruth Wilcox and Miss Avery came to be so attuned; however, the novel seems to suggest that this attunement is a sensibility that people can develop. There is a need for development among most characters in the novel, including the Schlegels, who share in some of the less admirable business values at the beginning of the novel. *Howard's End* reveals the extent to which the middle-class colonization game has succeeded even with educated, intelligent, and leisured individuals. Those values, which are conversational in nature and exhibited in large part by the Wilcoxes, include condescension and haste, which is the direct enemy of leisure. The Wilcoxes are also deeply paranoid when it comes to defending their economic interests, a trait that has spread to the lower middle classes. Helen engages imaginatively with the Wilcox family during her visit and adopts temporarily at least some of their values. For example, she fails to stand up for herself and her values when pressed by Henry. She also writes a hasty note to her sister that results in an egregious misunderstanding

among the families, and her condescension toward Leonard causes him a great deal of embarrassment. The business classes exert enormous psychological pressure on everyone. Even those isolated in the halls of academia cannot escape their influence. Tibby, who attends Oxford, is unable to make connections at a crucial moment and betrays his sister's confidence. Margaret also has moral failings when she is rude to Ruth. Although scholars would like to contrast the Wilcoxes and Schlegels, Margaret and her siblings also have room for improvement.

The Wilcoxes, however, also have some admirable traits, such as grit, neatness, decision, and obedience, that could have a positive impact. Margaret understands these qualities and feels a degree of sympathy for Henry Wilcox that makes him an attractive marriage partner to her. Yet these traits also have a darker side. Decisiveness can find expression in stubbornness, and obedience to the wrong authorities can do more harm than good. The Wilcoxes are largely insular and their loyalties lie with the family to such an extent that they will ignore Ruth's desire to bequeath her property to Margaret. They close ranks at key moments that demand imagination and a larger sympathy.

Unfortunately, the business classes will often choose the expression of their values that best suits their needs. For example, Henry is quite decisive when he tells Margaret that Leonard's company is unstable. He is equally as decisive when he inveighs against Leonard for leaving a perfectly good position. *Howards End* illuminates further the consequences of the bourgeois ascension. The middle classes have, according to the text, left a largely negative mark on society and are unworthy of their position. They simply cannot make connections among people and events. Margaret hopes that Henry is susceptible to her influence and will develop the capacity

to make connections as she has done. She loses faith after Evie's wedding, and she ultimately realizes that her husband cannot make the necessary connections which foster empathy. He is, in the end, so unable to make them that he alienates Margaret. The only option, therefore, is to distance herself from him. So too must those who can make connections distance themselves and live distinctive lives apart from the business-oriented middle classes. This is the future that the text envisions for England and the type of existence with which it asks readers to engage imaginatively.

These texts stress the importance of having access to alternative modes of life in the new economy. The bourgeois elite would like to frustrate attempts to imagine and certainly to live independently of its influence. Its colonizing project takes a gaming form in both *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *The Golden Bowl*. Utterson constantly watches Hyde and shines a light on possible hiding places, engaging in a game of hide-and-seek with his enemy. The Ververs also play a social game with their spouses with the object of restoring their vision of appropriate power relations. Gaming is a much more effective means of colonization than overt force because it gives the participants a sense of having played fairly and lost. The loss is not total because the loser gets the sense of having gained something in the process. Amerigo and Charlotte recommit to their spouses and their new lives. The winners realize the added benefit of instilling a commitment to self-surveillance in their counterparts. These texts, told from the colonizer's point of view, also illuminates the darker side of the bourgeois project. They behave similarly to those they oppose and their power is backed by wealth, the state, and by those who look up to them and mimic their behavior.

However, there are alternative modes of living that artists create in order to enlarge the public imagination. Lord Henry creates his own life and uses language to expose hypocrisy. This activity is certainly an important service to a society that takes itself too seriously and fails to question its own actions and motives. Amerigo seeks, above all, to maintain his private self and familial pride. Charlotte jealously guards her sense of freedom and independence. These individual variations pose a threat to the status quo and must be neutralized because they constitute a distinct threat to the type of dissatisfaction fostered by consumerist bourgeois democracy. *Dorian Gray* asks readers to look for these alternatives and to keep creating because to stop creating means losing inspiration, turning into a sterile bore at best and a monstrosity at worst, possibly doing actual harm to others. *Howards End* illuminates the simplicity, and emptiness and fear that underlie the business *ethos*. Actual harm does not have to come from some supernatural monstrosity but can come from ordinary people. The harm is not necessarily as dramatic as that which *The Picture of Dorian Gray* portrays but is more subtle and insidious. The psychological pressures change people, making them impulsive, insensitive, and fearful. They lose the ability to connect with their fellow human beings and feel grounded. Theirs is a rickety foundation at best that collapses easily when shaken because their imaginative repertoire is so paltry.

