IMPERIAL WAYS:
THE VICTORIANS, THE SUEZ CANAL, AND NARRATIVE

by

CARA MURRAY

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

2005

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: 3169956

Copyright 2005 by
Murray, Cara

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3169956

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

©2005

CARA MURRAY

All Rights Reserved

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

6 Jan. 2005 — Anne Humphreys

Date — Chair of Examining Committee, Anne Humpherys, Ph.D.

6 Jan. 2005 — Steven F. Kruger

Date — Executive Officer, Steven Kruger, Ph.D.

Rachel M Brownstein

Rachel Brownstein, Ph.D.

Timothy Alborn, Ph.D.

Gerhard Joseph

Gerhard Joseph, Ph.D.

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

IMPERIAL WAYS: THE VICTORIANS, THE SUEZ CANAL, AND NARRATIVE

by

Cara Murray

Adviser: Professor Anne Humpherys

"Imperial Ways" pursues the complex relation between narrative practices and imperial ones through an analysis of England's engagement with Egypt in the thirty-year period leading up to England's 1875 purchase of the Suez Canal, an event which led directly to Egypt's colonization in 1882. Although the British had the most to gain by investing in the international canal project, they had nothing to do with it until 1875. I argue that the forces that enabled the British to eschew the project throughout the 1850s and then greet its purchase with jubilation twenty years later are written in the culture. The public embrace of imperialism is articulated in literature before it is expressed through policy.

"Imperial Ways" explores the cultural making of the Suez Canal by exposing the cultural adjustments that made imperial projects possible. From the 1840s to the 1870s the Victorians readjusted their notions about character, investments, and technology. I suggest that the concept of character develops its centrality in the Victorian age because of the instability to which the newly globalized market exposed it. Thus, the Victorians not only had to expand their repertoire of characters throughout the century but alter their ideas about what constitutes character—a process which happens primarily through the novel. Related to the reevaluation of character, is an alteration in sentiments about

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

investing. From the domestic speculative boom of the 1840s to the exportation of capital in the 1860s, Victorians gained a new confidence in investing. Technology was the beneficiary. It, in turn, altered Victorians' relation to time/space, bringing the colonies closer to home and the idea of colonization nearer to the heart.

I argue that novels and travel narratives are the carriers and promoters of these alterations. The technology of the novel--the work that it does generically--enables change. Using novel theory and postcolonial theory, I examine novels by Charles Dickens, Benjamin Disraeli, and Jules Verne, novelistic travel narratives by Lucie Duff Gordon, Emmeline Lott, and William Simpson, and other cultural productions such as biographies, newspaper articles, and parliamentary reports to suggest that colonizing works at the level of genre itself.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the generosity and rigor of my dissertation committee. I wholeheartedly thank my director, Anne Humpherys, for not only reading my work with enthusiasm and care, but for inspiring me to become a Victorianist by her exemplary scholarship, teaching, and service. I am ever appreciative of Rachel Brownstein, whose work fills me with the desire to write with joy, for directing my orals, out of which came the idea for my dissertation. Timothy Alborn has taught me how to strive towards the ideal of interdisciplinarity, and his generosity in sharing his discipline with me has given me the tools to do so. I am thankful for Gerhard Joseph's encouragement; his probing questions along the way have improved my thinking and writing tremendously.

Many teachers at the Graduate Center have helped to shape my work. I would like to thank those who stand out. Without Glenn Burger's early encouragement, I would never have had the confidence to follow through with my topic. I thank him for recognizing the potential of this project when it was nothing more than a vague notion, for reading many drafts of my prospectus as well as early drafts of chapters two and four, and for aiding me in the application of Cultural Studies methodologies to my dissertation. Gordon Whatley, who has made me love everything that I have studied with him, from Old English to research methods, I thank for providing me with a model of careful and thorough scholarship. Finally, Marshall Berman, whose *All Things Solid Melt into Air* was the original inspiration for this project, I thank for closely reading my prospectus and turning me onto Goethe. But most of all, I thank Marshall for generously discussing my dissertation with me on various occasions, and I am especially grateful for his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

observations about Dickens, Verne, Lesseps, and cosmopolitanism, for they were invaluable to my writing of chapters one and four.

Without the deep friendships I formed at the Graduate Center, I would have never completed this project. I thank Sean O'Toole, whose writing inspires me almost as much as his friendship; Crystal Benedicks, who has the ability to make me appreciate all things beautiful and ugly, even the Spasmodics; Vincent Bissonette, whose intellectual curiosity gives me hope; and Maria Fahey, who never lets me forget the beauty of teaching. To those who have finished before me, I owe special thanks, especially, Chris Iannini and Ira Dworkin, for they have not only made me realize that it can be done, but have given me a reason to do it. Their superb dissertations have provided me with models of scholarship.

