



Title	Inventing the Author's Voice : The Rhetoric of an Autobiographical Novel in <i>Jude the Obscure</i>
Author(s)	Asahata, Noriko
Citation	Osaka Literary Review. 2010, 48, p. 1-23
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/25344
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Inventing the Author's Voice: The Rhetoric of an Autobiographical Novel in *Jude the Obscure*

Noriko Asahata

1.

If we call a story of a protagonist whose background shows remarkable similarities with the author's personal life an autobiographical novel, *Jude the Obscure* (1895) should be the first one among Thomas Hardy's fiction. When we seek correspondence in their lives, it would be easy for us to find an analogical relation between a story of Jude the protagonist and experience of young Hardy the author. Because of their certain similarities, in the introduction of the Penguin classics 1998 edition, Dennis Taylor practically cites some topics which correspond to Hardy's posthumous autobiography, so-called *Life*:

[T]he sense of the family decline, the portrait of young Hardy lying in the field with his straw hat, his early readings in the classics and his lists of books, his wish to enter the church but decision to be an apprentice Gothic architect, his purchase of Griesbach's Greek Testament, his Dick Whittington-like move to London, his decision against trying to enter Cambridge, his various character traits: his love of music, his romantic longing for the 'well-beloved', his desire to rise in the world, his responsiveness to suffering. (Taylor xxiii)

In order to see such analogical relation between the story of Jude and Hardy's autobiography more clearly, first of all, I will focus on one of these examples that Taylor refers to in the sentence "the portrait of young Hardy lying in the field with his straw

hat." In Hardy's autobiography, which was published under the name of his second wife Florence Emily Hardy and therefore Hardy disguisedly narrated his own life from the third-person point of view, the author of *Life* introduces a memorable sight when Hardy was a child:

He [Hardy] was lying on his back in the sun, thinking how useless he was, and covered his face with his straw hat. The sun's rays streamed through the interstices of the straw, the lining having disappeared. Reflecting on his experiences of the world so far as he had got, he came to the conclusion that he did not wish to grow up. (*Early Life* 19)

This vivid perception of the sun's ray through the interstices of the straw hat which is associated with Hardy's self-reflection on growing up could be traced in an episode of Jude's childhood:

Jude went out, and, feeling more than ever his existence to be an undemanded one, he lay down upon his back on a heap of litter near the pig-sty. The fog had by this time become more translucent, and the position of the sun could be seen through it. He pulled his straw hat over his face, and peered through the interstices of the plaiting at the white brightness, vaguely reflecting. Growing up brought responsibilities, he found. [...] If he could only prevent himself growing up! He did not want to be a man. (*Jude* 18)

Here, the moment of young Hardy's self-reflection as we have seen in *Life* is described in the same manner. And the pessimistic way of thinking unfamiliar to a young child impresses the readers with the similarity of both characters. This kind of identification of their personalities calls attention to an analogy between Jude's story and Hardy's history. In this sense, there is no wonder that some critics have been tempted to bring in other biographical materials in their interpretations of *Jude*.

One difficulty which we might confront at the time when we take Jude's story as autobiographical, however, is the fact that Hardy strongly denied such intention. In general, Hardy seemed to have a tendency to reject any interpretation to suggest the connection between his fictional characters and the author's personality. Especially in *Jude*, Hardy seemed to be irritated at the rumor that the life of Jude reflects the author's personal experience. In *Life*, the author refers to the widespread rumor about *Jude* among the critics, and even scorns "[s]ome paragraphists" who "knowingly assured the public that the book was an honest autobiography," and then declares that "the superstition still lingered" is not based on fact because "no book he had ever written contained less of his own life" (*Later Years* 44). Also, Hardy privately responded by a letter in 1919 to an inquiry from a critic who asks "if *Jude the Obscure* is autobiographical," which says "I have to answer that there is not a scrap of personal detail in it" (*Later Years* 196). His ambivalent attitude toward the autobiographical novel, which obscures the authorial intention involved in *Jude*, shows the difficulty of explaining the story only by means of its sources in Hardy's personal experience, whatever some biographical studies might contribute to understanding the rhetorical association between them.

