

# 琉球大学学術リポジトリ

## Henry Esmond 中の Reproduction (再生/複製) と Genealogy (系図/血統)

メタデータ	言語: 出版者: 琉球大学教育学部 公開日: 2007-07-18 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 平良, 勝明, Taira, Katsuaki メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/1051">http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/1051</a>

# Henry Esmondの中のReproduction (再生／複製) とGenealogy (系図／血統)

平 良 勝 明

Henry Esmondの中ではreproductionというのは重要な概念であるが——例えば初版ではタイトルの二重化という物理的な現象によりauthorityのcomplication (複雑化) が生じている——このreproductionの概念をgenealogyという角度からHenry Esmondの history (歴史=story=フィクション) に当てはめてみると、そこにはcontinuity (連続性) と discontinuity (非連続性) との絶え間ない dialecticな関係の存在が確認できる。そしてそのdialecticはmale subject (主体) によるpublic sphere (公的空間/politics/national history) とprivate sphere (私的空間/family/private history=stasis) の二空間の隔絶、genealogyの分断、female subjectによるgenealogyのreproductionという一連の現象に見られる。

## Henry Esmond: Reproduction and Genealogy

Nineteenth century readers objected to Thackeray's *Henry Esmond* because of its sexual politics. George Eliot observed that "Esmond is the most uncomfortable book you can imagine. ... The hero is in love with the daughter all through the book, and marries the mother at the end."<sup>1</sup> Many twentieth-century critics have found inconsistencies and contradictions in the work. *Henry Esmond* has become an unhistoric narrative and, as it were, an "anti-history,"<sup>2</sup> in which the narrating subject is deconstructed, fact relativized, and order upset. Some recent critics, however, praise it as a product of Thackeray's vision to create a genuine historical space. According to Karen Chase, the family offers the ultimate possibility for continuous history in *Henry Esmond*, and Avrom Fleishman finds in Thackeray's detached narrative an emergent space that transcends the "empty" domain of history.<sup>3</sup> Since the elusive nature of *Henry Esmond* gives rise to such diverse interpretations of its historical aspect, I would like to focus on the issues of genealogy and reproduction as they pertain to the construction of history in *Henry Esmond*.

Thackeray's work marks the emergence of a new historical discourse of continuity, in which authority is granted to the masculine subject while the family is alienated from its reproduction. But what is the relation between the subject and genealogy? In order to answer that question I would like to look at Thackeray's original text. One of the curious features of the 1852 and 1853 printings of *Henry Esmond* is the problematic relationship between the author and the title and the text. The cause of this complication can partly be attributed to the duplicate nature of the title of the book. The two versions of the title do not exactly copy one another. One of them—which makes a sarcastic allusion to the eighteenth-century practice of authenticating fictitious autobiography—is entitled *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq.: A Colonel in The Service of Her Majesty Q. Anne Written by Himself* and the other *Esmond: A Story of Queen Anne's Reign*. While the latter is followed by Thackeray's name, which appears as "W.M. Thackeray, Author of 'Vanity Fair,' 'Pendennis,' &c.,"

the former is not. One way to distinguish them is to focus on the subject position each seems to create in the text. One title promises a story of public, political history narrated through the figure of Esmond, and the other suggests a history that was associated in the eighteenth century with autobiography or memoir. The history ascribed to Thackeray is expected to represent a man named Esmond who will be what Lukacs terms a “typical” character embodying “social trends and historical forces” and thus making the “great historical trends...tangible.”<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the autobiography or memoir that is purportedly written by Henry Esmond locates the individual subject above his historical milieu (after all, the narrating subject has to detach himself from the narrated subject, even though they are mere doppelgangers of each other, in order to say something about himself) and at the same time within history, for Henry Esmond must remain an active agent and cannot allow himself to be reduced to a “type,” to tell his own biography.

Because of the discrepancy between the two titles of the same text, the reader is disoriented as to how the textual content should be properly apprehended. The reader must first determine the accuracy of the titles: does one grant “authority” to the first title, i.e. , *Esmond: A Story of Queen Anne's Reign*, on account of its priority (after all, it appears on the first page), as well as its connection to Thackeray, whose authorship can probably be more easily substantiated? Or, after finishing the novel, should one choose the other title, *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq.: A Colonel in the Service of Her Majesty Q. Anne Written by Himself*, as more appropriate, for it is after all his autobiography? In other words, are first things inevitably more genuine and more authoritative, or is authority judged only after the content is examined, that is, after the act of reading? How about the claim to authorship? Thackeray merely inserts his name into a continuum of titles he has produced without clearly defining his relation to each title, while Henry Esmond asserts his authorship by incorporating his name as well as his own title, “Colonel,” in the title of the memoir. Then, what constitutes the entitlement to write? Is it a history of past fictional productions, a series which this text augments and continues, or the title which guarantees a discourse based on public experience? In any case, the one transforms the work into part of Thackeray's publication history, in which Thackeray deprives Esmond of his subjectivity and reduces him into a type, and the other into Henry Esmond's memoir, thus private history, in which the author Esmond makes the narrative contingent upon his own subjectivity and dominates the textual space.