A much more stable model is found in the aristocratic values that *Howards End* identifies. Stillness, listening, and the art of communication are virtues of the leisured. Attachment to place and the practice of staying in one location are essential to nurture the latter two qualities. Listening and careful communication are activities that foster understanding, which, in turn, help individuals make connections with one another and

respond empathetically. Those with the ability to connect provide the support necessary to help the future thrive. In sum, business ideology is not the only model available to modern individuals. Artists and natural aristocrats shed light on alternatives that make eradicating opposition to the dominant model impossible. These alternatives are in the popular consciousness and just await the busy professional's attention and moment's reflection.

References

Adams, James Eli. "Dandyism and the late Victorian Masculinity." *Oscar Wilde in Context*. Eds. Kerry Powell and Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 220-229. Print.

Arata, Stephen D. "Realism." *The Cambridge Companion to The Fin De Siècle.* Ed. Gail Marshall. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. 169-187. Print.

---. "The Sedulous Ape: Atavism, Professionalism, and Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*." *Criticism* 37.2 (1995): 233-259. Print.

Bailey, Peter. *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*. London: Routledge, 1978. Print.

Baker, Geofrey. *Realism's Empire*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2009. Print.

Baudelaire, Charles. "Le Dandy." *Baudelaire par lui-même*. Éditions du Seuil, 1952. Print.

Beattie, J.M. *The First English Detectives: The Bow Street Runners and the Policing of London, 1750-1840*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Bell, Duncan, ed. *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K. "The Commitment to Theory." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. 2nd ed. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch, 2010. 2353-2372. Print.

Blackshaw, Tony, and Garry Crawford. *The Sage Dictionary or Leisure Studies*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2009. Print.

Boudreau, Kristin. *Henry James' Narrative Technique: Consciousness, Perception, and Cognition*. New York: Palgrave, 2010. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. New York: Routledge, 1984. Print.

Bradshaw, David, ed. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster*. New York: Cambridge UP 2007.1-7. Print.

---. "Howards End." *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster*. New York: Cambridge UP 2007. 151-172. Print.

Braunschneider, Theresa. "The People that Things Make: Coquettes and Consumer

Culture in Early Eighteenth-Century Satire." *Refiguring the Coquette: Essays on Culture and Coquetry*. Lewisburg: Burcknell U P, 2008. 39-61. Print.

Bristow, Joseph, ed. *Oscar Wilde and Modern Culture*. Athens: Ohio UP, 2008. Print.
---. *Wilde Discoveries: Traditions, Histories, Archives*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2013. Print.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Ed. Margaret Smith. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Buck, R.A. and Timothy R. Austin. "Dialogue and Power in E.M. Forster's *Howards End*." *Twentieth-Century Fiction: From Text to Context* (1995): 63-77.

Chung, June Hee. "Money and Class" *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. 224-233. Print.

Claeys, *Imperial Sceptics: British Critics of Empire, 1850-1020*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

Cleere, Eileen. *The Sanitary Arts: Aesthetic Culture and the Victorian Cleanliness Campaigns*. Columbus: Ohio State U P, 2014. Print.

Comfort, Kelly, ed. *Art and Life in Aestheticism: De-Humanizing Art, the Artist, and the Artistic Receptor*. New York: Palgrave, 2008. Print.

Cruz, Moran. "E.M. Forster and Ruth Wilcox's Unintended Death." *Modern Fiction Studies* 61.3 (2015): 404-422. Print.

Cunningham, Hugh. *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1980. Print.

"Custom." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 10 Oct 2015. <www.oed.com>

Davidson, Carol Margaret. "A Battle of Wills: Solving *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*." *Troubled Legacies: Narrative and Inheritance*. Ed. Allan Hepburn. Buffalo: U of Toronto P, 2007. Print.

Deacon, Richard. *The Cambridge Apostles: A History of Cambridge University's Elite Intellectual Secret Society*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1985. Print.

Denisoff, Dennis. "Decadence and Aestheticism." *The Cambridge Companion to The Fin De Siècle*. Ed. Gail Marshall. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. 31-52. Print.

Domosh, Mona. *American Commodities in an Age of Empire*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Dowling, Linda. *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford*. Ithaca: Cornell UP,

1996. Print.

---. *Language and Decadence in the Victorian Fin de Siècle*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986. Print.