This subtle but definitive detachment from biographical "sources" is the profound structure of *Jude*, as it is of many other Hardy's fiction. In *Distance and Desire*, J. Hillis Miller points out that the transference from the real to the fictive in all Hardy's works has a special attraction for critics. "In Hardy's case," Miller says, "in spite of his tendency to deny the connection of his stories with his own life or with people he had known, the relation between his fictional world and the real one is unusually close" (Miller 32). Nevertheless, "[h]e has transposed one reality, his own experience of life, into another no

less realm," that is, "the reality of a novel" (Miller 34, 35). According to Miller, "the ambiguities of fictional realism" has caused a problem in "the relation of a novel to its sources":

The relation of a novel to its sources is not that of a sign to a reference which is unequivocally factual, but that of one sign to another sign, one human meaning to another human meaning. [...] They [the facts of Hardy's life or of nineteenth-century European history] can only be interpreted in terms of other significances which are anterior to them, and those anterior ones to others more anterior still, so that a true beginning or source can never be reached. (Miller 36)

As Miller says, a "true" source in Hardy's personal life is transmuted and made timeless by being putting into his artistic world. The referential meanings in his fiction turn out to be a sign which indicates not an unknown scandal outside the narrative but an unsolved mystery inside the narrative.

In *Jude*, this kind of transmutation could be observed in Hardy's compositional device to invent a narrative voice of a fictional narrator, an authorial chronicler. Hardy describes himself as "a chronicler" who faithfully presents Jude's story, for example, in saying that "[t]he purpose of a chronicler of moods and deeds does not require him to express his personal views upon the grave controversy above given. That the twain [Jude and Sue] were happy — between their times of sadness — was indubitable" (*Jude* 288). Likewise, in the end of Jude's life, Hardy preserves the illusion of fictional realism in his narrative voice as "the chronicler," to say that "[t]he last pages to which the chronicler of these lives would ask the reader's attention are concerned with the scene in and out of Jude's bedroom when leafy summer came round again" (*Jude* 401). The rhetorical way of narrating from the viewpoint of a detached observer makes a distance from its practical sources in Hardy's own experience. But still,

the description of the narrator, or of a persona of the author, depends on a principle of mimetic representation in authentic reality as if it historically happened.

This paper puts its focus on the rhetoric of fictionalizing Hardy's personal experience, of depersonalizing his own consciousness, from the third-person point of view. As we have already seen, such an impersonal but authorial voice could be observed even in his autobiography *Life* as a supposed biographer, his second wife Emily. It may be possible to say that some episodes of *Jude* would have significant meanings in Hardy's personal experience outside the narrative, but at the same time, we might wonder why Hardy chose the narrative discourse which uses a third-person reference, a typical form of traditional authorial narration in the late Victorian age, rather than the confessional autobiographical mode. Interestingly enough, under his public persona as the author, Hardy creates a space to interweave his own consciousness with the performance of the narrator who has an impersonal but authorial narrative voice. All referential meanings in *Jude* are constitutive of the ambiguity between the author's intention and the narrator's speech-act.

Up to today, many critics have had a negative view on the use of an intrusive authorial voice in Hardy's fiction. They have criticized that his didactic tendency to intrude into the narrative is "bad" or somewhat "too much" because it often shows the author's logical incoherency, which spoils the illusion of the fictional reality. Such attack on the author's voice in fiction, which is fully illustrated by Wayne C. Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), has been dominant in critical climate, and also in the critical history of *Jude* that I shall refer to further. I will reconsider such critical climate and examine the function of the author's voice closely in *Jude*.

More importantly, there is another possibility in the function

of the author's voice. It requires a further discussion about the "conventional" way of narrating. In 1984, Booth himself confesses that his own reply to such attack on the author's voice was not satisfactory in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* because it stayed at the superficial level of compositional device. In his introduction of Mikhail Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Booth accepts his failure that "my own replies to such arguments were often almost as superficial as were those of my targets" because he had "never until recently, goaded by Bakhtin, ... confronted fully the possibility he raises of an ideology that 'knows neither the separate thought nor systemic unity' of any kind" (Booth xix, xxiv). Similarly, Miller holds the same attitude toward the works of Bakhtin, who "recognizes ... that dialogism is not necessarily a matter of the juxtaposition of blocks of language emanating from different irreconcilable points of view or ways of speaking, but that it may focus on a single word in a text" (Miller, *Reading Narrative* 121-22). Miller calls the ideological possibility of the narrative voice "radical polylogism":