The multiplication of the title therefore leads to the question of power, that of subject and object. For one thing, the clear connection of the author to the title and to the text is complicated and even ruptured. This severance between the three is related to the historical creation of the text. As a material object, the novel is a reproduction, implicated in the production of books. By the nineteenth century it has inextricably been involved in the consumer-supplier dialectic. As an intermediary to bridge the two existed Mudie's and other circulating libraries. The readers mainly consisted of the middle and upper-middle classes who were wealthy enough to subscribe to those libraries. The readers “expected, in some heavily mediated way...a ‘confirmation’ of his or her exclusive status. The three-volume borrower [Henry Esmond was issued as a tripartite edition]... tended to be engaged...by an experience of belonging, as to a family, a faith, or a people, grounded, of course, in the real experience

of belonging to Mudie's."<sup>5</sup> The moral standard associated with Mudie's was a kind that tended to reinforce the emerging cult of domesticity. Placed in this historical context, *Henry Esmond* seems firmly grounded in the middle-class ideology, particularly that of domesticity. In the economic matrix of author, publisher, and reader, however, the ultimate authority resided in the intermediary entity like Mudie's, because it generated the demand for the reading material while guaranteeing the quality that was fit for middle-class consumption.

Whereas the production of the text and the middle-class ideology is an important aspect of the tripartite economic matrix of author, publisher, and reader, I must mention the complications that arise from the text's status as a reproduction. In contrast to Walter Scott, who creates a historical effect by referring to the pre-existing discourse that is detached from him both in temporality and spatiality, Thackeray conceives of a narrative that is based on its material condition, i.e., how the actual text is presented to the reader. While Scott's works depend on their narrative strategy for the production of history, *Henry Esmond* heavily relies on the publication process for the realization of its discursive significations. Reproduction transforms the temporal lapse into a site of multifarious presence of otherwise absent objects by regenerating the historical past within the present moment. In the case of *Henry Esmond*, what is reproduced is not an actual object, but an abstract one: the historically specific appearance of the eighteenth-century narrative, transposed to a different temporality as well as contextuality by print technology. The discrepancy between the present and the past is made visible by an ontological operation in which a self-conscious use of typography accentuates the historical double meaning physically marked on the pages.

Precisely because the available technology makes it possible to recreate an object within a new historical context, both "history" and "authenticity" become slippery terms. Is the original object or appearance authentic, for the reason that it becomes an originary point for the narratives that follow? Or, is the claim to authenticity more appropriately assigned to the reproduction because of its ability to recuperate the lost object in the present? Or, does the very possibility of reproduction frustrate any search for an authentic object, because authenticity will be helplessly diluted in the infinite production of copies? In *Henry Esmond*, reproduction constantly threatens to undermine authenticity by transforming it to its opposite, for a copy of an original work—provided that the latter could ever be located—always implies an act of forgery. The reproduction of an earlier textual style in an attempt to partake of authenticity is doomed to fail, for no writing can escape from its historical specificity, and no writing can sever itself from its historical-situatedness.<sup>6</sup> It is true that the novel's fictionality makes forgery an inappropriate description of its reproductive process. But the multiplicity implied by reproduction contradicts the novel's pretension to be genuinely of the eighteenth-century, although the title tries to identify the text with that particular century. Indeed, by the very fact of its appearance in the nineteenth century, the reproduction is already marked by its difference. No matter how closely the reproduction resembles the "original," the originality of the simulacrum can never be more than a sign of indistinction, for a successful reproduction eliminates originality by producing a duplicate. When the reproduction tries to establish continuity by infinitely reducing the temporal discrepancy between the present and the past, it becomes devalored as its temporal inauthenticity obtrudes. Thus, in order to place the reproduction in a proper perspective, the difference between its claimed historical context and

the contemporary historical context must be recognized.

The question of reproduction is thus related to that of maintaining continuity and historical identity. In the narrative of *Henry Esmond*, this continuity manifests itself in the mode of legitimation, particularly through genealogy. Genealogical histories of *Henry Esmond* exhibit a desire for continuity that rejects the possibility of gaps and intrusions. The continuity in this context is always implicated in a struggle for the creation of a dominant ideology. As J.G.A. Pocock observed, it is a means of social definition that generates "legitimacy" through the inheritance of authority, thereby "successfully creating its own time" and consequently "ensuring that no future ever comes into existence." The desire for continuity is exclusive in that it tries to prevent the emergence of historical heterogeneity and, thus, the possibility of future, for the occurrence of future is contingent upon the discontinuity between now and later. It is this preoccupation with continuity and its ramifications that are transformed into diverse modes of historical representation in *Henry Esmond*. In other words, reproduction, in its biological sense, is collapsed with a narrative, rhetorical propagation-to perpetuate genealogy.

I would like to take up Chapter II as an example of genealogical writing in the novel. A representative figure is a woman whose biological status—she "had pretty well passed the age when ladies are accustomed to have children"<sup>a</sup>—necessitates that the name go to other branch of the family tree. In a sense, the name is a transferable property that is detached from biological reproduction:

'Tis known that the name of Esmond and the estate of Castlewood... came into possession of the present family through Dorothea, daughter and heiress of Edward, Earl and Marquis of Esmond, and Lord of Castlewood, which lady married... Henry Poyns, gent (21).