A fellowship at the Center for Place, Culture, and Politics helped me to begin to write. The fellows in the Center's 2002-3 seminar on "imperialism" provided a receptive and demanding audience for an early version of chapter four. I am grateful to director Neil Smith and the associate director Omar Dahbour for making the Center such an inspiring intellectual environment. A fellowship at the CUNY Honors College provided me with the funding that permitted me to continue to write. And the English Department at the Graduate Center awarded me with the means to finish my dissertation, the Towsend Harris Dissertation Year Fellowship. I thank the Department for its vote of confidence.

I am grateful to my parents for their love and encouragement.

Final and greatest thanks are due to Enrique Lanz Oca, whose love, support, and geographical knowledge made this work possible.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iv
Acknowledgements vi

1. Introduction:
"The Suez Canal and the Technologies of the Novel" 1

2. Chapter I:
"French Imports: The Entrepreneur in England, Deciphering de Lesseps" 25

3. Chapter II:
"English Exports: Romantic Investments, Novel Technologies and Disraeli's *Tancred*" 74

4. Chapter III:
"Domesticating Egypt: Women's Writing, Space, and Everyday-Living Abroad" 121

5. Chapter IV:
"World-Girdling Technologies: Around the World Travel Narratives of the 1870s" 173

6. Epilogue 221

7. Works Cited 229

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Introduction

The Suez Canal and the Technologies of the Novel

In a pivotal scene in David Lean's 1962 movie *Lawrence of Arabia*, T.E. Lawrence, played by Peter O'Toole, emerges like a ghost from the Sinai desert at an abandoned British outpost. He has just crossed the desert on foot with two young Bedouin servants in order to report the news to the Cairo headquarters of his successful leadership of a group of Arab nationals to take Akaba from the Turks. In the crossing he lost his servant in quicksand and his compass in a storm. The camera fixes on his gaunt corpse-like face, covered in dust, still and emotionless as he pauses before the empty outpost. A metal fence squeaks in the wind; a door bangs open and shut. His desert travail seems to have ended here in this apocalyptic landscape. But as he walks through the wreck of the station, he hears the sonorous blast of a ship horn; and as he emerges on the other side, he stands transfixed as a large ship steams by in the desert. The music starts, and the movie cuts to a busy street in Cairo.

In this, the first incorporation of the Suez Canal into a Hollywood epic, the canal is portrayed as something like a miracle. Technically, it provides the scene with a transition--from the stultifying desert to the bustling city, from Lawrence's desert romance to his discomfort with the regimented realities of military living. Moreover, to a contemporary viewer, the canal dramatically symbolized a transition of another sort. Just five years earlier in 1956 Gamal A. Nasser, then President of Egypt, nationalized the canal that had long been controlled by Great Britain, causing fear and panic in the West and hope in the East. England and France then joined together in opposition and induced

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Israel to provoke a conflict with Egypt on their behalf that would serve as a pretext for an Anglo-French invasion of Egypt.

England and France's joint venture failed of course. As Nassar's bold actions inspired fear or confidence depending upon where one sat in the world and one's politics, they also registered a major shift in the geopolitical landscape, most aptly described by the word postcolonial. Many books appeared explaining what was deemed "the Suez Canal Crisis." More infrequent, however, were books written about nineteenth-century antecedents to this crisis, or what one historian called "the first Suez Crisis," referring to England's 1882 bombardment and invasion of Alexandria to seize the Suez Canal.[1] It could, however, be argued that the crisis began even before that.

This study examines the three decades leading up to England's seizure of the Suez Canal: the 1850s when the canal project was conceived of by the Frenchman Ferdinand de Lesseps and invested in internationally, the 1860s when the canal was built (1859-1869), and the 1870s when the British Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, purchased a majority of the shares of the canal for England. Within seven years of the 1875 purchase, England invaded Egypt and physically laid claim to the canal. Edward Said argues that European cultural practices of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries culminated in the imperial violence of the 1882 land seizure. While Said posits 1882 as the teleological endpoint of cultural imperialism in the Middle East, I shift the focus to only a few years earlier, the 1875 purchase, anticipating that a somewhat differently configured teleology may reveal imperialism's more banal aims.

---

[1] See Christopher Danziger's "The First Suez Crisis."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Much has been written on the Suez Canal, but this study differs from others in two significant ways. First, I focus on the British. Because Lesseps, the projector of the canal, was French, and because Napoleon Bonaparte was the first European to investigate a canal project, accounts of the Suez Canal largely have a French focus. Indeed, the British had nothing to do with the canal throughout the near twenty years of its planning, investing and building, and only became involved six years after the canal was built when they purchased it. I focus on the British precisely because they were dead-set against what was so obviously in their interest. Second, the canal is often written about by historians who seek to uncover records of its political, technological, and financial making. I, however, focus on its cultural makings. In other words, I understand its financial, technological, and political construction to be impossible without major shifts in cultural attitudes about investment, technology, and empire. A study of England's initial resistance to the canal project and its final embrace will reveal the cultural attitudes that needed to be in place for empire to function.

