

Wuthering Heights and Its Critical Reception from 1847 to 1900

Marie Suzuki

The aim of this article is to study in as much detail as possible the reception of *WH*, from the first publication of the novel in 1847 to the end of the nineteenth century. By examining the various and varying opinions in reviews of, and articles and books about, *WH* in this period, I aim also to explore some of the characteristic aspects of values constructing the Victorian literary climate. *WH* has at times been regarded as singular book, isolated from any literary background. Simultaneously, there have been attempts to place it in relation to literary tradition. The variety of approaches point to contradictory values not only in critical standards but also in society.

WH was published in 1847 under the pseudonym of Ellis Bell, who was regarded as a male writer. The second edition was issued in 1850, accompanied by CB's 'Preface' and 'Biographical Notice' which revealed the author's identity and personal details. The biographical background was supplemented by *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* published by Elizabeth Gaskell in 1857. Each of these dates provide landmarks which determine the road taken the first two parts of this article. Interest in *WH*, which had slackened in the 1860s, was revived in the 1870s, and the last three decades of the century provide a number of significant critical discussions of the novel, which are examined in the third part.

1. From 1847 to 1850

Reviews are a signpost of the feeling and the taste not only of the reviewers but also of the age. There is a prevailing impression that *WH* was ignored or hostilely treated by the contemporaries. It is mainly based

on the 'Biographical Notice' of CB who found the reviews of the first edition totally unsatisfactory and condemned their injustice. G. H. Lewes, however, did not agree with her complaint ; his judgement was that 'the critics were excessively indulgent'. The difference between the reactions of two main literary figures in the mid-century is interesting enough to make us re-examine how the first edition of *WH* was received and which opinion, or opinions, correctly reflect the reaction of the time.

I have examined eleven British reviews published within a year of the first edition.¹⁾ Varied in length and tone, three of them are aggressive (*New Monthly Magazine*, *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, *Quarterly Review*), one is highly favourable (unidentified review), and the rest weigh merits against demerits.

One of the factors we cannot dismiss is that these early reviews are strongly influenced by the universal success of *JE*, which was published two months before *WH*. Although the high reputation of *JE* might have helped to draw attention to *WH*, it also prevented the latter novel from being evaluated for itself, because some reviewers were biased in favour of the former.²⁾

In spite of comparing it unfavourably with *JE*, the early reviewers did not fail to recognise merits in *WH*. Of the eleven reviews, eight point out some strengths among which the most outstanding is its overpowering impact : 'power'—appearing 9 times,³⁾ 'powerful',⁴⁾ 'force',⁵⁾ 'forcible',⁶⁾ 'energy',⁷⁾ 'energetic',⁸⁾ 'strength',⁹⁾ 'vigor',¹⁰⁾ and 'ability'.¹¹⁾ It is obvious that *WH* impressed contemporary readers with its extraordinary vigour and intensity.

The next feature acknowledged by reviewers is its uniqueness : 'originality',¹²⁾ 'original',¹³⁾ and 'novelty'.¹⁴⁾ The third is its verisimilitude : 'truth',¹⁵⁾ 'truthful',¹⁶⁾ 'reality',¹⁷⁾ 'real',¹⁸⁾ and 'vraisemblance'.¹⁹⁾ The last one is 'interest'²⁰⁾ and 'interesting'.²¹⁾ It is quite suggestive that most of these variously termed qualities are characteristics usually attributed to male writers according to Elaine Showalter.²²⁾ *WH* was appreciated for the very qualities that women writers were thought to lack : power and originality. As for 'truthfulness' the situation is more problematic, because some reviews say exactly the opposite, calling *WH* 'improb-

able',²³⁾ doubting its 'truth'²⁴⁾ or 'vraisemblance'²⁵⁾ These contradictory opinions indicate that there must have been various ideas about what was 'true' or 'real' in fiction. According to Kathleen Tillotson, the novel was 'in the process of becoming the dominant form'²⁶⁾ in the 1840s and the subject matter was changing 'from extravagant romance to domesticity, from the extremes of high and low life to middle class'.²⁷⁾ It means that the novel was gradually shifting towards the authentic form in which the standard of propriety in middle-class life could be explicated. There was more of a demand that fiction should be realistic than had been the case before. 'Realistic' here means like actual life. The 'social-problem novel' appearing in the 1840s indicates what was coming to be expected by readers. Obviously people were much interested in what was really happening around them. Although some reviewers found the delineation of life in *WH* convincing and 'truthful', others felt its subject matter too unfamiliar and, therefore, judged it 'improbable'.

Even if the early reviewers did not altogether fail to appreciate what was good in *WH*, they were more eloquent in pointing out what they thought was bad in it. What offended the readers can be seen to fall roughly into three categories: the tone, the technique and the absence of moral purpose.

The first aspect is variously termed and attacked: 'strange',²⁸⁾ 'painful',²⁹⁾ 'coarse',³⁰⁾ 'disagreeable',³¹⁾ 'unpleasant',³²⁾ 'repulsive'³³⁾--these are used more than twice--and so forth. There are some reasons explaining these hostile reactions. Novels were often regarded as entertainment and, therefore, it is quite natural that dark or depressing stories were not much in favour. In spite of the growing demand for realistic novels, there was also opinion that novels ought to be pleasant because readers want escape from unpleasant reality.³⁴⁾ The *Britannia* shows what was expected to be their function: 'The aim of fiction is to afford some sensation of delight'.³⁵⁾ The *Examiner* asserts that it is necessary for an artist 'to modify and in some cases refine what he beholds in the ordinary world'.³⁶⁾ It supports Stang's opinion that much realistic theory was 'tinged with idealism'.³⁷⁾ Besides, novels were provided for family reading, including

young women. Description of physical pain and details of brutality seemed to be improper subjects for such a reading public. Some of the reviewers deplore 'the injudicious selection of the theme and matter'³⁸⁾ and 'unfortunate selection of objects'.³⁹⁾ The dark tone of *WH* was against the public craving for the brighter side of human life.

As for the technique, the highly elaborate narrative form as well as the double perspective of the two narrators seemed so complicated that reviewers judged it as 'disjointed'⁴⁰⁾ and 'confused'.⁴¹⁾ The typical reaction is as follows: 'It is not easy to disentangle the incidents and set them forth in chronological order.'⁴²⁾ This underestimation of the novel's complexity continued until 1926 when C. P. Sanger elucidated the well-ordered narrative strategy and the symmetrical structure of *WH*.⁴³⁾ The narrative complexity is closely related to the third aspect: the absence of moral purpose.

There has been a tendency to believe that the notorious didacticism in the Victorian period is the main factor which generated misunderstanding and underestimation of *WH*. Moral teaching as the function of novels was widely accepted, as entertainment. As Richard Stang quotes from *National Review*, "There is a 'law, that the writer of fiction now-a-days must be the teacher and preacher, as well as the amuser.'"⁴⁴⁾ If, however, moral instruction had been the main criterion, *AG* ought to have received a higher approval. None of the six reviews referring to *AG*⁴⁵⁾ regard that novel as superior. It is obvious that critical judgement was not governed only by simple didacticism but that, by mid-century, there were other criteria. This does not mean, however, that novels were seen altogether without regard to moral teaching, as no one would separate moral function from fiction. Three of the reviews⁴⁶⁾ point out the absence of a moral in *WH*, though their tone is rather more perplexed than outraged. According to Michael Wheeler, a moral in fiction is mainly conveyed in two ways:

Moralism in Victorian fiction is conveyed largely through the commentary of authorial narrators and through judgements enacted in the plot, and particularly in the endings of novels.⁴⁷⁾

What annoyed the reviewers seem to be that they were not provided a perspective to elucidate the esoteric interior of the novel. The author is so ingeniously hidden that the readers can find no clue to fathom his intention. Their bewilderment and irritation are typically shown as follows: 'We want to know the object of a fiction...' ⁴⁸⁾ The author's invisibility is derived from the complex narrative form in which two narrators disclose their stories based on their own values and leave no room for the author's intervention. This narrative, though reminding modern readers of a similar technique developed in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, may have appeared to be too complicated for contemporary readers. It is no wonder, therefore, that they were frustrated in their search for authorial intention and obliged to judge *WH* as purposeless: 'We do not know whether the author write any purpose...' ⁴⁹⁾ The relationship between an author and readers was much closer in the Victorian period than it is today, mainly because the serialization in periodicals made the communication between the two easy and frequent. The author's invisibility in *WH* must have annoyed readers as it assumes a new and ambiguous stance towards the reading public.

Besides the narrative complexity, the absence of a moral is related to another factor which made readers doubt the author's intention: the ambiguous ending. The end ought to be clear and convincing, as the *Britannia* declares: 'the end of fictitious writings should always be kept in view'. ⁵⁰⁾ We can easily imagine how confused readers felt by the unorthodox end of *WH*. As it allows various interpretations, some of the reviewers find order regained to some extent. ⁵¹⁾ However, they judge the ending insufficient and far from persuasive, that is why they assert that the novel is 'purposeless'.