The emergence of Dorothea in the genealogical history does not occur until her son assumes her silenced name. In fact, the genealogy allows only the masculine agency to inscribe the family name into history as demonstrated in such sacrificial acts as giving up the family plate (22) or forsaking the entire estate for the "royal service" (24). Between Dorothea and Isabel the vicissitudes of the family are marked by acquisition and loss of titles and court offices (22, 26-27).

Esmond functions to sever each name from biographical markers and produce an effect so that the narrative becomes more detailed and, at the same time, more prosaic as the chapter progresses. Despite Esmond's effort to bring the family name and title to the private realm, however, the hierarchical relation between the individual episodes and a larger narrative that chronologically traces the reach of the family name, remains intact. In fact, the project of genealogy is to valorize the family name and to make it subsume the history of any individual inheritor of that name. The name does not exclusively belong to the terminal individual body but travels from one site in the genealogy to the next. Depending on the order of succession, an individual becomes just a temporal bearer of the name,

What, then, defines the connection between the name and the title that enable the continued history of the family and the masculine subject who happens to possess them? This issue is illuminated by the insertion of an illegitimate child into the genealogy. Henry Esmond was "no servant, though a dependant: no relative, though he bore the name and inherited the

blood of the house..." (19); in fact, he "had a father and no father: a nameless mother that had been brought to ruin, perhaps, by that very father who Harry could only acknowledge in secret and with a blush, and whom he could neither love nor revere" (70). Henry's curious status as illegitimate shows the limitation of genealogical history, which maintains purity through the incorporation of only genuine members—those produced as a result of marriage or kinship relations. It is dominated by an exclusive order that prescribes the "'propriety' of terms"<sup>9</sup> as it regulates the family as defined in relation to a public sphere. Genealogy grants a family name while emptying it out, splitting the name off not only from biology but also from the more symbolic aspects of aristocratic "blood."<sup>10</sup> Henry transgresses the boundary separating the aristocratic family from the rest of the world, because he is marked with a lack of historical record that will entitle him to a certain position in a social hierarchy. When a biological fact—Henry has a "father"—collides with the genealogical record, according to which Henry has "no father," therefore, the latter supersedes the former.

The tendency to exclude Henry Esmond from the proper family line on account of his supposed illegitimate status is attributable to the social hierarchy that is founded on the pre-established, clearly distinguished ranks/positions. Movement among ranks is possible, but this movement occurs in a linear advance through a series of distinct gradations. In such a sharply hierarchized social structure, difference is generated as a relational concept among ranks rather than within them. Because of his uncertain parentage, however, Henry exceeds the limit placed by one particular rank, and occupies a number of hierarchical sites. What his social transgression foregrounds is a dichotomy between an essential individual value determined by biological family history and another one constituted by existential performance. Since his birth does not take place as a consequence of an authenticated marriage, his existential worth collides with his biological value. Thus, his illegitimate status forces him to assume an ambivalent position that does not contribute to the production of family history while physically participating in the family. Frank Castlewood describes Henry Esmond's predicament when he remarks that "You are an Esmond, and you can't help your birth," but that marriage with Rachel is "impossible [because] we are of the oldest blood in England; we came in with the Conqueror" (224). The genealogical history, in its insistence to maintain the fiction of the family's pedigree dating back to the Conqueror, excludes Henry Esmond on the ground that he lost his claim to the aristocratic family circle at the time of his illegitimate birth.<sup>11</sup> In this context, genealogy is exactly what Foucault in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" says it is not, because the genealogy in *Henry Esmond*

go[es] back in time to restore an unbroken continuity that operates beyond the dispersion of forgotten things; its duty is... to demonstrate that the past actively exists in the present, that it continues secretly to animate the present, having imposed a predetermined form on all its vicissitudes.<sup>12</sup>

The continuation of the family history is tied to the preservation of the name, considered as a synchronic anchoring point, a concatenation of which constitutes a diachronic genealogy by erasing any deviations from the paradigmatic line. The threat that unsanctioned sexuality poses to the family is circumvented by debarring its products from history.

The recurrence of name and the constant reference to antiquity associated with genealogy are imagined to be somehow connected to heroic history by Henry Esmond:

What spectacle is more august than that of a great king in exile? Who is more worthy of respect than a brave man in misfortune? Mr. Addison has painted such a figure in his noble piece of *Cato*. But suppose fugitive Cato fuddling himself at a tavern with a wench on each knee, a dozen faithful and tipsy companions of defeat, and a landlord calling out for his bill; and the dignity of misfortune is straightway lost. The Historical Muse turns away shamefaced from the vulgar scene, and closes the door ... upon him and his pots and his pipes, and the tavern-chorus which he and his friends are singing (15).