Dryden, Linda. "'City of Dreadful Night': Stevenson's Gothic London. *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2006. 253-264. Print.

---. *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles*. New York: Palgrave, 2003. Print. Print.

Eastham, Andrew. "Aesthetic Vampirism: Pater, Wilde, and the Concept of Irony." *Art and Life in Aestheticism: De-Humanizing and Re-Humanizing Art, the Artist, and the Artistic Receptor*. Ed. Kelly Comfort. New York: Palgrave, 2008. 79-95. Print.

Eaton, A.W. "Robust Immoralism." *JAAC* 70.3 (2012): 281-291. Print.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. 1939. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Malden: Blackwell, 2000. Print.

El-Rayess, Miranda. *Henry James and the Culture of Consumption*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2014. Print.

English, James F. "Everywhere and Nowhere: The Sociology of Literature After 'the Sociology of Literature.'" *New Literary History* 2.41 (2010): v-xxiii. Print.

Evangelista, Stephano. *British Aestheticism and Ancient Greece: Hellenism, Reception, Gods in Exile*. New York: Palgrave, 2009. Print.

Felski, Rita. "The Counterdiscourse of the Feminine in Three Texts by Wilde, Huysmans, and Sacher-Masoch." *PMLA* 106.5 (1991): 1094-105. Print.

Follini, Tamara. "Museums and Exhibitions." *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. 234-245. Print.

Foster, E.M. *Howards End* Ed. Paul B. Armstrong. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998. Print.

Forman, Ross. G. "Empire." *The Cambridge Companion to The Fin de Siècle*. Ed. Gail Marshall. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. 91-111. Print.

Fortunato, Paul L. *Modernist Aesthetics and Consumer Culture in the Writings of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. William E. Cain. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.

Frank, Catherine O. *Law, Literature, and the Transmission of Culture in England, 1837-1925*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2010. Print.

Freedman, Jonathan. *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990. Print.

---. "What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl*, and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Knowledge. *Cambridge Quarterly* 37.1 (2008):98-113. Print.

"Full." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 10 Oct 2015. <www.oed.com>.

Gagnier, Regina. *Idylls of the Marketplace: Oscar Wilde and the Victorian Public*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986. Print.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick, ed. *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. Print.

---. *The Picture of Dorian Gray: "What the World Thinks of Me*." New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995. Print.

---. "Picturing Dorian Gray." *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. 387-403. Print.

---. "Reviews and Reactions." *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. 347-384. Print.

Goodale, Thomas L., and Peter A. Witt, eds. *Recreation and Leisure: Issues In An Era of Change*. State College: Venture Pub., 1980. Print.

Green, Laura. *Literary Identification from Charlotte Brontë to Tisitsi Dangarembga*. Columbus: The Ohio State UP, 2012. Print.

Gross, Erin M. "Homespun Gossip: Jane Austen and the Task of Literary Criticism." *The Eighteenth Century* 56.2 (2015). Print.

Halbertstam, Judith. *Skin shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters*. Durham: Duke UP, 1995. Print.

Harmon, Clare. *Myself and the Other Fellow*. New York: HarperCollins, 2005. Print.

Hawthorne, Julian. "The Romance of the Impossible." *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Ed. Michael Patrick Gillespie. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. Print.

Hitchings, Henry. *Sorry! The English and Their Manners*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013. Print.

Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy: Changing Patterns in English Mass Culture*. Fair Lawn: Essential Books, Inc. 1957. Print.

Howe, Anthony. "Free Trade and Global Order." *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought*. Ed. Duncan Bell. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. 26-46. Print.

Hultgren, Nell. "Oscar Wilde's Poetic Injustice in The Picture of Dorian Gray." *Wilde Discoveries: Traditions, Histories, Archives*. Ed. Joseph Bristow. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2013. 212-230. Print.

Hurka, Thomas. Intro. *The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia*. By Bernard Suits. 1978. Orchard Park: Broadview, 2005. Print.

Hwang, Haewon. *London's Underground Spaces: Representing the Victorian City, 1840-1915*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh U P, 2013. Print.

James, Henry. "The Art of Presentation." *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By R.L. Stevenson. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003101-102. Print.
---. *The Golden Bowl*. 1904. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Karschay, Stephan. *Degeneration, Normativity and the Gothic at the Fin de Siècle*. New York: Palgrave, 2015. Print.

Kermode, Frank. *Concerning E.M. Forster*. New York: Farrar, 2009. Print.