It may happen as an effect of the human imaginative power to be, or to think of itself as being, someone other than itself and to speak for that other. "Radical polylogism" would mean the presence of an indefinite number of incompatible logoi in a text. By no effort of reduction could these be reduced back to the unity of a single point of view or of a single mind. These logoi would remain irreconcilable, heterogeneous, like flora and fauna. (Miller 121)

Taking both critics' suggestions into account, I insist that the function of the author's voice should not be treated as a mere superficial problem of compositional device, but rather the function would raise an ideological question whether the narrative voice reflects a single mind of the author, or the author's monological voice. It requires a further discussion on Hardy's general

"weakness" to make a logical contradiction in the authorial discourse, in David Lodge's words, the author "hedges his bets, equivocates, qualifies or contradicts his own authorial dicta, use tortuous formulae to avoid taking responsibility for authorial description and generalization" (Lodge 37-38).

In the following chapter, first of all, I will consider why Hardy took the authorial third-person point of view in his autobiographical novel, and secondly show how some critics have negated the existence of the author's voice. Then, I will reconsider to what degree the function of the author's voice works properly for Hardy's artistic aim "to tell, without a mincing of words, of a deadly war waged between flesh and spirit" (*Jude* Preface). The main objective of this paper is to explore the *Hardy-esque* narrative to weave his consciousness into the texture of the novel, and ultimately, to show how the possibility of the author's voice could be extended in the rhetoric of *Jude*.

2.

At the beginning of this paper, I have stressed the analogical relation of *Jude* to the author's biographical sources. In the 1895 preface of *Jude*, where Hardy explained the gradual development of the story that he had brooded over for about seven years, there is a remarkable sign to indicate an authentic account behind the story. In the preface, Hardy referred to the long-period conception that "[t]he scheme was jotted down in 1890, from notes made in 1887 and onwards, some of the circumstances being suggested by the death of a woman in the former year" (*Jude* Preface). The author's reality behind the novel, "the death of a woman in the former year", which had given significant influence over its further development, was mentioned cursorily in the preface; nevertheless, no other details of the incident to specify the woman's background followed. It does not help us reach a

"true" origin of the story, but the allusion in the preface leads to another realm of the fictional reality as if it historically happened.

Hardy gave away little extra-textual information about "a woman" other than to say that its genesis was the combination of the memory of a woman who died in 1890. To some extent, however, we could trace the practical fact of what really happened in Hardy's life. *Life* contains one of the personal notes of "Observations on people and things" on 5 March, 1890, which makes an entry of the death of the woman:

In the train on the way to London. Wrote the first four or six lines of 'Not a line of her writing have I.' It was a curious instance of sympathetic telepathy. The woman whom I was thinking of — a cousin — was dying at the time, and I quite in ignorance of it. She died six days later. The remainder of the piece was not written till after her death.

(*Early Life* 293)

Judging from the date, this cousin who "was dying at the time" is supposed to be the woman who Hardy mentioned in the preface of *Jude*. The notes to the Penguin classics edition also confirm that this supposition has reached agreement among critics.

In the same way of the preface of *Jude*, this personal note leaves an allusion of the recent death of his cousin, which also leads us to Hardy's fictional realm. In this case, the note is related to the first line of his poem, "Not a line of her writing have I." The poem's official title is "Thoughts of Phena: At News of Her Death" contained in his *Wessex Poems and Other Verse* (1898). If we just take a glance at the content of the poem, it is enough for us to understand the speaker's special kind of feeling for the woman named "Phena" is more than cousinship in a general sense, or rather it implies a certain mutual affection, as Hardy felt "sympathetic telepathy" when she was dying.

Some biographical studies later on caused a great scandal about the relation of this cousin to Hardy. The first critic who exposed Hardy's love affair with "Phena" was Lois Deacon. Deacon tried to prove that "Phena" is Hardy's cousin Tryphena Sparks and they had been supposed to be married in those days, before the marriage with his first wife, by gathering her relatives' statements as evidence. About the provocative discussion after Deacon's exposure, Michael Millgate, one of the authoritative biographers of Hardy, scrutinizes the reliability of the scandalous assumption:

Tryphena at the age of sixteen was pretty, lively, and intelligent. She had a strong sense of fun, as surviving letters show, and exhibited both energy and determination in her subsequent career as schoolteacher and headmistress. The absence of her name from the pages of *Early Life* — in which so few of Hardy's family are mentioned — has in recent years been highlighted (rather than made good) by suggestions that she had a passionate love affair with Hardy during the summer of 1867 and bore him an illegitimate son in 1868, but did not marry him because they were in fact not cousins but uncle and niece. For none of these speculations is there any evidence capable of withstanding scholarly or even common-sensical scrutiny. (Millgate 105)

As Millgate doubts here, these assumptions — when their love affair begins and how it ends, whether they have an illegitimate son, and whether they commit incest — are still a guess that could hardly bear critical assessment. At least, we could notice the fact that Hardy had an intention to hide his relation with Tryphena in his lifetime probably because he thought it somewhat immoral, and therefore her name was deleted from the pages of his *Life*.