According to the histories imagined here, the undignified/improper belongs to a private history. In contrast to a private history, there is a heroic history composed of such epic moments as "a great king in exile" or "a brave man in misfortune." The epic events of the heroic history derive their grandeur partly from the repetition of such events, in which each event is subsumed into a genealogy stretching into the infinite past. The "great king in exile" is analogous to the family name: its status as an authoritative construction of history is generated by its continuity with previous events of the same nature. Because of its repetitiveness, however, heroic history is resistant to difference. In other words, heroic history is anti-historical, for it creates historicity through the reproduction of archetypal events and figures. Joseph Addison writes a historical poem that is "harmonious and majestic, not familiar, or too near the vulgar truth" (255-56), or the Viscountess is "for dying like Mary, Queen of Scots" (57). For Addison, the heroic is based on the creation of a national poetics, in which "a humbler poet from the banks of the Isis may celebrate a victory and a conqueror of our nation, in whose triumphs every Briton has a share, and whose glory and genius contributes to every citizen's individual honour" (256). Subsuming the private under the national category, Addison extols the heroic as something transhistorical, and manages to generate a history that can be used to consolidate patriotism, because when heroism becomes reproducible it can easily be severed from its historical context. The heroic history in this sense flattens out temporal discontinuities, and synchronizes all the diachronic specificities.

At this juncture I can place heroic history and genealogy on the same plane. Both try to empower themselves as the only correct historical perspective, and in doing so both exclude other modes of comprehending history. When they monopolize historical discourse, impropriety or vulgarity is equated with illegitimacy, and regarded as a threat to the myth of unbroken continuity through time. What is improper is rejected because it cannot be regarded as authentic. Aberrancy is suppressed, as the author detaches himself from what is not sanctioned, in an attempt to create the illusion of an official history whose relation to the present is characterized by its lack of difference from it. But there is a seed of deconstructive move in the dominance of heroic and genealogical history when an opposing discourse of familiar history arises from the repressive narrative and tries to transgress the limit with its emphasis on the specificity of each bearer of a name or agent of an event.

In order more clearly to define the relation between the genealogical/heroic history and familiar history, I draw upon the monarchical plot. In the episodes connected to the plot, we find that continuity and succession are legitimated through two different discourses: one is a kind based on a semi-mystical religious cult and the other inspired by nationalism. These two discourses are also implicated in the issue of gender, subjectivity, and representation. The religious discourse of continuity is represented in the text as feminine. Continuity becomes an

object of faith rather than reason. Rachel Esmond, “being a simple-hearted woman, with but one rule of faith and right, never thought of swerving from her fidelity to the exiled family, or of recognizing any other sovereign but King James” (120), and, as a “stanch Jacobite,” she “would no more have thought of denying her king than her God” (304). Similarly, Viscountess views King James and his consort as saints-of whom she possesses “tokens” and “relics”- and believes in “the miracles wrought at [James’s] tomb, and had a hundred authentic stories of wondrous cures effected by the blessed king’s rosaries, the medals which he wore, the locks of his hair, or what not” (189). Such cultic adoration is often indistinguishable from sensuality: “Madame Beatrix was as frantic about the king as her elderly kinswoman: she wore his picture on her heart; she had a piece of his hair, she vowed he was the most injured, and gallant, and accomplished, and unfortunate, and beautiful of princes” (315). Interestingly enough, this strong sentiment toward the king is repeated within the domestic sphere when the Viscountess’ subjection is pledged to Castlewood, “Jove and supreme ruler... her lord, Harry’s patron, the good Viscount Castlewood. All wishes of his were laws with her” (72). The mirroring effected by the domestic sphere is transformed into the concept of continuity when the Viscountess asserts maternity as the basis of familial stability: “If evil should happen to my lord...his *successor* I trust will be found, and give you protection. Situated as I am, they will dare not wreak vengeance on me now” (63-64).

This confirmation of continuity by faith is linked to Catholicism through a discursive process incorporated in the text. The Jesuits constitute a family of brotherhood that depends for its propagation on discourse rather than sexuality. The size of the holy family depends on how people are persuaded by the “fiction” of “the glories of [its] order, of its martyrs and heroes, of its brethren converting the heathen by myriads, traversing the desert, facing the stake, ruling the courts and councils, or braving the tortures of kings” (38). While Catholicism seeks its historical foundation in divine authority, Henry Esmond unsettles the solid basis of Catholicism by valorizing secular politics, which he associates with masculinity: “Had I not best have joined the manly creed of Addison yonder, that scouts the old doctrine of right divine, that boldly declares that Parliament and people consecrate the sovereign, not bishops, nor genealogies, nor oils, nor coronations” (416). As the secular and the sacred clash, Catholicism is eventually feminized. By way of establishing a link between Catholicism and femininity, George Levine observes that “[w]omen, in Thackeray, are capable of believing, but we can see... that this is because they are barred from the knowledge available to men.”<sup>13</sup> Although the sacred and the secular elements are compatible in both Beatrix and the Viscountess, the generic woman in patriarchy can be compared to a priest, for both are marked by lack of worldliness. That is why they are so inept at political manipulations: “the prince’s affairs, being in the hands of priests and women, were conducted as priests and women will conduct them, artfully, cruelly, feebly, and to a certain bad issue” (193). However, their unsuccessful political scheme does not mean that they avoid politics; on the contrary, politics becomes a site of their struggle as they rely on the secrecy of plots and conspiracies to produce history. Beatrix, for example, has been

trying her freaks and jealousies, her wayward frolics and winning caresses, upon all that came within her reach; she set her women quarrelling in the nursery, and practised her eyes on the groom as she rode behind him on the pillion ... . She intrigued with each [of her

parents] secretly; and bestowed her fondness and withdrew it, plied them with tears, smiles, kisses, cajolements (133).