Killeen, Jarlath. *History of the Gothic: Gothic Literature 1825-1914*. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2009. Print.

Kimball, Jean. "Henry James's Last Portrait of a Lady: Charlotte Stant in The Golden Bowl." *American Literature* 28.4 (1957): 449-468. Print.

King, Shelley and Yaël Schlick, eds. *Refiguring the Coquette: Essays on Culture and Coquetry*. Lewisburg: Burcknell U P, 2008. Print.

Lane, Rebecca. "Oscar Wilde and the Epigram." *Oscar Wilde Studies* (226): 33-39. Print.

Law, Joe. "The 'perniciously homosexual art'" Music and homoerotic desire in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *The Idea of Music in Victorian Fiction*. Ed. Sophie Fuller and Nicky Losseff. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004. 173-96. Print.

Leitch, Vincent, et. al. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. 2nd ed. New

York: W.W. Norton, 2010. Print.

Le Fanu, J. Sheridan. *The Rose and the Key*. 1895. New York: Dover, 1982. Print.

Levy, Paul. *Moore: G.E. Moore and the Cambridge Apostles*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979. Print.

Liebman, Sheldon W. "Character Design in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. 433-454. Print.

Linehan, Katherine, ed. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By Robert Louis Stevenson. New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 2003. Print.

Livesey, Ruth. *Socialism, Sex, and the Culture of Aestheticism in Britain, 1880-1914*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

MacDuffie, Allen. *Victorian Literature, Energy, and the Ecological Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2014. Print.

Malcolmson, Robert W. *Popular Recreations in English Society 1700-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973. Print.

Mathieson, Charlotte. *Mobility in the Victorian Novel: Placing the Nation*. New York: Palgrave, 2015. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Alienated Labor. Yavanika.org*. 17 July 2017. <hhttp://www.yavanika.org/classes/reader/marx1.pdf>

Marshall, Gail. *The Cambridge Companion to The Fin De Siècle.* New York: Cambridge UP,2007. Print.

McDiarmid, Lucy. "Oscar Wilde, Lady Gregory, and Late-Victorian Table-Talk." *Oscar Wilde and Modern Culture: The Making of Legend*. Ed Joseph Bristow. Athens, Ohio UP, 2008. 46-61. Print.

McWhirter, David, ed. *Henry James in Context*. New York, Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

Medalie, David. *E.M. Forster's Modernism.* New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.

Meissner, Collin. *Henry James and the Language of Experience*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Mendelssohn, Michèle. "Aetheticism and Decadence." *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. 93-104. Print.

Menikoff, Barry, ed. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By Robert Louis

Stevenson. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003. xi-xv. Print.

Mighall, Robert. *A Geography of Victorian Gothic Fiction*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Miller, Stephen. *Conversation: A History of a Declining Art.* New Haven: Yale U P, 2006. Print.

Mitchell, Sally. *Daily Life in Victorian England*. 2nd ed. Westport: Greenwood P, 2009. Print.

Moretti, Franco. *The Bourgeois: Between History and Literature*. New York: Verso, 2013.

Naman, Anne Aresty. *The Jew in the Victorian Novel: Some Relationships Between Prejudice and Art*. New York: AMS, 1980.

Nord, Deborah Epstein. *Walking the Victorian Streets: Women, Representation, and the City*. Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1995. Print.

O'Brien, Lee. "Wilde Words: The Aesthetics of Crime and the Play of Genre in E. W. Hornug's Raffles Stories." *English Studies* 96 (2015): 654-669. Print.

O'Farrell, Mary Ann. "Manners." *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. 192-202. Print.

Parratt, Catriona M. *'More Than Mere Amusement': Working-Class Women's Leisure in England, 1750-1914*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2001. Print.

Pater, Walter. "A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde." *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Ed. Michael Patrick Gillespie. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. Print.

Peppis, Paul. "Forster and England." *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster*. New York: Cambridge UP 2007. 47-61. Print.

Petrow, Stefan. *Policing Morals: The Metropolitan Police and the Home Office 1870-1914.* Oxford: Clarendon P, 1994. Print.

Pieper, Josef. *Leisure: The Basis of Culture*. Trans. Alexander Dru. San Francisco: Ignatius P, 1952. Print.

Plato. *Symposium and Phaedrus*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. New York: Dover Pub., 1993. Print.

Powell, Kerry and Peter Raby, eds. *Oscar Wilde in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. Print.

"Prejudice." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 10 Oct 2015. <www.oed.com>.