If we consider the fact that Hardy had continued to be

secretive about his private relation to his cousin, the reason why Hardy endangers himself by leaving these two allusions that I have mentioned above seems to be self-contradicting. Nevertheless, we could see that both allusions to the woman who died in 1890 are effective not merely in suggesting his personal experience behind the narrative but in giving a sense of authentic reality to his imaginative realm. As a matter of fact, they suggest the heroine Sue, who is a schoolteacher and Jude's cousin, is modeled on a real person Tryphena, but paradoxically, it also would be true that Hardy might swear Sue is not modeled on a real person but fictitious.

In this sense, the speech-act of a detached observer who narrates Hardy's hidden experience in public is by nature based on two different motivations. On the one hand, Hardy would feel an impulse to declare his personal feelings provoked by the fact of her death. On the other hand, however, he ought to avoid putting her into the object of public interest. Writhing in a double-bind, impersonality which is implicit in the use of the third-person point of view is appropriate for Hardy to weave his repressed personal feelings into the narrative texture of his writing.

Moreover, if the memory of the dead woman provokes Hardy's imagination, the excluded past from his "official" autobiography could be treated only in the fictive mode of "as if". In one sense, Hardy could not refer to the details of their love affair in historical time, and in another sense, he had no correspondences to the alternative future if they had not ended their relation in his young days. Needless to say, even though it seems to be possible to presume that to some degree *Jude* reflects Hardy's youthful love affair with his cousin, his relation to Tryphena did not follow the course of Jude's love for Sue. The autobiographical but unrealizable story of Hardy's own reminiscence might achieve "an effect of the human imaginative power to be, or to

think of itself as being, someone other than itself and to speak for that other."

As we have already seen, Hardy in fact stated that "there is not a scrap of personal detail" in *Jude*. This statement itself is based on a paradoxical intention. On the one hand, Hardy would need to take a precautionary measure to reject critics' inquiry into his hidden experience. On the other hand, however, his figurative detachment from historical time and space is the only way to release his repressed past through the act of storytelling. There are two contradictive forces in the rhetoric to fictionalize his memory: the one is a centrifugal force to exclude his relation to "the woman" from official registration under the pressure of social morality, and the other one is a centripetal force to confess his personal feeling to "the woman" against the repression of his moral consciousness. The position of an impersonal but authorial narrator becomes an arena for Hardy to struggle with these contradictive forces, which overlaps with his artistic aim "to tell, without a mincing of words, of a deadly war waged between flesh and spirit" in *Jude*.

3.

The rhetorical effect of the author's voice still remains arguable because the negative view on the narrative device has been dominate in the critical history of *Jude*. One of the targets of their attack was the insinuating voice which is echoed behind a nicknamed character Old Father Time, an adopted son by Jude and Sue. The child, who was born as a son between Jude and Arabella after their estrangement, is adopted into the family of Jude in the middle of Part fifth (the work is divided into six parts), and brings sudden destruction into their premarital happy days. Before Arabella's reappearance to claim the adoption, Jude and Sue had decided to live together without sexual relationship

because Sue insists that they should not justify their lust by means of marriage registration. The abrupt entrance of Arabella's son into the later part of the story, however, ruins their hope of lasting romantic relationship. Sue submits herself to accepting a sexual relationship with him, for Arabella's reappearance endangers Sue's firm resolution to hold Jude's platonic love. As a result of her pregnancy, hardships of increasing their children drives Old Father Time into his too hasty decision to kill all their other children and also himself for making his parents' burden less, and the story rapidly comes to the tragic destruction.