The Jesuits are also involved in generating political tactics to bring "nations on their knees to their sacred banner, the Cross" (272). Their strategy is to cause heterogeneity and, by taking advantage of destabilization, produce homogeneity. Catholicism makes division a foundation on which to build their universal family. Proselytization is a means for Catholicism to reproduce itself as a trans-national family, in which difference is abolished by dint of faith. This universalism advocated by the Jesuits is in a sense pre-nationalistic, because the concept is based on the removal of discontinuous territoriality, or what Benedict Anderson terms the "inherently limited and sovereign" nation.<sup>14</sup>

The formation of a universal family is reflected in feminine politics as an issue of family succession. As evidenced in Henry Esmond's remark, domestic order takes precedence over national order: "if Nero were to rise again, and be king of England, and a good family man, the ladies would pardon him" (121). In other words, Esmond hints that in feminized discourse continuity is literalized to mean an actual continuation of family history. The unbroken family line, as well as the harmonious domestic sphere, is represented not as a mirror image of the social order maintained by politics, but as the ultimate goal toward which all political intrigues should be directed. It does not imply that there is an insurmountable gap between the public and the domestic spheres, but simply that women emphasize the latter because of their overwhelming concern with the family line. In fact, both the husband and the king are similarly venerated and inserted into the same political discourse. Esmond perceives that national politics can stand as a metaphor for family politics:

When heads of families fall out, it must naturally be that their dependants were the one or the other party's colour; and even in the parliaments in the servants' hall or the stables, Harry, who had an early observant turn, could see which were my lord's adherents and which my lady's, and conjecture pretty shrewdly how their unlucky quarrel was debated. Our lackeys sit in judgement on us. My lord's intrigues may be ever so stealthily conducted, but his valet knows them; and my lady's woman carries her mistress's private history to the servants' scandal-market, and exchanges it against the secrets of other abigails. (135).

However, Esmond implicitly differentiates the two domains by his metaphorization, while connecting them through political discourse. This ambivalence is also manifested in the Castlewood family structure: "[Frank] had a small court, the sons of the huntsman and woodman, as became the heir-apparent, taking after the example of my lord his father" (118-19). Even in this pattern of homogeneity, heterogeneous elements inevitably make their presence felt.

While feminized discourse represented by Catholicism smooths over discontinuities and contradictions in its universalizing move—thus its inability to account for the difference between national politics and family politics—masculinized discourse thrives on discontinuities, because they are the site that grants genealogy an opportunity to demonstrate its power in secular politics. A good example is Esmond's strongly nationalistic remark: "It wounded our English pride to think, that a shabby High-Dutch duke, who could not speak a word of our language, and whom we chose to represent as a sort of German boor, feeding on train-oil and sauerkraut,...

should come to reign over the proudest and most polished people in the world" (269). This definite rupture in continuity is countered by the insertion of a figure who operates as a genealogically cohesive agent: "It seemed to [Esmond] that King James the Third was undoubtably King of England by right: and at his sister's death it would be better to have him than a foreigner over us" (315). Whereas feminized discourse turns the individual subject into an object of religious adoration, this masculinized discourse first registers a difference, delineated as a dichotomy between foreign and native, and then turns it into a genealogical site of contention between continuity and disruption. The opposition between faith and nationalism can be transposed to a different level where reality and fantasy clash. In feminized discourse, a mythological narrative is constantly threatened by the intrusion of reality: "Strephon and Chloe languish apart; join in a rapture: and presently you hear that Chloe is crying, and Strephon has broken his crook across her back" (116). While reality is represented as male violence in feminized discourse, it is figured as a danger from outside in masculinized discourse, and located in secular politics, i.e., a public sphere where continuity is generated not through inclusiveness/universalism but through exclusiveness/nationalism.

These two orders of continuity shed light on the diametrically opposed nature of feminine and masculine historical discourses. One derives the basis of monarchical succession from a transcendent right, and links it to the propagation of universalism under the aegis of the Catholic church. The other finds the authority of the exiled prince in the "subjective antiquity" of the English nation, in order to create an exclusively nationalist space marked by difference.<sup>15</sup> It is hard to decide which discourse takes precedence in Henry Esmond's history, particularly because the plot to bring the Pretender to the throne eventually fails. But the text can be inserted into the historical context of the eighteenth century when nationalism was emerging as the dominant form of political discourse. The sentiment Esmond expresses in the New World clearly demonstrates this point:

In England you can but belong to one party or t'other, and you take the house you live in with all its encumbrances, its retainers, its antique discomfords, and ruins even; you patch up, but you never build up anew. Will we of the New World submit much longer, even nominally, to this ancient British superstition? There are signs of the times which make me think that ere long we shall care as little about King George here, and peers temporal and peers spiritual, as we do for King Canute or the Druids (373).