Raby, Peter. "Poisoned by a Book: the Lethal Aura of *The Picture of Dorian Gray.*" *Oscar Wilde in Context.* Eds. Kerry Powell and Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 159-167. Print.

Reed, Thomas L. *The Transforming Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Victorian Alcohol Debate*. Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 2006. Print.

"Relation." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 10 Oct 2015. <www.oed.com>.

Rojek, Chris, ed. *Leisure Studies*. 4 Vols. Los Angeles: Sage, 2010. Print.

Rosecrance, Barbara. *Forster's Narrative Vision*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982. Print.

Rosner, Victoria, ed. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to The Bloomsbury Group*. Ed. Victoria Rosner. New York: Cambridge UP, 2014. 1-15. Print.

Rowe, John Carlos. "Nationalism and Imperialism." *Henry James in Context*. Ed. David McWhirter. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. 246-257. Print.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. *The Norton Anthology of Theory & Criticism.* 2nd ed. Eds. Vincient B. Leitch, et. al. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2010. 1861-1888. Print.

Salamensky, S.I. "Oscar Wilde's Jewish Problem: Salomé, the Ancient Hebrew and the Modern Jewess." *Modern Drama* 55.2 (2012): 197-215. Print.

Sawaya, Francesca. *The Difficult Art of Giving: Patronage, Philanthropy, and the American Literary Market*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2014. Print.

Seltzer, Mark. *Henry James and the Art of Power*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984. Print.

Shirkhani, Kim. "The Economy of Recognition in *Howards End*." *Twentieth-Century Literature* 54.2 (2008): 193-216. Print.

Sidorsky, David. "The Uses of the Philosophy of G.E. Moore in the Works of E.M. Forster." *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 38.2 (2007): 245-71. Print.

Simpson, Zachary. *Life as Art: Aesthetics and the Creation of the Self*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2012. Print.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Gossip*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985. Print.

Steinbach, Susie L. "Discussions on the Subject of Reform." *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture, and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. 2012. 31-58. Print.

Stevenson, Randall. "Forster and Modernism." *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster*. Ed. David Bradshaw. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. 209-222. Print.

Stevenson, R.L. "An Apology for Iders." *Essays by Robert Louis Stevenson*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. Print.

---. "The Dream Origin of the Tale." *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003. 87-91. Print.

---. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed Katherine Lineman. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003. Print.

Suits, Bernard. *The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia*. 1978. Orchard Park: Broadview, 2005. Print.

Swafford, Kevin *Class in Late-Victorian Britain: The Narrative Concern with Social Hierarchy and Its Representation*. New York: Cambria P, 2007. Print.

Taylor, Jesse Oak. *The Sky of Our Manufacture: The London Fog in British Fiction from Dickens to Woolf*. Charlottesville, U of Virginia P, 2016. Print.

Thompson, E.P. "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." *Leisure Studies*. Ed. Chris Rojek. Vol. 2. Los Angeles: Sage, 2010. 307-347. Print.

---*The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon, 1964. Print.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Vanguard, 1912. Print.

Vickerman, R.W. *The Economics of Leisure and Recreation*. London: The MacMillan P, 1975. Print.

Wallace, Anne D. *Walking, Literature, and English Culture: The Origins and Uses of Peripatetic in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford, Clarendon P, 1993. Print.

Walker, Richard J. "Pious Works: Aesthetics, Ethics, and the Modern Individual in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.*" *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2006. 265-274. Print.

Walton, Kendall. *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of Representational Arts*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990. Print.

Whelan, Lara Baker. *Class, Culture and Suburban Anxieties in the Victorian Era*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Widdowson, Peter. *E.M. Forster's Howards End: Fiction as History*. London: Sussex UP, 1977. Print.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Complete Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. Merlin Holland and Rupert Hart-Davis. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2000. Print.

---. "The Critic as Artist." *Collected Works of Oscar Wilde*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1997. 965-1016. Print.

---. "The Decay of Lying." *Collected Works of Oscar Wilde*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1997. 919-943. Print.

---. *De Profundis, Being the First and Accurate Version of Epistola: In Carere et Vincalis*. *The Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. Rupert Hart-Davis. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1962. 423-511. Print.

---. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Ed. Michael Patrick Gillespie. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. Print.

Weihl, Harrington. "The Monumental Failure of *Howards End*." *Studies in the Novel* 46.4 (2014): 444-463. Print.

Wisenthal, J. L. "Wilde, Shaw, and the Play of Conversation." *Modern Drama* 37.1 (1994): 206-219. Print.

.