Partly because the ending of their marriage life was so provocative, most reviewers in those days strongly opposed to the author's moral attitude toward marriage system. They criticized the description of Old Father Time as a mouthpiece of the author, who seems to have a radical opinion against a sacred marriage. For example, an anonymous reviewer of the *Athenaeum*, on 23 November 1895, said that "that idiotic son of Jude who is brought on as a sort of chorus to accentuate his and Sue's misery, and who puts the finishing touch to their woes, seems quite gratuitously improbable being." Likewise, a critic Mrs. Oliphant spoke against the factitious treatment of the child in the *Blackwood's Magazine*, in January 1896: "[w]hat is the point of the allegory which Mr. Hardy intends us to read in the absurd little gnome, nicknamed Old Father Time, who is the offspring of the buxom country lass [Arabella], is a secondary subject upon which we have no light: but it is by the means of this strange creature that the difficulty is settled." In her question, "[d]oes Mr. Hardy think it is really a good way of disposing of the unfortunate progeny of such connection?", Mrs. Oliphant cast doubt upon the morality of the author's conclusion to bring miserable deaths of all Jude's children,

Such negative views on the author's voice had continued in the

critical climate of the next century. Several critics in the twentieth century began to pay their critical attention not only to the morality of the author but also to the technique of the narrative, but still in their perspective on its rhetorical aspect, most critics disregarded the treatment of Old Father Time. For example, in 1912 Lascelles Abercrombie regretted to say that it is the only fault of the novel:

[A]s a matter of technique, one can only be astonished as the way the mood which surrounds the whole story is concentrated into this formidable small boy, and by his means, inextricably woven into the narrative texture. Even so, however, this formal condensation of the mood is not enough to counteract the tremendous emphasis it takes from being so personified. The emphasis is too great for the form of the book as a whole to contain. (Abercrombie 127)

Following Abercrombie's consideration, David Cecil claimed in 1943 that the child represents a typical weakness of Hardy's all fiction:

The pale, sad child in the train is an effective, arresting symbol of the predicament of latter-day mankind, as conceived by Hardy. But he is only a symbol — I had almost said only a metaphor — not a human creature with an independent life of his own. [...] Little Father Time exists on the plane of allegory and can no more be transferred to the plane of objective reality. (Cecil 121)

As we see, both critics in the early part of the twentieth century insisted that Hardy failed to "dramatize" the personality of Old Father Time according to the Jamesian aesthetic, with the result that the "objective reality" of the novel was violated. Their negative views on the author's voice to exaggerate the allegorical aspect of Old Father Time have fixed the dominant opinions in the

critical history of *Jude*.

To some degree, we could agree with these critical attitudes toward both the "too great" emphasis of the personality of Old Father Time and the improbability of his allegorical existence. In fact, the child's appearance is overemphasized as "a boy with octogenarian face" (*Jude* 311) even though he is only "an intelligent age" (*Jude* 274: "about six years old" in manuscript), and the narrator exaggerates an ominous atmosphere around the child in saying that "[h]e was Age masquerading as Juvenility, and doing it so badly that his real self showed through crevices" (*Jude* 276).

Nevertheless, we should not ignore the fact that Hardy, on the other hand, makes his effort to keep mimetic representation of the "old child" in storytelling. Hardy tries to distinguish the narrator's discourse from the characters' discourses on the level of expression, and in direct speech of Old Father Time, Hardy exemplifies the particularity of the child's voice. Unlike the authorial discourse to emphasize his allegorical "octogenarian" appearance, the child's direct speech seems to show a general kind of childishness appropriate to his age. For example, at the first time when the child meets Jude and Sue, the timid boy answers their successive questions in his uncertain tongue such as "Never heerd on it" (*Jude* 280). Three years after living with Jude and Sue, the young child, who grew up to learn "the Wessex tongue quite naturally by now," replies to his real mother Arabella's question in saying that "You be the woman I thought wer my mother for a bit, till I found you wasn't" (*Jude* 311). In the most significant way, at the moment of his suicide by hanging, Old Father Time leaves "a piece of paper" "in the boy's hand" to explain the reason why he involves his two young brothers into the suicide, to say "*Done because we are too menny*" (*Jude* 336), which is an example of his illiteracy.