In spite of the various attacks on the deviancy from the critical standard, some of the contemporary reviewers were unable to ignore the enormous potentialities of *WH*:

WH is a strange sort of book, -- baffling all regular criticism; yet, it is impossible to begin and not finish it; and quite as impossible to lay it aside afterwards and say nothing about it... His qualities are... excessive... ⁵²⁾

JE and *WH* are not things to be forgotten...that [the work] of Ellis Bell is only a promise, but it is a colossal one.⁵³⁾

Moreover, it is surprising that one reviewer is highly in favour, appreciating the author's 'knowledge of human nature' and judging the novel as 'one of the most interesting stories we have read for many a long day.'⁵⁴⁾ Not only does he point out the important contrast of the two houses as well as their occupants, he also recognises 'ample opportunity of sympathising' and goes so far as to express 'the genuine pleasure' the author affords. Even if the critical standard in the mid-century was somewhat biased, it was not monolithic. Two of the reviewers are so perplexed about how to appreciate the novel that they frankly suspend their judgement as follows :

With all its power and originality, it is so rude, so unfinished, and so careless, that we are perplexed to pronounce an opinion on it, or to hazard a conjecture on the future career of the author.⁵⁵⁾

It is very puzzling and very interesting, ...we must leave it to our readers to decide what sort of book it is...⁵⁶⁾

It is also worth noticing that these early reviewers correctly perceive the Romantic aspect of the novel. Affinity with Byron,⁵⁷⁾ German tales,⁵⁸⁾ especially Hoffmann⁵⁹⁾ is referred to. Comparison with Salvator-Rosa's pictures representing typically Romantic landscapes is made by two reviewers.⁶⁰⁾ Without any knowledge of the author's background, they were sensitive enough to penetrate to the essence of *WH*.

From this survey of the early reviews, I cannot but conclude that CB's 'Biographical Notice' is rather doing an injustice to them, though it seems too severe to call them 'too generous' as G. H. Lewes thought. *WH* was attacked and criticised by contemporary readers for the very ambiguities that are variously interpreted and highly praised in the twentieth century. Its esoteric atmosphere was alien to the mid-century spiritual background and the search for clear insight into human life. R. Stang explains what expected in fiction as follows :

According to W. C. Roscoe...the rapid growth of the novel into the 'most characteristic literature of modern times' was due to the development of political democracy. With the diminishing power of the state and the growth of personal liberties in the nineteenth-century England, the individual became more important and could more and more shape his own future. As a result, he became interested in his own character, and 'an increased interest in the individual characters of others; and the examination and representation of character has been the most universal object of modern imaginative literature, its most special characteristic, and its highest excellence'.⁶¹⁾

Construction of self in the turbulent world is exactly what was focused on in fiction. It helps people to understand human nature and to cope with it in society. *WH* fell short not only of the Victorian measure of moral intention, but also of character expectations set by the reading public. It is amazing, however, that most of the early reviewers did not fail to see something extraordinary and potential in it. *WH* 'was neither understood nor ignored'. as John Hewish rightly remarks.⁶²⁾

There remains the review by Sydney Dobell which appeared after the first excitement caused by the appearance of *WH* had subsided.⁶³⁾ This review is now regarded as epoch-making, starting 'the cult for *EB*',⁶⁴⁾ and it is well-known for having made *CB* rejoice, as she thought it was the only article that did justice to *WH*.⁶⁵⁾ Her gratitude, however, is problematic, because Dobell's high estimate of *WH* half derives from a false supposition that it must be the first and immature creation of *CB*, and, moreover, what he finds to praise is already referred to by earlier reviewers. Regarding *WH* as 'the early efforts of unusual genius', he draws attention to merits such as 'native power', 'the brave simplicity', 'the unaffected air',⁶⁷⁾ 'extreme likelihood', 'the unspeakable pathos' and 'the rarest originality'.⁶⁸⁾ Most of these qualities are, however, already referred to in the earlier reviews. He sees the novel as the dramatic expression of 'a poet',⁶⁹⁾ which is one of the earliest comments on the poetic essence of *WH*. *EB* as a poet becomes the central topic of discussion after the 1870s. Dobell shows the same negative attitude to Heathcliff as most of the earlier reviewers. He criticises its narrative technique. He

is as annoyed by the absence of a moral as some other reviewers. It seems rather surprising that he can praise *WH* while he is dissatisfied with so many aspects of the novel. Judging from his quotations from the novel, what he most values is Catherine's pathetic life and its vivid delineation. He finds in *WH* a Romantic image: the unpremeditated art of a young genius. His frequent use of the negative prefix augments the image: 'unequivocal', 'unobtrusive', 'unexpected', 'unaffected', 'unconscious', 'ungenial', 'unspeakable', 'ungovernable', 'unimpaired' and so on. He emphasises 'the involuntary art'⁷⁰⁾ and 'unconscious felicities'⁷¹⁾ of an immature genius as well: using 'unconscious'⁷²⁾ and 'instinctive'⁷³⁾ three times each. He seems to imply that innocent author has created unawares. What made CB happy was probably the Romantic appreciation of *WH*. The tone of Dobell's review forshadow her Preface to the second edition which was published three months later. Although his review is not the most favourable nor the first to appreciate the author's great potentiality, it is apparently to CB the most sympathetic.

2. From 1850 to 1859

The second stage of reviews began in 1850, when the second edition of *WH* was published. This was edited and prefaced by CB who thought it essential to defend her dead sisters. Her enthusiasm was so great that ironically the 'Editor's Preface' and 'Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell' drew more attention than the novel itself. CB died on 31 March 1855, and in 1857 Elizabeth Gaskell published *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. It was reviewed by some of the major critics like John Skelton, William Caldwell Roscoe and Eneas Sweetland Dallas, who thus had an opportunity to reconsider the entire works of the sisters.

The main characteristic of the reviews in the 1850s is a growing interest in the life of the Brontës. CB's Preface, BN and Gaskell's biography supplied enough information to arouse forms of sympathy which subtly influenced the appreciation of the novel.

CB's preface and BN show not only how she felt towards her sister's

enigmatic work but also what she thought was crucial to bridge the gap between the reading public and *WH*. She ingeniously used three tactics: an apology, an appeal for sympathetic understanding, and an invitation to praise.

First, in the BN, she carefully reveals the identity of the Bells and explains why they chose to use the neutral pseudonyms:

...we did not like to declare ourselves women, because--without at that time suspecting that our mode of writing and thinking was not what is called 'feminine'--we had a vague impression that authoresses are liable to be looked on with prejudice...⁷⁴⁾

It is obvious that they tried to avoid the double critical standard.⁷⁵⁾ It is worth noting that they never suspected that they would be criticised as 'not...feminine', nor that they thought it necessary to be feminine in their writings, which implies that they regarded themselves equal to men as writers. However defiant they might have been at the beginning, CB slightly changes her attitude in the preface. She gradually come to know how female writers are supposed to behave:

If she [the woman writer] refused to be modest, self-deprecating, subservient, refused to present her artistic productions as mere trifles designed to divert and distract readers in moments of idleness, she could expect to be ignored or (sometimes scurrilously) attacked.⁷⁶⁾

As female writers were regarded as inferior in the male-dominated literary tradition,⁷⁷⁾ an apology and a humble attitude were indispensable for them. By describing her sister's character as 'not...demonstrative' and 'unobtrusive'⁷⁸⁾ CB guards EB against criticism of vanity and unfeminine ambition. CB also finds it necessary to acknowledge the author's limitations, derived from a lack of the kind of experience needed to make the novel by a woman acceptable in society. She is careful not to provoke the public by a fatal impression of unwomanliness and immodesty. CB also apologises for the unfeminine creation of her sister. She tries to counter the supposed attack by emphasising her sister's innocence: 'Having formed these beings [Heathcliff, Earnshaw, Cathy], she did not know what she had done'.⁷⁹⁾ Hesitating about how to interpret Heathcliff, she

uses the same logic :

Whether it is right or advisable to create beings like Heathcliff, I do not know : I scarcely think it is. But this I know ; the writer who possesses the creative gift owns something of which he is not always master--something that at times strangely wills and works for itself.⁸⁰⁾

By describing her sister's confined life like that of 'a nun',⁸¹⁾ she apparently tries to impress the public with the image of a naive and unsophisticated girl without any affectation or arrogance.

Secondly, the details of EB's character delineated in the BN help to underline her stoic life and death. The sisters' despair and hope in their literary attempt must have drawn the attention of the readers who had variously discussing the true authorship of the Bells for the past two years. In order to free *WH* of prejudice and misunderstanding, CB judges it necessary to try to separate the art and the life of EB by implying that the cruelty and brutality in *WH* are in no way the direct reflection of the writer's personality, but purely the imaginative creation of a girl with rare fortitude and a strong will : 'In Emily's nature the extremes of vigour and simplicity seemed to meet.'⁸²⁾ EB was so reserved and inexperienced that she needs 'an interpreter'⁸³⁾ to communicate with the outer world. CB willingly takes on the task to save the dead sister from infamy. Confiding something of her tragical family history, she aims to stir the public's compassion and sympathy. She expects that readers will tolerate the novel's eccentricity and deviation from the standard once they realise the author's mysterious nature. The death-scene of EB, in particular, makes up a perfect tragedy of its own.

Lastly, CB not only defends her sister but, in the last two paragraphs of the preface, praises her enthusiastically. She represents EB as a Romantic genius inspired by a power which forced her to create. CB suggests that EB cannot be blamed for what she created because the author write 'as Fate or Inspiration direct'.⁸⁴⁾ EB is compard to a sculptor irresistbly driven by imaginative power. By using--consciously or not--the image and the diction found in the earlier reviews,⁸⁵⁾ CB constructs a new mask for a woman writer instead of a pseudonym : a medium who unconscious-

ly conveys a message inspired by a Romantic passion. She appears to acquiesce in the limitation ascribed to woman writers by saying that her sister created unawares, while she dares defy the male literary tradition by presenting a female genius with unconscious potentiality. Her ingenious defence and assertion are so influential that they are to dominate the reviews in the 1850s.