Nationalism here marks America's split from the British Empire, generating a diverging territorial space in which uniquely American history is to be produced. In this context, the American Independence symbolizes the outcome of the opposition between the feminine and masculine political discourses. In other words, feminine political discourse, with its focus on belief, transcendent values, and universality, is taken over by masculine political discourse, which emphasizes nationalism with its implicit territorial boundaries. The feminized ideology of continuity is defeated because of its universalizing move to subsume separate nations under the banner of a single name. It is possible to find a homology between feminized discourse and the heroic history I mentioned above, for the latter too seeks to homogenize history by eliminating differences and rejecting the heterogeneous world. In the end, the difference both feminized discourse and heroic history try to suppress causes a rupture in historical continuity while it enables the masculine discourse to preserve genealogical history.

The differentiation between feminine and masculine discourses is also noted by Eve Sedgwick when he comments that "*Henry Esmond*... while it seems to dramatize a ...shift at the level of the transfer of power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie, actually ... grounds this apparent shift in a pre-existent division of power and roles between men and women, the structure and content of which are already those of the bourgeois nuclear family."<sup>16</sup> The transition from feminine to masculine political discourse represents a shift in focus from the public to the domestic sphere. It is at this juncture that the search for the implications of the name becomes significant.

The family name is a temporary possession the legitimate male child inherits from his father, and is not to be identified with the individual who happens to bear that name. This relation between the bearer and the name is illustrated as Beatrix explains to Esmond that it is not the name which represents the bearer, but the bearer who represents the name: "I would have made our name talked about. So would Graveairs [Esmond] here have made something out of our name if he had represented it" (341). The relation between the two is totally arbitrary as is implied in Beatrix's remark to Esmond after his legitimacy is revealed: "Oh, why didn't I know you before?" (369). That is, the name remains the same, but the signified that is contingent upon Esmond's legal status fluctuates. Genealogy, after all, implies family continuity through the subsumption of the individual under the name. The name signified by one representative is passed onto the other, but what is perpetuated is the name itself, and all the circumstantial significations attached to it are ever contextualized as it occurs at different points in temporality.

Henry's spurious status/name arises from his adherence to illegitimacy, by severing the name from the family tree and relocating it within a narrative of individual authority. In terms of genealogical history, Esmond generates a narrative of self-legitimation that replaces family history with individual history. Maintaining illegitimacy signals a turn from the aristocratic ideology of inherited authority to the bourgeois counterpart of entrepreneurship, or what Harold Perkin calls the "entrepreneurial ideal" of the self-made man, who brings himself to a landed status from his initial propertyless one.<sup>17</sup> Instead of inserting himself in the genealogical line of property and patronymic, the self-made man initiates his own family history by authorizing himself as the point of origin.

Entrepreneurism is, therefore, a creation of new genealogy. This genealogy is produced when a subject causes a rupture in old genealogy, and chooses to dwell in another. Yet, how is the new genealogical history characterized? In *Henry Esmond*, Esmond's subjectivity fills the new historical space when public politics, patriarchal power, and the inherited past are replaced by apolitical domesticity, democratic egalitarianism, and the individualistic present/future. In the process, Esmond rejects the title in favor of "love, gratitude and fidelity" (165), as exemplified by his choice of Rachel when he shows "his love for her, and to prove it by some little sacrifice on his own part" (331). Significantly enough, Esmond observes to Frank Castlewood that "I stand in the place of your father... and sure a father may dispossess himself in favour of his son. I abdicate the twopenny crown, and invest you with the kingdom of Brentford..." (410-11). At this point, this new genealogy is again found to be premised upon the disruption of the succession symbolized by the title. In this sense, Esmond's renunciation of loyalty to the Pretender, which is equated with his allegiance to the

Castlewood family, both terminates and initiates a genealogy. Just as Michel de Certeau recognizes that historical chronology transforms the site of historical production into the teleological goal of history,<sup>18</sup> *Henry Esmond* establishes a space out of which is generated both a conceptual formulation of the family as a domestic retreat both from history and politics and a physical formulation of the family at the colonial Castlewood estate. In other words, the family is turned into a site where the history of the entrepreneurial, masculine subject is produced. Paradoxically enough, however, the new genealogy, although it is based on a rupture of the old succession, reproduces the old genealogy: Esmond and Rachel now occupy "that estate...far away from Europe and its troubles, on the beautiful banks of the Potomac, where we have built a new Castlewood," and "Heaven hath blessed us with a child, which each parent loves for her resemblance to the other" (463).