As we see, there are two kinds of contradictory discourses in

the way of describing Old Father Time. The first one is the author's indirect narration to emphasize the ominous mood of his appearance, and the other one is the character's direct speech to represent his innocent way of being. As Abercrombie points out, we could realize "the mood which surrounds the whole story is concentrated into this formidable small boy, and by his means, inextricably woven into the narrative texture." But, is it certain that each discourse is subordinated to a process of symbolization of "the predicament of latter-day mankind, as conceived by Hardy" as Cecil says? At least, one point we should ask is the reason why both Abercrombie and Cecil should reach the conclusion that "the emphasis is too great for the form of the book." Even if they are right, it still remains uncertain how the narrative diminishes Hardy's artistic attempt by leaving such a remarkable contradiction between the author's significant narration and the character's ignorant speech.

Opposed to these critical judgments, I doubt the logical contradiction in the narrative would be a mere weakness of Hardy's storytelling, for we could find that another kind of contradictive discourses between Arabella and Sue is associated with the former contradiction. Interestingly enough, the child looks exactly his age for Arabella's eyes. When Arabella meets her son again, who had lived with Arabella's parents in Australia, she looked him over "with an expression that was as good as saying, 'You are very much what I expected you to be,'" and she indifferently gave her son "a good meal, a little money, and, late as it was getting, dispatched him to Jude by the next train" (*Jude* 277). In her view, Old Father Time does not attract her attention to his aged face so much as the narrator emphasizes. On the contrary, at the first meeting with Arabella's son, Sue seems to be greatly shocked at the child's features, and "suddenly went away into the little sitting-room adjoining" (*Jude* 278). Sue's tremendous suffering

from her shock is provoked by her unconscious doubt of the child's parentage, even though she has already agreed to his adoption. At the moment, Sue shows her disturbance in crying "What Arabella says is true — true! I see you [Jude] in him! ... the other half of him is — she! And that's what I can't bear! But I ought to — I'll try to get used to it; yes, I ought!" (*Jude* 278). As opposed to Arabella's indifference, Sue's interest in the child's features is consistent with the "tremendous emphasis" which the narrator makes, and after overcoming her disturbance, Sue actually says that his aged face is "like the tragic mask of Malpometic" (*Jude* 280) in the same manner as the narrator does.

Because of these simultaneous contradictory discourses in the narrative, both in direct discourses of characters and in indirect narration of the narrator, the figure of Old Father Time belongs partially to a realistic world and partially to a fantastic realm. A visualization of such an old child becomes a difficult task for us not merely because we have never met such a figure in the external world but because we could not find any clue to unify each contradictory discourse in the narrative space. Without the unified control of the authorial narration, it is impossible to find a so-called objective description of the figure of Old Father Time in the story. To put it another way, the readers are mediated not by the authorial narrator's perception but through the relative impressions of characters including the narrator himself. The child is treated as an object not of the narrator's perception but of his penetration, which is consistent with Sue's and also inconsistent with Arabella's.

Although this inter-subjective description of Old Father Time would damage the verisimilitude of the novel somehow as some critics have been criticizing, it is still doubtful whether it becomes a technical failure of the author's narrative. As I have mentioned above, the contradiction between Arabella's and Sue's

attitude toward the old child has a vital function to indicate Sue's repressed distrust of Jude's fidelity. Let me take another example. On the spring fair at Kennetbridge, Sue and Arabella unexpectedly meet each other in front of the child. Regardless of Sue's restlessness, Arabella asks her whether he knows "I am his mother really", and at this point, Sue succeeds hiding her doubt of Jude's faithfulness in her response, in saying "No. He thinks there is some mystery about his parentage — that's all. Jude is going to tell him when he is a little older" (*Jude* 311). But soon after that, when Arabella repeats the unpleasant fact that the child is "My boy and Jude's," her provocative words drive the rational Sue, whose "eyes darted a spark", to cry "You needn't throw that in my face!" (*Jude* 313). Here again, no matter how she pretends her selflessness when she is indifferent to the past physical relationship between Arabella and Jude, which is no equivalent to the present spiritual connection between Sue and Jude, her doubt of Jude's fidelity persists in her self-deception, and it brings her into an opposition between selfish and selfless love for Jude.