I have examined twelve reviews, articles, letters and a poem written between 1850 and 1857, that is, just before Gaskell's *The Life of CB* was published.⁸⁶⁾ Most of them are a reaction to the preface and BN rather than new approach to *WH*. How zealously the identity of the Bells has been guessed at and discussed thus far is described in the *Eclectic Review*.

Whether these works were the productions of a gentleman or a lady, and whether their authorship was single or threefold, have been mooted with considerable interest in some literary circles... Though the internal evidence of the works is strongly favorable to the hypothesis of a female authorship, there is, nevertheless, a certain masculine air about their style, a repudiation of conventionalisms, and a bold, nervous, cast of thought and action, which suggests the presence of the other sex.⁸⁷⁾

The background to this peculiar game of detection is derived from the double standard:

This double standard was so widely accepted through about 1875 that critics and readers automatically employed it in the game of literary detection. Approaching an anonymous or pseudonymous novel, reviewers would break it down into its elements, label these masculine or feminine, and add up the total. The predominance of masculine or feminine elements determined the sex of the author.⁸⁸⁾

This prevailing standard is based on the dualistic presupposition that male writers and female writers ought to be distinctly different and that their spheres are clearly separated. As for female writers:

...the central preoccupation ...is with the woman as an influence on others within her domestic and social circle. It was in this preoccupation that the typical woman novelist of the 1840s found her proper sphere...⁸⁹⁾

WH undermines the preoccupation and the standard, because it has

appreciated for the qualities which were believed to be exclusively characteristic to male writers: power and originality.

Nevertheless, the revealed female authorship changes the tone of some reviews. The typical example is the *Athenaeum*. *WH* was regarded as 'a disagreeable story'⁹⁰⁾ in 1847, while in 1850 it is praised as 'a more than usually interesting contribution to the history of female authorship in England',⁹¹⁾ probably by the same reviewer. He uses 'female genius' and 'female authorship' twice each and 'women', 'Englishwomen', 'Rosalinds' once each in the review of less than two pages. He also points out the author's lack of 'experience of men and manners'⁹²⁾ which is supposed to be one of the disadvantages of female writers. It is obvious that he does not appreciate the novel seriously.⁹³⁾ Female authorship makes some reviewers focus on love and madness, which are believed to be characteristic of women. G. H. Lewes is fascinated by the truthfulness of the love between Cathy and Heathcliff.⁹⁴⁾ P. Bayne also emphasises emotion and passion in the novel: 'She [Ellis Bell] has not to do with intellect, but emotion...The passion she has chosen is love.'⁹⁵⁾

Another main reaction at this time is a perplexity and a surprise at the gap between the novel and the life of the author. *WH* overthrows the presupposition of readers who believe that the life delineated in fiction and the writer's actual life should be continuous or, at least analogous, because this is the basis of realism which Victorian literary tradition highly values. Female writers are regarded as inferior because they lack a wide range of experience, education, intellect and physical strength. If a woman without health, education and experience can write a novel extremely powerful and true, it is not only 'a potential danger to female delicacy'⁹⁶⁾ but also it throws the whole idea of male-dominated literary creation into doubt. This is exactly what some of the reviewers begin to recognise. At least G. H. Lewes does:

Curious enough it is to read *WH* and *TWH*, and remember that the writers were two retiring, solitary, consumptive girls....There is matter here for the moralist or critic to speculate on.⁹⁷⁾

Not only Lewes, but also many other reviewers and readers are disturbed

and at the same time fascinated by the discrepancy between the extraordinary world of the novel and the author's inexperience. This is another reason why the biographical background of the sisters gathers more attention than the novels hereafter.

Apart from the surprise at female authorship and the aroused interest in the facts of her biography, the reviewers' reaction is similar to the one we have surveyed before. They are deeply impressed with the great power of the novel: G. H. Lewes uses the word 'power' (including 'powerful') six times, while Bayne uses it (including 'powers', 'powerful') six times and 'strength' four times.⁹⁸⁾ D. G. Rossetti is fascinated by its power.⁹⁹⁾ As for truthfulness, there are again two contradictory opinions: Lewes appreciates it using the word 'true', 'truth' three times,¹⁰⁰⁾ while the *Eclectic Review* regards the incidents as 'wanting in probability', 'devoid of truthfulness', and 'not in harmony with the actual world'.¹⁰¹⁾ The contrasting attitude towards the estimation of truth is generated from the different ideas of what should be represented in fiction—a point which will be discussed later.

In spite of some favourable reactions, most of the reviewers never hesitate to point out the negative aspects of the novel as well: such as it being 'sombre, rude, brutal',¹⁰²⁾ 'perplexing, horrible',¹⁰³⁾ 'repellent, loathsome',¹⁰⁴⁾ and 'distempered, disturbed, and unnatural'.¹⁰⁵⁾ Although some reviewers acknowledge the potential greatness of EB,¹⁰⁶⁾ the general opinion still gives preference to CB.¹⁰⁷⁾ Bayne concludes that Ellis and Acton Bell will not 'survive the generation now passing a way'.¹⁰⁸⁾

On the other hand, a few reviewers begin to regard EB as a poet:

Ellis Bell's poetry...is characterized by strength and freshness, and by that original cadence, that power of melody, which, be it wild, or tender, or even harsh, was never heard before, and comes at first hand from nature, as her sign of the born poet.¹⁰⁹⁾

It seems strange that Bayne could value her poems so highly, while he also bids readers 'avoid works of distempered excitement' like *WH*. Although he judges her poetry to be 'not healthful',¹¹⁰⁾ he is fascinated by its morbid beauty:

Its beauty is allied to that wild loveliness which may gleam on the hectic cheek, or move while it startles, as we listen to maniac ravings.¹¹¹⁾

It is obvious that he distinctly separates the sphere of fiction from that of poetry. This seems to be a prevailing idea throughout the Victorian period :

The novel is clearly felt to be bound by different rules [from that of poetry] , due, no doubt, to its supposedly influential position in society, and to its greater reliance on material drawn from the everyday world of moral situations and decisions--¹¹²⁾

What Bayne considers to be appropriate in fiction gives us an interesting example of what is allowed to be delineated in a novel. Although he values *WH* as 'a psychological study' of the characters, he declares that 'bedlam in no legitimate sphere of art'.¹¹³⁾ He compares *WH* with works of Poe--he is the first to observe this similarity--and criticises the evil influence on the human mind of the works of these two writers :

Their [works of E. Bell and Poe] general effect is to produce a mental state alien to the calm energy and quiet homely feelings of real life ; to make the soul the slave of stimulants, and those of the fiercest kind...¹¹⁴⁾

What he expects in fiction is a kind of educational function, not to say didacticism, helping readers to adjust to various human relationships in life. It is no wonder that he would 'sentence them [*WH* and the works of Poe] to oblivion'.¹¹⁵⁾ His idea of fiction as an instructor is close to what George Eliot thinks art should be :

'Art is the nearest thing to life...a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot'.¹¹⁶⁾

Interestingly enough, we find an opposing idea about relation between creative power and the writer in the review by G. H. Lewes :

...we suppose every writer will easily recall his sensation of being 'carried away' by the thoughts which in moments of exaltation possessed his soul... There is at such time a momentum which propels the mind into regions inaccessible to calculation, unsuspected in our calmer moods.¹¹⁷⁾

He thinks that writers should be motivated by uncontrollable imaginative power rather than by a conscious intention of helping people adapt to real life. Lewes' Romantic idea of the artist is contradictory to the realistic one stated by Bayne. These various opinions coexisted and constructed the literary background in the mid-century.

The Life of CB which Elizabeth Gaskell published in 1857 helped to greatly increase the sympathetic reaction of the public towards the sisters,¹¹⁸⁾ which had been caused by the preface and BN.

...it was Mrs. Gaskell's *Life of CB* which was most instrumental in changing people's ideas about the supposed coarseness of the Brontës; and it is in reviews of her biography that we first see the very tremors of abuse turned into praise.¹¹⁹⁾

Their integrity, their struggle in life through self-help and their premature deaths described in *The Life* must have generated a favourable response from the readers. Their strong sense of duty and their modest life style are readily endorsed by Victorian ideology.

As for EB, the discrepancy between the novel's art and the author's life increasingly fascinates, rather than disturbs, the public. It is rather ironical that her life seems to receive more attention than her novel: it is appreciated as another work of art, as it were, which is intense, unique, hard to believe, but real, as it is based on facts. In other words, her life has become a realistic fiction with the tangible qualities which her novel apparently fails to provide. The confusion between life and art is related to the realistic demands made of fiction. In the mid-century, a biography is often considered as an ultimate form of a novel.

Every novel, according to [Fitzjames] Stephen, should strive to give 'a perfect representation of life', specifically the life of a single man... 'The first requirement of a novel is, that it should be a biography--an account of the life or part of the life, of a person.'¹²⁰⁾

It is no wonder, therefore, EB's 'real story' becomes more popular than her esoteric novel. Her life story supplied the moral sensibility which is thought to be completely lacking in the novel. Most of the reviewers refer

to her impressive death-scene,¹²¹⁾ which seems to convey a significant meaning :

While she was yet dying, she refused all remedy...She refused to be comforted, she refused to be nursed ; she bore up with indomitable patience to within two hours of her death ; then she...hid her head upon her pillow and died like the heroine of a Grecian tragedy, who willingly approaches the altar when her life is required as a sacrifice to fate.¹²²⁾

Her life's ending offers the dramatic and complete ending which the Victorian readers expect in fiction. According to John Reed, the deathbed convention was 'a truly immediate reality that bound fictional convention and social fact together'.¹²³⁾ He also explains that :

...deathbed scenes were common in Victorian literature because they were an important practical and moral feature of life.¹²⁴⁾

Although Heathcliff's death-scene rejects moral implications of any kind, that of EB inspires readers' compassion and respect, and offers a moral meaning. The reviewers interpret her death-scene in various ways : Skelton sees her 'untamable' aspect,¹²⁵⁾ Roscoe is impressed by her Stoicism,¹²⁶⁾ and Dallas focuses on her despair, emphasising the tragic fate.¹²⁷⁾ Her decline and death support the Victorian conventional idea of female delicate health, while her strong will, patience and fortitude surprised the reviewers who begin to regard her as an 'enigma'.¹²⁸⁾ The incompatibility of her life with her novel seems to be 'an impenetrable mystery' :

...how a quiet, reserved...steady and well-conducted young woman...could have conceived such scenes, or couched her conceptions in such language. With this fresh scent, as it were, we can pursue the story to the end, not without amusement, for the language is vigorous, and the scenes energetic.¹²⁹⁾

The point is that her life comes first rather than her art.