Nonetheless, a qualitative difference between the new and the old genealogies can be located in domestic love, defined as antithetical to politics, and as a purely private emotion that transcends power and history. Love is "immeasurably above all ambition, more precious than wealth, more noble than name" (462). Existence in love implies involvement in the sacralization of the feminine transcendence: "In the name of my wife I write the completion of hope, and the summit of happiness. To have such a love is the one blessing, in comparison of which all earthly joy is of no value; and to think of her, is to praise God" (462). This sacralization of love shifts the historical focus from ambition to salvation, i.e., from the political to the religious/familial sphere. If politics operates on the desire to change and better the circumstances, the institution of the family functions as an antidote to the instability such a desire generates. In fact, the application of religious discourse to love can be viewed as a sign of the Esmond family's retreat from politics. In this case, the faith that was related to feminized discourse of the Jesuit emerges as a metaphor for marital relations. Religion severed from political implications becomes inserted into the familial sphere.

Now I would like to follow the consequences of the reproduction of the old genealogical history in the new history. Moving the family out of history and into a "love" of political stasis entails subjective plenitude conferred on the masculine subject in the domestic sphere, because when Esmond is turned into a cultic center of the family, he becomes the sole author of genealogical history in the new land. But, at the same time, Esmond reproduces the possibility of deconstructing the supreme authority of the writer of history. This possibility arises when the preface and footnotes to Henry Esmond's history destabilize the equilibrium within the family by problematizing the discontinuity between domesticity and history, and transform *Henry Esmond* into a historicized document. In the footnotes to Henry Esmond's history, there is a multiplicity of authors, including Henry Esmond, Rachel Esmond, Rachel Esmond Warrington, and one of the grandsons, allowing several points in the family tree to have a voice. Thus, the fragmentation of authorship that arose from the duplicate nature of the title is repeated in the narrative, as separate voices of at least four people dwell in the same narrative space. (Needless to say, the number of these voices would be further augmented and the issue of authorship more complicated, if another obvious author Thackeray is included in the list. Since some footnotes remain unidentified and Thackeray conveniently fills in that authorial vacuum, his inclusion in the narrative seems unavoidable.)

Some of the footnotes provide relevant political information. But others contain

gendered, ideological references (Esmond's allusion to the dichotomy between "royal highness" and "king," 441), or rectify Esmond's immature judgment (the grandson's comment on Esmond's reliance on Father Holt, 293), or supply testimonials that are either unfounded or spurious (Rachel Warrington's praise of Esmond's courtesy, 432), or reveal a character's critique of her own representation (Rachel Esmond, 435). The marginalized footnotes not only resist subordination to the main text but also try to place the text in different historical configurations. The effect they produce seems to historicize Esmond, who has supposedly attained an omniscient position free from historical biases and contaminations, and implicate him in politics. The grandson, for example, connects Esmond's political views to the flawed omniscience, and reveals the continued influence of Father Holt by pointing out Esmond's "habit of telling many stories which he did not set down in his memoirs, and which he had from his friend the Jesuit, who was not always correctly informed" (293). The marginalized voices bring the subjective nature of Esmond's history to the fore, and demystify his historically absolutist perspective. In a way, the footnotes deconstruct Esmond's representation of history, and show that it too is based on universalizing discourse.

In particular, the footnotes attributed to the two Rachels are among the most assertive in that they threaten the representational hegemony that is formed in the text by the dominance of the male subject. Rachel Esmond, for one, contests Esmond's representation of her, and interrupts his writing of her by her writing of him: "This remark shows how unjustly and contemptuously even the best of men will sometimes judge of our sex. Lady Esmond had no intention of triumphing over her daughter; but from a sense of duty alone pointed out her deplorable wrong.-R.E." (435). Instead of seeking retroactive empowerment, Rachel seeks empowerment in the present by interfering with the process of historical production. In the case of Rachel Esmond Warrington, the struggle for historical power is centered on the name, or the lack of it, within Esmond's narrative history. Remaining throughout the narrative as a nameless entity, she nevertheless offers important opportunities to evaluate her parent. Particularly, she introduces the narrative, and reconstructs for the reader what she considers an objective image of Henry Esmond. In this pre-textual production of *Henry Esmond* (which is, in fact, chronologically later than the text), Rachel opens up his history after his closure of it through the stasis of love, and reproduces a history of familial continuity.

The pattern of reproduction is repeated even after the dissenting voice of Rachel intrudes into the narrative. Love, which is associated with the ahistorical domestic sphere, is again implicated in politics. This time, the issue is racial:

It was not until after that dreadful siege of our house by the Indians, which left me a widow ere I was a mother, that my dear mother's health broke. She never recovered from her terror and anxiety of those days, which ended so fatally for me, then a bride scarce six months married, and died in my father's arms ere my own year of widowhood was over (9).

The nationalist discourse represented by America is, however, fused with an older style of thinking, in which there is no apparent difference between Britain and America despite the result of the war, since her "son's children" will be at home either "here in our Republic, or... in the always beloved mother country, from which our late quarrel hath separated us" (7). In other words, love, inserted into politics, again overcomes the discontinuities generated

by political violence. In the same token, the ruptures left by the Indians are healed by the union of Henry and Rachel Warrington. United in this new manifestation of perfect love, the historical impact of the Indians fades from Rachel's own discourse, as she concludes by referring to Henry's European life as "far more exciting than his life in this country, which was past in the tranquil offices of love and duty" (12).