The nagging anxiety about Jude's "weakness for women" (*Jude* 353) becomes Sue's unreasonable fear inspired by a threat of the existence of Arabella's son. In addition to this, her fear of the child works properly for bringing a greedy aspect of Jude's inconvenient past to light. In fact, Jude has an unpleasant story that he tainted his romantic love for Sue once before their marriage by succumbing to Arabella's seduction. In chapter eight of Part three, Jude feels hopeless about his love for Sue because she married Phillotson even though she seemed to be attracted to Jude. Out of his desperation, Jude gives in Arabella's invitation which suggests their reconciliation after separation. At the time when they unexpectedly meet again at an inn where Arabella works as a waitress, she invites Jude to go to the neighboring

town to avoid the eyes of others, and "they went on to the railway, and made the half-hour's journey to Aldbrickham, where they entered a third-rate inn near the station in time for a late supper" (*Jude* 184). This is the last sentence of chapter eight, and the next chapter begins with the following description of their early journeying back from "Aldbrickham" in "a third-class railway-carriage":

On the morrow between nine and half-past they were journeying back to Christminster, the only two occupants of a compartment in a third-class railway-carriage. Having, like Jude, made rather a hasty toilet to catch the train, Arabella looked a little frowsy, and her face was very far from possessing the animation which had characterized it at the bar the night before. (*Jude* 184)

Apparently, both descriptions of Jude's "hasty toilet" and Arabella's "frowsy" face suggest what happened last night between them. In the night, Jude seemed to have a sexual relationship with Arabella, which means a breaking of his personal faith with Sue. Across the gap between the chapters, this unpleasant reality of Jude who yields to his animal passion becomes invisible on the pages of the novel. His "deadly war waged between flesh and spirit," then, means his hidden sense of guilty during his happy days with Sue.

Hiding the episode which indicates their sexual relationship from the readers is a practical necessity for Hardy to keep moral decency under the pressure of strict censorship of magazine publication. This episode, however, seems to be precisely restored later on in the scene of Old Father Time's first entry. In chapter three of Part fifth, the narrator introduces Arabella's son, who is coming to "Aldrickham" in "the gloom of a third-class carriage":

In the down train that was timed to reach Aldbrickham station about ten o'clock the next evening, a small, pale child's

face could be seen in the gloom of a third-class carriage. He had large, frightened eyes, and wore a white woolen cravat, over which a key was suspended round his neck by a piece of common string: the key attracting attention by its occasional shine in the lamp-light. In the band of his hat his half-ticket was stuck. (*Jude* 276)

Here, the hidden episode of Jude's unpleasant reality is indicated in the first description of Arabella's son as if he comes to accuse Jude's past infidelity. The "key" suspended round the child's neck seems to be intended to attract the readers' attention, and the narrator continues to emphasize the ominous mood around the child in saying that "the solitary boy bearing the key and ticket ... seemed mutely to say: 'All laughing comes from misapprehension. Rightly looked at there is no laughable thing under the sun'." The last sentence, "there is no laughable thing under the sun," sounds like the biblical line of the *Ecclesiastes*, "there is no new thing under the sun" (*Ecclesiastes* I: 9), and some critics may criticize the formidable tone of the voice as the fact the author makes the child's inner voice his mouthpiece, for such expression is beyond a young child's knowledge. But here, we should not ignore the fact that the narrator claims not only the privileged insight into the interiority of the child but also the distance between the authorial norms and the character's norms, to make a speech tag as "seemed mutely to say" to affirm the existence of the narrator.

The interpolated tag which distinguishes the child's direct speech from the narrator's indirect discourse is consistent with the method of narration. When Old Father Time arrives at his destination late at night, a ticket collector notices that the child is unfittingly alone at the station. For the collector's eyes, the same as Arabella's case, the child looks exactly what he is expected to be from his age, and therefore the collector worries

about the child:

[...] with a meditative sense of the unfitness of things, asked him where he was going by himself at that time of night?

'Going to Spring Street,' said the little one impassively.

'Why, that's a long way from here; a'most out in the country; and the folks will be gone to bed.'

'I've got to go there.'

'You must have a fly for your box.'

'No. I must walk.'

'O well: you'd better leave your box here and send for it. There's a 'bus goes half-way, but you'll have to walk the rest.'