Informing this study is a question asked in the negative: "Why didn't the British build the Suez Canal?" They after all had every reason to do so. They had the technology and the expertise. They had a well-prepared set of vessels to navigate the canal, and an industry poised to build the new steamships that the canal necessitated. They had an educated and skilled body of workers. They had the capital. They had the right political connections with Turkey and Egypt. Most important of all, they had the motivation: they needed a direct route to their largest colony, India, and after the 1857 Sepoy Rebellion, they felt this need even more, for a canal would provide a quick and direct route for the deployment of British troops. In addition they were aware that if the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

canal was cut, the markets of East Africa would be newly open to them while markets in the Near and Far East would only become more accessible.

Still, the British did not invest, a fact that is more perplexing when one realizes that Lesseps counted upon the British to purchase twenty percent of the shares. He therefore made propaganda tours of England throughout the 1850s. During his 1857 visit he spent three months in England and held twenty-two meetings in eighteen cities (Farnie 43). He talked to the press, business groups, and politicians and passed out elaborate pamphlets and a book written by his English secretary. As in France and elsewhere, his appeal was to the people, bypassing big banks and powerful financial institutions, attempting instead to gain the support of small investors. He was received cordially and even enthusiastically, but still no individuals subscribed.

It may be proposed that the British were otherwise engaged. They were too busy building railways in India to invest in Egypt, and they were constructing their own railway to Suez and did not want the competition. (The British line from Cairo to Suez was finished in 1859, the year that work on the canal began.) Yet neither explanation suffices. Although it is true that the British began building railways in India in the 1850s there is little evidence to suggest that as a result capital was not available for investment in Egypt. On the contrary, British investment in Egypt had increased dramatically during the 1850s. In addition, journalists did not posit India and Egypt as competitive spheres of investment. The second explanation has more validity. Work on the Cairo-Suez line began just two years after Lesseps was granted the concession for the Suez Canal in 1854. However, Said Pasha did not grant the British a concession for that railway until a year after he granted one for the canal, so that even before the railway was a possibility, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

British press strongly disapproved of the canal. As early as 1851 Palmerston proclaimed, "It shall not be made, it cannot be made, it will not be made; but if it were made, there would be a war between France and England for the possession of Egypt" (Farnie 29). Victorians realized that a railway was also less ideal because transport upon it was less fluid. One would have to disembark/embark at Alexandria only to do the same at Cairo and then again at Suez where one would wait for weeks for a steamer. The process was tedious, and once the Cairo-Suez line was opened, lengthy travel time due to poor connections was the main complaint in the "Travel through Egypt" column of *The Times*.

Another common-sense response to why the British did not get involved in the building of the Suez Canal is that they intentionally waited until the canal was built, and then swooped down and took it. As ingenious as this may sound, there is little evidence that the British believed that the canal could be built. In fact, the body of literature about the canal, including newspaper and journal articles and Parliamentary reports, is characterized by its naysaying. During the 1850s and 1860s the press continually repeats Robert Stephenson's 1847 pronouncement that the canal was "impracticable." Although the culture of rejecting innovative engineering projects was not new to England--Samuel Smiles writes that nearly every engineer had struggled against it—the adamant rejection of the Suez Canal after so many "impracticable" projects had been built in England gives one pause. Indeed an 1850 article in *Household Words* says in reference to a proposition to build the Panama Canal (not attempted until forty years later) "after the Croton aqueduct or our own railway tunneling and the Britannia tubular bridge, engineering difficulties have become obsolete" (66).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The journalistic accounts of the Suez Canal during the twenty years of its planning and development supply insights into a staunch and near universal resistance. Yet only six years after its completion, Disraeli purchased the canal to universal fanfare.[2] This sea change in public opinion may merely represent the fact that the canal was now not only functioning, but British. Yet, there is more behind it than that. The decade of the purchase also coincides with an entirely new public acceptance of British imperialism called by many the "New Imperialism."[3] The canal is unique because it was an international project, not just in its positioning between two seas, but in its conception, investments, labor, management, technology, and in its proposed use. England's rejection of the canal then may tell us something about the readiness of the nation to accept its positioning in the new world order.

Economic Projections

The near unanimity of the British press during the 1850s and the 1860s is striking. Across political lines writers agreed: the Suez Canal could not be built. Even though two out of a team of three engineers representing France, England, and Austria who went to Egypt in 1847 to study the prospects asserted the project's feasibility, the British press

---

[2] Disraeli did not actually purchase the canal, but it was perceived that way by the public. He purchased 40 percent of the shares, making England the largest shareholder.