Her life has not only turned into a moving story, but has also influenced the appreciation of the novel itself. Separated from her life, the novel could be seen as pure fiction ; and in those terms, some reviewers begin to find Heathcliff great or heroic. Skelton remarks : 'we feel that though his

soul is the fouler, he is the greater, the more loveable of the two [Heathcliff and Edgar]'.¹³⁰⁾ Dallas regards Heathcliff as a victim of a fate, as in a 'Greek tragedy'.¹³¹⁾ Skelton significantly refers to Cathy's dream of Heaven¹³²⁾ which modern scholars never fail to quote. It is obvious that some of the reviewers find themselves freed from moral concern about the author and able to discuss the fiction for its own sake.

Interestingly, there are contradictory opinions of the delineation of 'the human heart' in the novel: Roscoe criticises the author for revealing 'the worst recesses of the human heart',¹³³⁾ While Hobart remarks: 'It is a fearful picture, but it is drawn with a deep miraculous knowledge of the human heart'.¹³⁴⁾ It seems that some reviewers are still disturbed by an incongruity between the power of language and the inappropriateness of the material. Behind this dilemma, we can again see the opposing ideas about what should be allowed to be expressed in art. For example, Skelton, comparing Cathy's madness with Ophelia's, admires 'This richness and affluence of poetic life'.¹³⁵⁾ On the other hand, Roscoe shows a negative attitude towards 'the fierce uncontrolled tone of the work...its overriding essential probabilities' and 'scornful indifference to the restriction of Art and the judgment of men'.¹³⁶⁾ The former indicates the Romantic appreciation of the poetic essence, while the latter shows a realistic judgement attacking the deviation from the standard which is based on the close observation of actual life. Although Victorian literary tradition in fiction is often regarded as embodying the principle of realism, there seems to exist, as an undercurrent, another tendency:

...the question of *WH* presented a powerful challenge to prevailing criticism to examine many of its long-accepted premises. The characters of that novel were much more relentless than any the reviewers knew in everyday experience and the action was hardly what they would call 'realistic'; yet the book had something that many of the novels of the century lacked.¹³⁷⁾

Again, there must have been a clear distinction between fiction and poetry, because the *Christian Remembrancer* praises EB's poems even as it passes severe judgement on her novel:

Glancing over Emily's poems after the perusal of this monstrous perfor-

mance [*WH*] we the more regret that this phase of her nature should ever have found expression. Verse was her real utterance...¹³⁸⁾

This diversity of response--seemingly, as her novel and poems are very similar in their tone and content--proves that what is censured in *WH* is not the expression itself but its impropriety in fiction.

Another feature of the reviews of this time is that EB is sometimes regarded as a greater novelist than CB in one respect or another. Skelton hesitatingly remarks: 'we meet in it [*WH*], I think, with more subtle diversities of character than we do in any of them [CB's novels]'.¹³⁹⁾ Roscoe admits that 'In force of genius, in the power of conceiving and uttering intensity of passion, Emily surpassed her sister Charlotte'.¹⁴⁰⁾ A French reviewer, Émile Montégut considers Emily and Anne to be underestimated:

'These two remarkable people, whose works have not been esteemed at their true value, having been as it were buried under Charlotte's success, deserve more space than we can give them'.¹⁴¹⁾

Although nobody dares assert that EB is definitely superior than CB, her reputation seems to be approaching a turning point at this stage. The last reviewer makes a remarkable comment on the effective invisibility of the author: 'The poetic effect produced is all the greater in that the author never appears behind her character'.¹⁴²⁾ The absence of the authoritative voice has been regarded as a defect from the Victorian literary viewpoint. He is probably the first to appreciate it.

At this point, then, EB's life has decisively influenced the way her art is seen. Although Roscoe asserts that life and art should not be confused,¹⁴³⁾ her life has surpassed her novel in attention. CB's defence of her sisters worked so effectively that, ironically, many readers began sympathising with EB and admiring her rather than her novel.

3. From 1870 to 1900

The apparent incompatibility of the life and the art of EB which was often referred to in the 1850s not only fascinated the public but also

generated a conjecture that *WH* had been written by her brother. In the 60s and the 70s two people who personally knew Branwell ascribed the novel in part or wholly to him,¹⁴³⁾ although they were refuted immediately. Apart from the discussion of authorship, *WH* seems to have been forgotten in the 60s, as the total absence of criticisms suggests. As Victorian prudery was at its height,¹⁴⁴⁾ reviewers as well as readers may have deliberately ignored *WH*, filled as it was with violence and passion. On the other hand, sensational novels were popular, and the abnormal situations and unregulated emotions which these contained might have prepared the way for *WH*.

...the sensation novel, explored the darker, often forbidden areas of human experience...they provide a context in which human psychology is explored under the stress of extraordinary, heightened emotion, and in which assumptions about the 'ordinary' are questioned or undermined.¹⁴⁵⁾

Wheeler compares the complex narrative pattern characteristic of the sensational novels with that of *WH*.¹⁴⁶⁾ In other words, the sensational novels helped to enlarge the sphere of fiction beyond domestic realism. Besides, they undermined the convention of novels as a vehicle for moral teaching, and revealed unfathomed aspect of human mind. These tendencies ultimately lead fiction to explore the inner psychological region rather than the actual world of probability.

A new tide seems to come in the literary world in the 70s, because EB is suddenly focused on and highly praised as a poetic genius, which favourably influences the appreciation of *WH*. I have examined ten books and articles published in the 70s (including one American review article).¹⁴⁷⁾

The first interesting example is 'The life and writings of EB' in *Galaxy*. Although it was published in New York, it foreshadows a new trend of criticism mainly found in England in the 1880s. In the article exclusively focused on EB,¹⁴⁸⁾ the critic praises the power in her poems, using the word 'power' eleven times at least (including 'powers' and 'powerful'), eight of which refer to poems. What is unique about this article is that he

applies the same critical standard to the novel as to the poems. He draws attention to 'the strong stamp of true genius' in of the novel and challenges 'a prejudice' and 'the wholesale condemnation and unqualified abuse': 'Though a brutal, it is not a sensual book ; though coarse, it is not vulgar ; though bad, it is no indecent'.¹⁴⁹⁾ Even if the novel lacks probability, it shows the 'rare power of making the unreal vividly real to the reader'.¹⁵⁰⁾ He obviously accepts a novel as a powerful illusion, rather than a simple vehicle of domestic realism. He compares the story of Heathcliff with the poems of Heine in its 'tragedy of a human life and love...a love godless, hopeless and desperate'.¹⁵¹⁾ The image of Heathcliff becomes somewhat metaphysical: 'The passion of Heathcliff for Catherine...is...a passion of soul for soul' and 'love is himself, and apart from it he has no being'.¹⁵²⁾ Although the critic admits 'its faults',¹⁵³⁾ he regards Heathcliff's history as 'a dramatic poem' which is 'tragic' and 'profound'.¹⁵⁴⁾ There is no boundary between fiction and poetry here. What he values in 'a profound psychological study', a 'complete history of human life and love' and the 'power of expressing it with rare simplicity and strength of diction'.¹⁵⁵⁾ Interestingly, this anticipates many of the British reviews and articles in the 70s and 80s.

Back in Britain in the 70s we can find a similar reaction in most of the articles. EB is praised mainly as a poetic genius and, consequently *WH* is often interpreted in a poetic context. The novel is gradually receiving a higher regard although some of the critics cautiously admit its 'faults'.

Thomas Wemyss Reid asserts not only that EB is the best poet of the sisters, but also that the poems and the novel are analogous: the former 'furnish a key to many passages in *WH*'.¹⁵⁶⁾ Heathcliff's story is compared with that of *Titus Andronicus*¹⁵⁷⁾ and Frankenstein's monster.¹⁵⁸⁾

Admitting that he is 'the most unmitigated villain in fiction',¹⁵⁹⁾ he is 'a real being, not a merely grotesque monster'.¹⁶⁰⁾ His sympathy and fascination with the novel are revealed as follows:

The author seizes the reader at the first moment at which they meet, holds him thrilled, entranced, terrified perhaps, in a grasp which never relaxes, and leaves him at last, after a perusal of the story, shaken and exhausted as by some great effort of the mind. Surely nowhere in modern English

fiction can more striking proof be found of the possession of 'the creative gift' in an extraordinary degree than is to be obtained in *WH*.¹⁶¹⁾

He shows a Romantic appreciation of the characters, calling them 'a living reality'¹⁶²⁾ and 'living originals'¹⁶³⁾ and 'the spontaneous creations of genius'.¹⁶⁴⁾ He is rather impressed than appalled with 'the secrets of morbid human nature'¹⁶⁵⁾ which might foreshadow the psychological interest in novels of the decadence. The idea of what is expected in fiction seems to be changing. There is a suggestion in 1873 that the novelist should describe 'the hidden springs of action, the inner mystery of the human consciousness, rather than man in society'.¹⁶⁶⁾

Swinburne is also enthusiastic about EB as a poet. He points to the 'primitive nature-worship'¹⁶⁷⁾ in the last scene of *WH* and 'such grandeur of anti-christian fortitude and self-controlling self-reliance'¹⁶⁸⁾ in her poem 'No coward soul is mine'. He obviously sees continuity between the novel and the poems. Both of these articles are beginning to assume a metaphysical or philosophical tone, which will be developed in the next few decades.