However, this domestic sphere that is freed from politics by the power of love is once more involved in politics. An intense love, linked to incest, leads to sexualization of love, which in its turn triggers competition among family members. Since incestuous relations do not allow the possibility of an extra-familial bond, the love limited within the familial sphere becomes exclusive. Rachel Esmond loves her husband with "a devotion so passionate and exclusive as to prevent her, I [Rachel Esmond Warrington] think, from loving any other person except with an inferior regard"; similarly, she regards her daughter as a competitor, admitting "her jealousy even that my father [i.e., Henry Esmond] should give his affection to any but herself" (9). At this stage, love objectifies the other, and something like cathexis arises. It produces difference within a domestic sphere, and creates a political divisiveness similar to the kind generated by Beatrix's sexuality. Paradoxically enough, it is through love, the purported shelter from politics and history, that politics and history come back. Love gives birth to a history once again and continues the history of Henry Esmond. Whereas Henry Esmond relied on discontinuity to start his new genealogical history, Rachel Warrington relies on the continuance of the name to reproduce the old genealogical history. In the end, or rather in the beginning, the genealogical history Henry Esmond has supposed to have disrupted returns with a vengeance.

Genealogy in *Henry Esmond* is a site of power struggle. In the formation of genealogy, a name is passed on while the bearer of it is denied his diachronic significance. Raised to an epic level, genealogy becomes a totalizing world view that subsumes all the synchronic occurrences under it. However, this reading of genealogy is problematized by the presence of conflicting masculine and feminine discourses. The genealogy inserted into masculine discourse develops further complications because of the two seemingly discontinuous spheres of public (politics) and domestic (family). However, Henry Esmond turns discontinuity/difference into a site where a new genealogy is produced. Or rather, when he tries to fill the new genealogical history with his subjectivity and cause a rupture in historical continuity, genealogy asserts itself and ends up reproducing itself. Paradoxically, love, which is supposed to promise domestic stasis, itself becomes a dynamic force both to create a rupture and genealogical continuity. Genealogy is continually implicated in the process of reproduction.

#### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> From a letter to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bray, 13 November 1852, as quoted on *Thackeray: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Geoffrey Tillotson and Donald Hawes (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), 151.
- <sup>2</sup> The term "anti-history" is from Stephen Bann, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 143.

- <sup>3</sup> See Chase, "The Kindness of Consanguinity: Family History in Henry Esmond," *Modern Language Studies* (1986), 217; and Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), 136-47.
- <sup>4</sup> Georg Lukacs, *The Historical Novel*, tr. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 34-35.
- <sup>5</sup> N.N. Feltes, *Modes of Production of Victorian Novels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 27.
- <sup>6</sup> There is a perceptive comment on the significance of reproduction by Walter Benjamin on "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, tr. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 220-23. On art reproductions and the consequent status of originality, see Julie F. Codell, "The Aura of Mechanical Reproduction: Victorian Art and the Press," *Victorian Periodicals Review* XXIV (1991), 4-6; on the print technology that gives rise to the division between "fresh and original" and "repeatable and copied," see Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 54.
- <sup>7</sup> See J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 92.
- <sup>8</sup> William Makepeace Thackeray, *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 26. All further references will be parenthetically indicated in the main text.
- <sup>9</sup> Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, tr. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 39.
- <sup>10</sup> On the relation of aristocratic blood to the exclusive sphere it creates, see Anita Levy, "Blood, Kinship and Gender," *Genders*, 5 (1989), 72-73.
- <sup>11</sup> On the issue of how blood is involved in the formation of aristocracy, see J.V. Beckett, *The Aristocracy in England 1660-1914* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 18-25; 93-98.
- <sup>12</sup> See Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), 81.
- <sup>13</sup> See George Levine, *The Realistic Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterley* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 167; 170.
- <sup>14</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991), 6.
- <sup>15</sup> The phrase occurs in the opposition between the "objective modernity of nations to the historian's eye" and "their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists" on Anderson, 5.
- <sup>16</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 146.
- <sup>17</sup> Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society* (London: Routledge, 1991), 226-27.
- <sup>18</sup> De Certeau, *The Writing of History*, tr. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 90.

## References

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

- Bann, Stephen. *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-century Britain and France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Beckett, J.V. *The Aristocracy in England 1660-1914*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Tr. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Chase, Karen. "The Kindness of Consanguinity: Family History in *Henry Esmond*." *Modern Language Studies* (1986).
- Codell, Julie F. "The Aura of Mechanical Reproduction: Victorian Art and the Press." *Victorian Periodicals Review*, XXIV (1991):
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Tr. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- . *The Writing of History*. Tr. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Feltes, N.N. *Modes of Production of Victorian Novels*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Fleishman, Avrom. *The English Historical Novel: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Levine, George. *The Realistic Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterley*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Levy, Anita. "Blood, Kinship and Gender." *Genders*, 5 (1989).
- Lukacs, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Tr. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.
- Perkin, Harold. *The Origins of Modern English Society*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq.* Ed. Donald Hawes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Tillotson, Geoffrey and Donald Hawes, eds. *Thackeray: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.