'I am not afraid.' (*Jude* 277)

Certainly, their dialogue shows how the collector treats him like a young child regardless of his unusual "octogenarian" face as the narrator emphasizes. His innocent behavior is also exemplified in the responses of his direct speech. Soon after that, however, the narrator makes a contradiction in his authorial discourses to emphasize an "impersonal" quality of the child, who is approaching Jude's residence on foot:

The child fell into a steady mechanical creep which had in it an impersonal quality — the movement of the wave, or of the breeze, or of the cloud. He followed his direction literally, without an inquiring gaze at anything. *It could have been seen* that the boy's ideas of life were different from those of the local boys. Children begin with detail, and learn up to the general; they begin with the contiguous, and gradually comprehend the universal. *The boy seemed to have begun* with the generals of life, and never to have concerned himself with the particular. (*Jude* 277-78, All italics mine)

Here again, two speech tags, "It could have been seen" and "The boy seemed to have begun," draw a distinction between the character's inner voice and the author's penetrative narration. As we have already seen in the contradiction between Arabella's and Sue's attitude toward Old Father Time, we confirm the fact that the child is treated as an object not of the narrator's objective perception but of his subjective penetration. And through the authorial penetration, the narrator succeeds in connecting his overt assertion of the fantastic or grotesque child with the following sequence of Sue's unreasonable shock.

The rhetorical purpose of the narrative is clarified in the last description of Old Father Time's face. The narrator tells about his dead face as if it shows cause and effect between Jude's hidden infidelity to Sue and the result of their marriage:

The boy's face expressed the whole tale of their situation. On that little shape had converged all the inauspiciousness and shadow which had darkened the first union of Jude, and all the accidents, mistakes, fears, errors of the last. He was their nodal point, their focus, their expression in a single term. (*Jude* 337)

In the last sentence, the narrator succeeds not only in exposing Jude's hidden past embedded in between the chapters but also in bringing Sue's another side of self-deception just before the readers. When she agrees to the adoption of Arabella's son, Sue shows her sympathy for the child to overcome her jealousy. Sue tells Jude that "[t]he cloud upon his young mind makes him so pathetic to me; I do hope to life it some day! And he loves me so" (*Jude* 299). After the sudden misery of her children, however, Sue casts off her compassion for the other woman's child and follows her maternal instinct to save only her own children. Sue comes to be selfish and says "[i]t was not unreasonable for him to die: it was part of his incurably sad nature, poor little

fellow! But then the others — my *own* children and yours!" (*Jude* 339, Italics as original).

The tragic last stage of their marriage life makes us understand that the existence of Old Father Time mirrors the unpleasant realities that they ought to confront. The disastrous consequence that the child makes forces them to see their ignorance of another "greedy" aspect in love. The function of Old Father Time in the story is subordinated to the author's intention to construct "a dreary war waged between flesh and spirit" in both Jude's and Sue's realities. The subjectivity of the child, however, is not violated by the author's voice because the child's direct speech does not become a surrogate of the author but rather an opposition to the authorial control over the narrative. As I have examined, Hardy makes an effort to distinguish the authorial norm and the child's norm at any time, and as a result the narrator's viewpoint itself includes one of the characters' multiple-viewpoints in the novel.

Considering the significant function of "the presence of an indefinite number of incompatible *logoi*" in the description of Old Father Time, it seems natural to conclude that the contradictions of discourses should not be treated as a mere failure of Hardy's story-telling but a trail of Hardy's struggle with irreconcilable reality. On the level of characters, the reality represents a "greedy" aspect of their love. On the level of the narrator, it represents a subjectivity of Old Father Time. On the level of the author himself, then, it represents the repression of social morality in the publishing world as well as his personal sense of morality as a novelist. As far as some biographical studies are concerned, it is possible to say that it would also mean his personal struggle with the past memory of Tryphena that he had regretted. Above all, the effect of the author's voice causes "radical polylogism" as its deviation from "the unity of a single point of view or of a

single mind." Without the rhetorical effect of the author's voice, Hardy's thematic aim "to tell, without a mincing of words, of a deadly war waged between flesh and spirit" could not have succeeded in *Jude*.

Works Cited

Abercrombie, Lascelles. *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Study*. London: Martin Secker, 1927.

Booth, Wayne C. Introduction. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. By Mikhail Bakhtin. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Oxford: Manchester UP, 1984. xiii-xxvii.

———. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1961.

Cecil, Lord David. *Hardy the Novelist: An Essay in Criticism*. London: Constable, 1943.

Clarke, Graham, ed. *Thomas Hardy: Critical Assessments* Vol. 1, 4. London: Helm Information, 1993.

Hardy, Florence Emily. *The Early Life of Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1928.

———. *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Hardy, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure*. 1895. Ed. Dennis Taylor. London: Penguin 1998.

Lodge, David. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Miller, J.Hillis. *Distance and Desire*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970.

———. *Reading Narrative*. Norman: Oklahoma UP, 1998.

Millgate, Michael. *Thomas Hardy: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.