Most of the critics in the 70s, though hesitatingly, begin to show a positive attitude towards *WH*, which probably indicates the turning point in the reception of the novel. As two conventions of Victorian fiction--the agreeable character and the happy ending¹⁶⁹⁾--die hard, critics cannot overlook some 'faults' in the novel.¹⁷⁰⁾ Nevertheless, they express a favourable appreciation in the end:

...while we cannot defend it altogether possibly as it stands, we should regret never having seen it, as one of the most extraordinary and powerful productions in the whole range of English literature.¹⁷¹⁾

It is not a pleasant book, but, with all its faults, it is a great one...¹⁷²⁾

Brimful of faults as it may be, that book is alone sufficient to prove that a rare and splendid genius was lost to the world when EB died.¹⁷³⁾

These passages show that, in spite of some 'faults', critics were beginning to feel compelled to recognise the extraordinary significance of *WH*.

Interestingly, just as in 1850s, there are two contrasting opinion as to

the 'truth' and 'reality' of the novel. Smith,¹⁷⁴⁾ Reid¹⁷⁵⁾ and Adams¹⁷⁶⁾ find *WH* or Heathcliff 'real' and 'true', while Leslie Stephen regards the book as 'a kind of baseless nightmare' because of the 'feeble grasp of external facts'.¹⁷⁷⁾ His moral position probably prevents him from tolerating a novel without any authoritative voice. The problem of reality in fiction which is often discussed throughout the Victorian period is a vexed one. Although Leslie Stephen attacks open didacticism, he 'demanded of fiction a definite social and moral function, not to be realized by direct preaching'. He asserts that a novel or poem should have :

a ruling thought...and the thought should be one which will help to purify and sustain the mind by which it is assimilated ; and therefore tend to make society so far healthier and happier.¹⁷⁸⁾

For him to read a novel 'is to lay aside for a moment one's own personality, and to become a part of the author'.¹⁷⁹⁾ It is no wonder, therefore, that he sees 'a baseless nightmare' in a novel without a tangible authorial presence. The other opinion focuses on the originality and imaginative power of the novel. It is typically found in G. H. Lewes and remains an undercurrent idea throughout the period. These opposing ideas about what should be expressed in fiction always seem to coexist and to produce discussion.

Another point is that the word 'romance' is often used for *WH*, which might foreshadow the romance revival in the 1880s. Reid regards *WH* as 'dealing with characters and circumstances which belong to the romance rather than the reality of life'.¹⁸⁰⁾ Millicent Fawcett asserts that '...her one romance, *WH*, places her in the first rank among the great imaginative writers of English fiction'.¹⁸¹⁾ The *Athenaeum* also calls *WH* a 'sonorous romance'.¹⁸²⁾ These opinions indicate that a new region and genre are being explored for fiction. Walter Pater published *Studies in the Renaissance* in 1873, which introduced Aestheticism into Victorian England. Henry James launched out as a rising novelist with *Roderick Hudson* in 1875. Obviously, a new climate for fiction is being prepared, in which the autonomy of a work of art is stressed, rather than its social function. Although some of the critics are still obsessed with the gap between the

life and the art of EB,¹⁸³⁾ literary discussion is less concerned with morality, and discussions of *WH* tend to focus more on the origin of the novel and the secret of the author's creativity.

The trend of criticism of *WH* which began in the 70s develops in the following two decades. There is an increasing stress on EB's poetic genius, which begins to assume a charismatic character. Besides, two main features characterize the criticisms of *WH* in the 80s: one is religious or philosophical interpretation and the other is seeing the novel as representing the spirit of romanticism. I have examined five books and articles published in the 1880s.¹⁸⁴⁾

Peter Bayne's detailed discussion of the poems and *WH* clearly shows the shift of the literary background. In 1857 he had denounced *WH* as an immoral novel, while in 1881 he seizes on a metaphysical message in the novel as well as in the poems. He praises the poem 'The Philosopher' as 'the most original in thought, the most powerful in imagination, the most intensely sincere and impassioned in feeling.'¹⁸⁵⁾ Its central idea, he thinks, is the question 'God or no God? He sees continuity between the poems and the novel: 'EB had searched the universe for God, and...God had never...revealed Himself to her'.¹⁸⁶⁾ His approach now foreshadows J. Hillis Miller's *The Disappearance of God* (1963) in which absence of God and alienation of self are regarded as determining features in the literature of the period.¹⁸⁷⁾ He interpretes the theme of *WH* as a metaphysical conflict.

The burden of *WH* is the potency of evil—its potency to pervert good...the root of pain and misery is goodness, and the world in which we move seems God-forsaken...the main doctrine of the book, that there is no overruling Divine force to be counted on to 'make for' righteousness, or for those who work righteousness, is fearfully illustrated.¹⁸⁸⁾

This analysis indicates that religious doubt has replaced moral edification as the central concern in fiction. In the 1880s religious novels are popular. "'Seriousness' and 'thought' become the key-words in the aims of a whole new generation of novelists and critics" after 1879.¹⁸⁹⁾ Bayne's article obviously reflects a change in the literary climate; he is far less severe on the 'morbidity' of the novel than he was in 1857. Moreover, he compares

EB with Shakespeare and admires 'her self-possession and self-command'.¹⁹⁰⁾ There is one more point worth noting: the clear distinction which he made between poetry and fiction in 1857 seems to have blurred in 1881. It might be because the prevailing idea of the novel's function as amusement and moral teaching were challenged in the 1880s, and critics began to assert that "a 'work of art' [fiction] should be judged by intellectual and aesthetic criteria similar to those applied to other art forms".¹⁹¹⁾ The definition of reality has also shifted: in 1857 Bayne saw 'the whole atmosphere [of *WH*]... [as] distempered, disturbed, and unnatural',¹⁹²⁾ while in 1881 he asserts that 'the tale is told without violation of natural possibility', although he thinks that 'it exaggerates the evil'.¹⁹³⁾ As the domain of fiction is enlarged, 'the faults' of *WH* which the earlier reviewers could not ignore become more acceptable and, consequently, the novel is more highly thought of than before.

A. Mary F. Robinson, who wrote the first full-length biography of EB, is also interested in her religious background as well as the biographical facts. She regards EB as a kind of dissenter, partaking of some of the stern doctrine of Calvinism. There is even a pessimistic tone of Darwinism in her assessment of EB: 'Terrible theories of doomed incurable sin and predestined loss warned her that an evil stock will only beget contamination'.¹⁹⁴⁾ It is 'the theories of life and evil' that generated *WH*. She searches for the origins of *WH* in the biography of EB and concludes that four elements helped to construct the novel: 'the neighbourhood of her home, the character of her disposition, the quality of the experience' and 'her acquaintance with German literature'.¹⁹⁵⁾ The quest for the genesis of *WH* in conditioning factors of personality and environment becomes a popular approach in the following decade.

On the other hand, *WH* is highly praised as a perfect poem embodying the spirit of romanticism. Swinburne admires the novel as a pure work of art. He appreciates the 'passionate and lifelike beauty of imaginative truth' and considers that 'any seeming confusion or incoherence...is merely external and accidental, not inward and spiritual'.¹⁹⁶⁾ He refutes 'the savage note or the sickly symptom of a morbid ferocity'¹⁹⁷⁾ which is attacked by many critics, and asserts that:

...the pervading atmosphere of the book is so high and healthy that the effect even of those 'vivid and fearful scenes'...is almost at once neutralized...sweetened, dispersed, and transfigured--by the general impression of noble purity and passionate straightforwardness...¹⁹⁸⁾

He is enthralled with the work of a writer 'whose genius is essentially tragic'¹⁹⁹⁾ and enthusiastic about the power of destructive love described in the novel :

The love which devours life itself, which devastates the present and desolates the future with unquenchable and raging fire, has nothing less pure in it than flame or sunlight.²⁰⁰⁾

It is worth noting that what is 'a kind of baseless nightmare' for Leslie Stephen turns out to be 'the splendour of lightning or the roll of a gathered wave'²⁰¹⁾ for Swinburne. Although both of them see the same thing their assessments are contrary. This diversity of opinions again points to differing criteria in the literary background. In the 1880s, critics began to attack the excessive realism of Henry James,²⁰²⁾ and the revival of romance also helped to enhance the romantic tendency in the literary climate.

Walter Pater also admired *WH* as a typical example of 'the spirit of romanticism'.²⁰³⁾ Obviously, aestheticism welcomes a novel without any specific moral purpose.

Yet, there are still different opinions : Mrs. Oliphant judges that '*WH* in very painfulness and horror made an impression...greater perhaps than its merits justify'.²⁰⁴⁾ This is contrary to the view of Swinburne : 'As an author she [EB] has not perhaps even yet received her full due or taken her final place'.²⁰⁵⁾ Interestingly, female writers such as Robinson and Oliphant are less enthusiastic about *WH* than some of their male counterparts. Robinson seems to be more sympathetic to EB than to her novel. Her life is another work of art representing a 'heroic character' with patience, courage and unselfishness.²⁰⁶⁾ Robinson explains her purpose :

The spectacles of temperament colour the world very differently for each beholder ; and, to understand the vision, we too should for a moment look through the seer's glass. To gain some such transient glance, to gain and give some such momentary insight into the character of EB, has been the

aim I have tried to make in this book.²⁰⁷⁾

Obviously, the presupposition of 'realism' based on facts is collapsing. Robinson is fascinated not only with 'the high noble character of EB'²⁰⁸⁾ but also with her tragic death:

She died, before a single word of worthy praise had reached her. She died with her work misunderstood and neglected. And yet not unhappy.²⁰⁹⁾

EB's life as a remarkable woman is more coherent and accessible than her novel. The strong interest in her biography generated a kind of legend in the 1870s.²¹⁰⁾ Robinson tries to illustrate what EB was like: 'Would that I could show her as she was!'²¹¹⁾ and to elucidate the origin of *WH*, which forms one of the main approaches hereafter.

In the 1890s, as the interest in the biographical background increases, the quest for the origin of EB's creativity is enthusiastically pursued. I have examined twelve books and articles,²¹²⁾ many of which are focused on her personal details and the environmental influence on her works. The discrepancy between her life and art continues to obsess the critics. Because of the scarcity of clues, the attempt to elucidate the mystery of creation assumes the nature of thrilling detective games. A. M. Williams ascribes the secret to the power of nature and of her father.²¹³⁾ Butler Wood also regards the influence of 'fierce and relentless powers of nature' as essential.²¹⁴⁾ William Wright suggests that the history of Patrick Brontë's ancestors provided the material for *WH*.²¹⁵⁾

The mysterious character of EB greatly attracts the critics: Arthur L. Salmon emphasises her stoicism,²¹⁶⁾ A. M. Williams admires 'the unbending firmness of her soul...the brave, strong spirit',²¹⁷⁾ and Clement Shorter is fascinated with 'her brief enigmatical life',²¹⁸⁾ calling her 'the sphinx of our modern literature'.²¹⁹⁾ Her life is seen as profoundly tragic and her premature death as a great loss to English literature.²²⁰⁾

Along with EB's increasing reputation as a tragic genius, the appreciation of *WH* surpasses that of her poems.²²¹⁾ Her power of creating characters is now praised,²²²⁾ and the character of Heathcliff, which often had been attacked, is regarded as heroic: 'Heathcliff is one of the most

vivid creations in all literature, he fascinates the imagination...'²²³⁾ Mackay is deeply impressed with the dramatic power of *WH* and dares to call EB 'Shakespeare's youngest sister', finding in *WH* 'the pathos of King Lear' and 'the tragic force of Macbeth'.²²⁴⁾

On the other hand, some critics still see the novel in negative terms: 'Vernon Lee' points out 'a fault of construction',²²⁵⁾ Frederic Harrison shows the same reaction as Leslie Stephen: 'a nightmare' and 'gruesome phantasmagoria...merely a grisly dream, not a novel at all'.²²⁶⁾ George Saintsbury considers that 'the thing is on the whole rather too unearthly' in spite of 'the intense reality' of the scenery and characters. Besides, 'there are many other technical drawbacks'. Therefore, he concludes:

If *WH* had stood alone it would have continued to be more or less alone—a kind of 'sport'...in the mid-nineteenth century...a wonderful and isolated tour-de-force very unlikely to be in any way germinal, to found a school, and still more unlikely to revolutionise or at least herald the revolutionising of the novel generally.²²⁷⁾

His belief that 'the novel is, while the poems is not, mainly and firstly a criticism of life'²²⁸⁾ must have determined his reaction to *WH*.

Behind this quest for the genesis of *WH*, there probably lies the growing interest in psychology or the mysterious aspects of the human mind. *Dr. Jekyll and Hyde* (1886) and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) explore the terrifying gap between appearance and reality in man. A series of Sherlock Holmes stories (1887–) also reveal the dark and secret side of the human mind. Obviously, the attention of the reading public is turning inward, rather than to the outer physical world which probably helps to create a sympathetic reception of *WH*.

Reading the criticisms in the 1880s and 1890s, we cannot but realise how influential CB's preface has been for many decades. Her presentation of EB as a Romantic artist driven by the power of imagination had constructed an image of poetic genius. The biographical details provided by CB, especially her enigmatic character and tragic death, are repeatedly referred to, supplemented with some fragmentary information,²²⁹⁾ and these continue to attract the attention of the public. If her novel had

offended Victorian standard of propriety, her naivety and stoicism produced admiration of a remarkable woman with a rare fortitude. Many of the articles show that CB's vindication provides the keynote in assessing EB's life and work.

However, a new trend seems to begin when Swinburne praises *WH* as a 'essentially and definitely a poem in the fullest and most positive sense of the term'.²³⁰⁾ He emphasises its perfection as a work of art, greater than CB's novels.²³¹⁾ EB as an artist begins to replace CB at this stage.²³²⁾ As fiction begins to acquire the status of an autonomous art form--'To the England of our own time...the novel is what the drama was to the England of Shakespeare's'²³³⁾--a literary climate favourable to *WH* is being prepared.

After the combination of growing enthusiasm and persistent attack, Mary Ward's introduction to the Haworth Edition indicates a new analytical approach to *WH*. She tries to place the novel in the mainstream of European literary tradition, because it 'has not even yet taken the place which rightly belongs to it'.²³⁴⁾ She traces the contemporary literary background which must have influenced the conception of the novel, and concludes that 'it holds a typical and representative place in European literature of the century',²³⁵⁾ opposing the idea of its isolated position in the tradition. She asserts that *WH* is 'book of the later Romantic movement' with 'the influences of Germanic Romantic imagination'.²³⁶⁾ She also praises the absence of the author and the autonomy of the novel as a work of art :

The artist remains hidden and self-contained ; the work...has always that distinction which belongs to high talent working solely for its own joy and satisfaction, with no thought of a spectator, or any aim but that of an ideal and imaginative whole.²³⁷⁾

As the moral and social function of fiction is dismissed, EB is regarded as an artist endowed with highest power of a Shakespeare or a Turgenev. Besides, Mrs. Ward emphasises the realistic power and sanity of *WH* , which makes a remarkable contrast to the majority of criticisms so far. Her revaluation shows that EB has finally replaced CB as an artist at the

end of the nineteenth century : 'the difference between them [CB and EB] is almost wholly in Emily's favour'.²³⁸⁾ Her systematic assessment can be regarded as one of the most important landmarks in the criticism of *WH* in the Victorian period.

Conclusion

WH has become something of a standard by which the taste--the aesthetic and climate of its period--has been judged.²³⁹⁾

Surveying the reviews and criticisms of *WH* for fifty three years, we cannot but realise how much the novel enraged and at the same time enthralled the reading public throughout the period. The reviews of *WH* underwent a dramatic change during the nineteenth century. What had been regarded repulsive and immoral when first published came to be appreciated as truthful and imaginative after fifty years. Three points continued to disturb the critics: how to interpret the character of Heathcliff, how to understand the absence of the authorial voice in the novel, and how to disentangle the complexity of the narrative technique. The last was still regarded as a defect at the turn of the century. Considering the way the novel challenged existing critical standards, it seems surprising that many of the earliest reviewers could appreciate its power and originality, even if most of them generally ended with a negative judgement. Yet, some of them even sympathised with it. The Romantic appreciation of *WH* intermittently appearing throughout the period indicates that an undercurrent of Romanticism lies in the literary climate, in spite of the prevailing preference for the realistic fiction.²⁴⁰⁾

On the other hand, the doctrine of realism repeatedly denounced *WH* as a 'dream' or 'nightmare'. Victorian preference for facts is demonstrated in the exhaustive search for the origin of the novel, accompanied by the growing enthusiasm for the biography of EB. In the preface and BN to the second edition, CB not only defended her sister against misunderstanding but also provided two important clues to the explication of EB: one is the image of a poetic genius inspired by a Romantic imagination, and the

other is a realistic, also tragic, life story. The life itself became an impressive Bildungsroman much favoured by the public. This is how each of the contradictory tendencies produced its own way to appreciate EB: a Romantic genius and a remarkable woman. The fact that the novel was written by a woman clearly came variously to affect its reception. The author's gender, once revealed by her sister a few years after the first publication, greatly influenced its evaluation. The critics seems to be disturbed by the discrepancy between the powerful originality and the female authorship of the novel and they tried to ascribe it to the isolated and restricted life or eccentricity of the inexperienced woman, probably because the prevailing theory was that 'only unhappy women wrote books'.²⁴¹⁾

One final point: these Victorian reviews and articles mainly focused on what was written in *WH* rather than how it was written. Examination of the contents in the novel was the central concern. We have to wait until the twentieth century for the forms and techniques of the novel to be extensively discussed.

WH undermined the stability and familiarity of actual life--this might be why it greatly disturbed and also deeply fascinated its Victorian readers.

〈List of Abbreviations〉

1. Book names.

WH *Wutheing Heights*

JE *Jane Eyre*

AG *Agnes Gray*

TWH *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*

BN 'Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell'

CH *The Brontës: The Critical Heritage*, Edited by Miriam Allott,
Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

BST *Brontë Society Transactions*

2. Person names.

EB Emily Brontë

CB Charlotte Brontë

AB Anne Brontë

<Notes>

- 1) These are, listed in chronological order, as follows:
Spectator, 18 December 1847, *CH*, pp.217-8.
Athenaeum, 25 December 1847, *CH*, pp.218-9.
Examiner, January 1848, *CH*, pp.220-2.
Britannia, 15 January 1848, *CH*, pp.223-6.
Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper, 15 January 1848, *CH*, pp.227-8.
Economist, 29 January 1848, p.126.
New Monthly Magazine, January 1848, *CH*, p.229.
Atlas, 22 January 1848, *CH*, pp.230-3.
Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, February 1848, Casebook Series, p.45.
Unidentified, c. 1847, *CH*, pp.243-4.
Quarterly Review, December 1848 (Elizabeth Rigby's review of *JE*) *CH*, p.111.
- 2) *Athenaeum* (*CH*, p.218), *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.227).
- 3) *Athenaeum* (*CH*, p.218), *Examiner* (*CH*, p.220), *Britannia* (*CH*, p.224, p.225, p.226), *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.228, twice), *Atlas* (*CH*, p.230, p.232).
- 4) *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.228), *Tait's Edinburgh* (The Casebook, p.45).
- 5) *Britannia* (*CH*, p.224, twice).
- 6) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.217), *Atlas* (*CH*, p.232).
- 7) *Britannia* (*CH*, p.226).
- 8) *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.227).
- 9) *Atlas* (*CH*, p.230).
- 10) *Britannia* (*CH*, p.224).
- 11) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.218), *Britannia* (*CH*, p.225), Unidentified (*CH*, p.243).
- 12) *Britannia* (*CH*, p.226), *Atlas* (*CH*, p.233).
- 13) *Britannia* (*CH*, p.223, p.224), *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.227).
- 14) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.217), *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.228).
- 15) *Athenaeum* (*CH*, p.218).
- 16) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.217).
- 17) *Atlas* (*CH*, p.231).
- 18) *Examiner* (*CH*, p.221).
- 19) *Atlas* (*CH*, p.231).
- 20) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.217).
- 21) *Douglas Jerrold's* (*CH*, p.228), *Economist* (29, Jan. 1848, p.126), Unidentified (*CH*, p.243).
- 22) Elaine Showalter, *A Literature of Their Own* (1977), p. 90.
- 23) *Spectator* (*CH*, p.217), *Examiner* (*CH*, p.220).
- 24) *Examiner* (*CH*, p.221), *Britannia* (*CH*, p.224).
- 25) *Examiner* (*CH*, p.221).
- 26) Kathleen Tillotson, *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (1954), p.13.

- 27) *Ibid*, p.5.
- 28) *Examiner* (CH, p.220), *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p.228), *Economist* (29, Jan. 1848, p.126).
- 29) *Athenaeum* (CH, p.218, p.219), *Atlas* (CH, p.231).
- 30) *Spectator* (CH, p.217), *Examiner* (CH, p.222).
- 31) *Spectator* (CH, p.217), *Athenaeum* (CH, p.218).
- 32) *Athenaeum* (CH, p.219), *Britannia* (CH, p.224).
- 33) *New Monthly* (CH, p.229), *Tait's Edinburgh* (The Casebook, p.45).
- 34) See Richard Stang, *The Theory of the Novel in England 1850-1870* (1959), p.65.
- 35) CH, p.225.
- 36) CH, p.222.
- 37) R. Stang, *op. cit*, p.160.
- 38) 39) CH, p.218.
- 40) *Examiner* (CH, p.220), *Atlas* (CH, p.231).
- 41) *Examiner* (CH, p.220, p.221).
- 42) *Examiner* (CH, p.221).
- 43) C. P. Sanger, *The Structure of WH* (1926).
- 44) Stang, *op. cit*, p. 68.
- 45) *Spectator* (CH, p.217), *Athenaeum* (CH, p.219), *Britannia* (CH, p.226), *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p.227), *New Monthly* (CH, p.229), *Atlas* (CH, pp. 232-3).
- 46) *Spectator* (CH, p.217), *Examiner* (CH, p.221), *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p. 228).
- 47) Michael Wheeler, *English Fiction of the Victorian Period 1830-1890* (1985), p.9.
- 48) *Tait's Edinburgh* (The Casebook, p.45).
- 49) *Britannia* (CH, p.225), cf. *Examiner* (CH, p.221) and *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p.228) have a similar comment.
- 50) CH, p.225.
- 51) See *Britannia*, (CH, p.225) and *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p.228).
- 52) CH, p.228.
- 53) *Atlas* (CH, p.233).
- 54) Unidentified (CH, p.243).
- 55) *Britannia* (CH, p.225, p.226).
- 56) *Douglas Jerrold's* (CH, p.228).
- 57) *Examiner* (CH, p.220).
- 58) *Britannia* (CH, p.223).
- 59) *Tait's Edinburgh* (Casebook, p.45).
- 60) *Britannia* (CH, p.224), *Atlas* (CH, p.232).
- 61) Stang, *op. cit*, p.51.
- 62) John Hewish, *Emily Brontë* (Macmillan, 1969), p.160.

- 63) *CH*, pp.227-283.
- 64) E. Weir, 'Contemporary Reviews of the First Brontë Novels' (*BST*, 1947, p.89).
- 65) *BN* to the 2nd edition of *WH*.
- 66)67) *CH*, p.279.
- 68)69) *CH*, p.280.
- 70) *CH*, p.278.
- 71) *CH*, p.279.
- 72) *CH*, p.279, p.280, p.281.
- 73) *CH*, p.280.
- 74) *BN* (*WH*, ed. by Hilda Marsden & Ian Jack, Oxford U. P., 1976, p.436).
- 75) cf. Showalter, *op. cit.*, p.76.
- 76) Gilbert & Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic* (Yale Univ. P.1979) p.65.
- 77) Showalter, *op. cit.*, pp.61-2.
- 78) *BN* (*op. cit.*, 6.436, p.440).
- 79) *CH*, p.286.
- 80) *CH*, p.287.
- 81) *CH*, p.285.
- 82)83) *BN* (*op. cit.*, p.440).
- 84) *CH*, p.287.
- 85) The association with a Romantic artist is made by *Britannia* (*CH*, pp.223-6) and Dobell (*CH*, pp.279-80). The image of 'a sculptor' is presented by *Britannia* (*CH*, p.226) and the word 'colossal' is used in *Atlas* (*CH*, p.233).
- 86) These are, listed in chronological order, as follows :
Examiner, 21 December, 1850 (*CH*, pp.288-91).
 G. H. Lewes (*Leader*) 28 December, 1850 (*CH*, p.291-3).
Athenaeum, 28 December, 1850 (*CH*, pp.294-5).
Economist, 4 January, 1851, p.5.
Eclectic Review, February, 1851 (*CH*, pp.296-8).
 D. C. Rossetti (a letter) 1854 (*CH*, p.300).
Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, 1855, p.421.
 Harriet Martineau (*Daily News*) April, 1855 (*CH*, p.303).
 Matthew Arnold, 'Haworth Churchyard' (*Fraser's*) May, 1855 (*CH*, pp.306-10).
 James Smetham, Jan. 1856 (*Letters of J. Smetham*, Macmillan, 1891, pp.65-8).
 W. P. P., *Jottings on Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell*, March 1856, pp.39-40.
 Peter Bayne, *Essays in Biography and Criticism*, 1857 (*CH*, p.321-6).
- 87) *CH*, p.296. A similar discussion is found in *Atlas* in 1848.
- 88) Showalter, *op. cit.*, pp.90-1.
- 89) Inga-Stina Ewbank, *Their Proper Sphere* (Edward Arnold, 1966) p.41.

- 90) CH, p.218.
- 91)92) CH, p.295.
- 93) cf. Carol Ohmann, 'Emily Brontë in the Hands of Male Critics' *College English*, 1971, pp.706-13.
- 94) CH, p.292.
- 95) CH, p.323.
- 96) Ewbank, *op. cit.*, p.39.
- 97) CH, p.292.
- 98) Lewes, CH, pp.292-3. Bayne, CH, pp.321-3. *Eclectic Review*, CH, p.298.
- 99) CH, p.300.
- 100) CH, p.292.
- 101) CH, p.298.
- 102) Lewes, CH, p.292.
- 103) Martineau, CH, p.303.
- 104) *Eclectic Review*, CH, p.297.
- 105) Bayne, CH, p.322.
- 106) *Tait's Edinburgh* (XXII, 1855, p.421) and Bayne (CH, p.321).
- 107) Lewes, CH, p.292.
- 108) CH, p.326.
- 109)110)111) Bayne, CH, p.325.
- 112) Kenneth Graham, *English Criticism of the Novel 1865-1900* (Oxford, 1965) p.77.
- 113) CH, p.324.
- 114)115) CH, p.325.
- 116) 'The Natural History of German Life', *Westminster Rev.* (1856) p.54, cited in Graham, *op. cit.*, p.4.
- 117) CH, p.293.
- 118) I have examined five reviews and a letter pulished or written from 1857 to 1859. These are, listed in chronological order, as follows :
 G. H. Lewes (letter) April, 1857, CH, p.329-30.
 John Skelton (*Fraser's Magazine*) May, 1857, CH, p.331-42.
 W. C. Roscoe (*National Review*) June, 1857, CH, pp.346-57.
 E. S. Dallas (*Blackwood's Magazine*) July, 1857, CH, p.358-63.
Christian Remembrancer, July, 1857, CH, p.364-71.
 V. H. Hobart (*Fraser's Magazine*) July, 1859, Repr. in *Essays and Miscellaneous Writings*. 1885, vol. I, pp.262-3.
 In addition, there are two foreign reviews (one French and one American) published in 1857, which will be discussed later in this part.
 Émile Montégut (*Revue des deux mondes*) July, 1857, CH, pp.372-8.
 Margaret Sweat (*North American Review*) Oct. 1857, CH, pp.379-85.
- 119) Ewbank, *op. cit.*, p.47.
- 120) Stang, *op. cit.*, p.150.

- 121) Skelton, *CH*, p.336. Roscoe, *CH*, p.348.
Dallas, *CH*, p.361. *Christian Remembrancer*, *CH*, p.366.
- 122) Dallas, *CH*, p.361.
- 123) John Reed, *Victorian Conventions* (Ohio Univ. P.1979) p.171.
- 124) *Ibid.*, p.156.
- 125) *CH*, p.336.
- 126) *CH*, p.348.
- 127) *CH*, p.361.
- 128) Dallas, 'enigmatical' *CH*, p.359. *Christian Remembrancer*, 'an enigma' *CH*, p.366.
- 129) *CH*, p.367.
- 130) *CH*, p.337.
- 131) *CH*, p.361.
- 132) *CH*, p.337.
- 133) *CH*, p.349.
- 134) Hobart, *Essays and Miscellaneous Writings*, vol I, p.263.
- 135) *CH*, p.338.
- 136) *CH*, p.349.
- 137) Stang, *op. cit.*, p.221.
- 138) *CH*, pp.368-9.
- 139) *CH*, p.336.
- 140) *CH*, p.348.
- 141) *CH*, p.376.
- 142) *CH*, p.377.
- 143) 'A living author is known to the world by his works only, or, if not so, it is with his works alone the public are concerned...' (*CH*, p.346).
- 143) *Halifax Guardian*, 15 June, 1867, rpr. in *BST*, 1927, pp.98-9. *Pictures of the Past*, 1879, p.80.
- 144) Tillotson, *op. cit.*, p.55.
- 145) Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p.92, p.94.
- 146) *Ibid.*, p.93.
- 147) These are, listed in chronological order, as follows:
Galaxy, 'The life and writings of EB', Feb 1873, *CH*, pp.392-6.
George Barnett Smith, *Cornhill Magazine*, 'The Brontës', July 1873, pp.54-71.
Thomas Wemyss Reid, *CB*, *A Monograph*, 1877, *CH*, pp.397-403.
Algernon Charles Swinburne, *CB*, *A Note*, May 1877, *CH*, pp.404-12.
Leslie Stephen, *Cornhill Magazine*, Dec 1877, *CH*, pp.413-23.
William H. Davenport Adams, *Stories of the Lives Women*, 1877, pp.280-1.
Millicent Garrett Fawcett, *The Mother's Companion*, 1877, p.105.
William H. Davenport Adams, *Women of Fashion and Representative*

Women in Letters and Society : A Series of Biographical and Critical Studies, in 2 vols, 1877, vill. II, p.314.

Francis H. Grundy, *Pictures of the Past*, 1879, p.80.

Athenaeum, 3 May, 1879, p.563.

- 148) Other reviews and articles in the 70s (and most of the 80s) discuss mainly CB and supplementarily EB.

149) 150) 151) 152) *CH*, p.393.

153) *CH*, p.392.

154) 155) *CH*, p.349.

156) *CH*, p.398.

157) 159) *CH*, p.399.

158) 160) 163) *CH*, p.401.

161) 162) 164) 165) *CH*, p.400.

166) Graham, *op. cit.*, p.103.

167) *CH*, p.411.

168) *CH*, p.412.

169) Graham, *op. cit.*, p.31.

- 170) Smith uses the words, 'fearful', 'unpleasant' and 'repellent', (*Cornhill Mag.* July, 1873, p.65).

Reid uses the words 'repulsive', 'ghastly', 'horrible' and 'mental or moral deformities' (*CH*, p.399).

Adams says 'not...pleasant' (*Stories of the Lives of Noble Women*, pp.280-1).

171) Smith, *op. cit.*, p.68.

172) Adams, *op. cit.*, pp.280-1.

173) Reid, *CH*, p.402.

174) Smith, *op. cit.*, p.65.

175) *CH*, p.401.

176) Adams, *op. cit.*, p.281.

177) *CH*, p.421.

178) Stang, *op. cit.*, p.76.

179) *Ibid*, p.79.

180) *CH*, p.402.

181) Fawcett, *op. cit.*, p.105.

182) 3 May, 1879, p.563.

- 183) Reid, 'From what unfathomed recesses of her intellect did this shy, nervous, untrained girl produce such characters as those which hold the foremost place in her story?' (*CH*, p.400)

Adams, 'It must always remain a psychological problem how a woman who mixed so little with the outer world, knew so little of the darker aspects and more complex relations of social life, could imagine such a character as Heathcliff, and present it with so startling a distinctness.'

- (*op. cit.*, pp.280-1)
- 184) Peter Bayne, *Two Great Englishwomen : Mrs Browning and CB*, 1881, *CH*, p.423-30.
 Mary Robinson, *Emily Brontë*, 1883.
 Algernon Charles Swinburne, *Athenaeum*, June 1883, *CH*, pp.438-444.
 Margaret Oliphant, *Blackwood's Magazine*, Jan. 1887, p.758.
 Walter Pater, 'Postscript' to *Appreciations*, 1889, *CH*, pp.445.
- 185) *CH*, p.424.
 186) *CH*, p.426.
 187) pp.1-14.
 188) *CH*, pp.426-7.
 189) Graham, *op. cit.*, p.8.
 190) *CH*, p.428.
 191) Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p.157.
 192) *CH*, p.322.
 193) *CH*, p.427
 194) Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp.158-9.
 195) *Ibid.*, p.165.
 196) *CH*, p.441.
 197) 198) 200) 201) *CH*, p.443.
 199) *CH*, p.440.
 202) Graham, *op. cit.*, pp.49-56.
 203) *CH*, p.445.
 204) *Blackwood's Magazine*, Jan. 1887, p.758.
 205) *CH*, p.442.
 206) 209) Robinson, *op. cit.*, p.6.
 207) 208) *Ibid.*, p.5.
 210) *CH*, p.42.
 211) Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp.6-7.
 212) Arthur L. Salmon, 'A Modern Stoic : Emily Brontë', *Poet-Lore*, Feb. 1892, pp.64-70.
 A. Malcolm Williams, 'Emily Brontë', *Temple Bar Magazine*, July 1893, pp.431-9.
 William Wright, *The Brontës in Ireland*, 1893.
 Frederika Macdonald, 'The Brontës at Brussels' *The Woman At Home*, July 1894, pp.279-91.
 Butler Wood, 'The Influence of the moorland on Charlotte and EB', 1894, rpr. *BST*, 1922, pp.79-87.
 'Vernon Lee', *Contemporary Review*, 1895, Casebook, p.93.
 Frederic Harrison, *Forum*, March 1895, rpr. in *Study in Early Victorian Literature* (1895), chp. 7 'CB', pp.146-62.
 Clement Shorter, *Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle*, 1896, chp. 6. Emily

- Jane Brontë, pp.144-80.
 Clement Shorter, 'Relics of Emily Brontë, *The Woman At Home*, Aug. 1897, pp.906-12.
 Angus Mackay, *Westminster Review*, Aug. 1898, *CH*, pp.446-7.
 George Saintsbury, 'The Position of the Brontës as Origins in the History of the English Novel', 1899, *BST*, pp.18-30.
 Mary Ward, Introduction to the Haworth Edition, 1899-1900, vol. V, pp. xi-xxxI.
- 213) Williams, *op. cit.*, pp.434-5.
 214) *BST* (1922) p.83.
 215) Wright, *op. cit.*, pp.15-44.
 216) Salmon, *op. cit.*, pp.63-70.
 217) Williams, *op. cit.*, p.438.
 218) Shorter, 'Relics of EB', p.906.
 219) Shorter, *CB, and Her Circle*, p.144.
 220) cf. Mackay, '...let us rather be grateful for the imperishable work with which she has enriched our literature, and cherish the careless preludes which show how great a poet was lost to the world when EB died.' (*CH*, p.447).
 Williams, '...when its author died our literature lost a novelist of great promise'. (*op. cit.*, p.438)
- 221) See Mackay (*CH*, p.446) and Shorter (*op. cit.*, pp.156-7).
 222) Williams, *op. cit.*, p.436.
 223) Mackay, *CH*, p.446.
 224) *CH*, pp.446-7.
 225) Casebook, p.93.
 226) Harrison, *op. cit.*, p.150, p.159.
 227) *BST* (1899) p.26.
 228) Graham, *op. cit.*, p.90.
 229) T. W. Reid made use of the letters which he had borrowed from Ellen Nussey. M. Robinson was also supplied with some information by E. Nussey. W. Wright excavated a story of the Brontë ancestors in Ireland which might have influenced *WH*. C. Shorter introduced EB's birthday journals in 'Relics of EB'.
- 230) *CH*, pp.439-40.
 231) *CH*, p.439.
 232) Some of the critics, however, still appreciate CB more highly than EB. See Bayne (*CH*, p.428) and Harrison (*op. cit.*, p.150).
 233) *CH*, p.438.
 234) Ward, *op. cit.*, p.xiii.
 235) *Ibid.*, p.xvii.
 236) *Ibid.*, p.xxv.

- 237) *Ibid.*, p.xxiv.
238) *Ibid.*, p.xxvii.
239) Hewish, *op. cit.*, p.160.
240) cf. *Britannia* (1848), Dobell (1850), CB (1850), G. H. Lewes (1850), D. G. Rossetti (1853), Swiburne (1883), Mackay (1898), Ward (1900).
The absence of this tendency from the late 1850s to 70s suggests that the climate was totally unfavourable to *WH*. In fact there is no criticism of the novel worth examining in the 60s, as far as I know.
241) Showalter, *op. cit.*, p.84.

(本稿の一部は 1996 年に第 68 回日本英文学会大会で研究発表したものである。)