[3] New Imperialism is a term used to understand the expansionist policies of Europe during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. The beginnings of New Imperialism are often contested, as is the idea that anything was new at all about imperialism in the late century. However, amongst those who distinguish between the imperialism of the early century and what came after, it has been proposed that England's involvement with the New Imperialism alternatively begins in 1867-68 with the Abyssinian expedition, in 1872 with Benjamin Disraeli's pro-imperialism rallying cry embedded in his Crystal Palace speech, in 1882 with England's bombardment of Alexandria and invasion of Egypt, and in 1888 with England's participation in the scramble for Africa.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cast doubts. Of course, the sole engineer against the canal was Robert Stephenson, son of George Stephenson, the "father of the railways" and inventor of the "rocket" locomotive. Robert Stephenson deemed the project "impracticable" and his assessment stuck and was repeated in nearly every article on the subject throughout the next two decades. Nine years later in 1856 another international committee of engineers, representing a wider array of European nations, traveled to Egypt to again study the prospects. This time there was a consensus: the canal could be built. Even the British engineer agreed. The British press, however, dug in their heels.

Articles on the canal project follow a similar pattern throughout the 1850s and 60s. They first recite the history of attempts to build a canal, arguing that while canals connecting the Mediterranean and the Red Sea (by a different route) had been cut in ancient times, few remained open for long.[4] They then jump to modern history, citing Napoleon Bonaparte's French expedition of 1798. Under Napoleon's direction, J.M. Lepère made the first survey of the isthmus of Suez in 1799 and concluded that the Mediterranean was thirty feet below the Red Sea, precluding the possibility of a workable canal because the currents would be too strong. Then comes Lesseps, attempting to do what Napoleon couldn't.[5] Thus in their narratives Lesseps' plan punctuates a long line of failures. If that fatal positioning is not enough, they drive their point home by reciting a

---

[4] A canal was built in the 20th or 19th century B.C.E. to Lake Timsah which was then the northern end of the Red Sea. Xerxes I had the canal extended. It was restored several times until the 8th century C.E. when it was closed and fell into disrepair.

[5] It is interesting that the British do not include in their history the Saint-Simonian plan to build a canal. It was after all the Saint-Simonians who popularized the idea of an isthmian canal throughout the 1830s and 1840s and Lesseps was clearly influenced by them and their ideas, although he cut them out of the project when he received the 1854 concession.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

litany of obstacles that Lesseps is sure to face. The most common include the lack of labor, the difficulty of Red Sea navigation, impossibilities of building in shifting sand, and the complications related to constructing a port where there was none on the Mediterranean end. Rev. J. W. Blakesley's 1860 sarcastic account in *Macmillan's Magazine* is typical:

> It [the Suez Canal] is to be carried through a sandy dessert, many miles away from any spot where a drop of water or a morsel of bread can be procured. . . . It is never to require the labour of more than 4,000 or 5,000 labourers; while the construction of the Mahmudieh canal, a great part of which consisted in the clearing out of an existing channel, employed nearly 250,000 workmen (of whom no less than 20,000 perished) for a year. It is dependent upon the previous construction of a fresh-water canal, itself of greater extent than the celebrated canal of the Pharaohs, in making which 200,000 lives are said to have been sacrificed. (413)

For these reasons Blakesley concludes that this current project will become known as "Napoleon's Folly." Three years after work on the canal began, *The Times* aptly captures the unanimity of the English public on the matter: "Opinion in England is that it is not at present possible to open a shipping canal across the isthmus for the use of traffic, nor can it be maintained in working order" (29 November 1862). While it may appear that these negative articles about the Suez Canal are not useful as sources because they only betray a prejudiced obstructionism, I suggest that the most earnest journalism in this vein reveals just how much is at stake in conceiving the canal.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shortly after Lesseps gained a second concession from Said Pasha in 1856 improving upon the terms of the 1854 concession after a new survey of the Isthmus was performed by an international group of engineers, the *Edinburgh Review* responded with an article that became the most influential of the canal criticisms and was quoted frequently throughout the next decade. H. Reeve's piece, in contrast to the vast majority of the ones that came before, intimates that building the canal may very well be a possibility: "Although these gigantic schemes seem so utterly impracticable, it is by no means intended to assert that the canalization of the Isthmus is not a possible or even a feasible idea" (126). He concedes that the canal can be built--technically speaking. As the international committee of engineers from nations including England, France, Holland, Prussia, and Austria had just returned from Egypt and declared the project feasible, Reeve did not contradict them—at least not their expertise. Instead, he asserts that engineers know nothing about commerce. Thus, he redefines the canal question by suggesting that it is not a matter of technical expertise, but a matter of money.

The article proceeds by showing how dredging, building the pier at Port Said, and keeping the locks in repair all may be performed, but at exorbitant costs. He points out that such large amounts of money could never come from France alone. Lesseps' pamphlets, however, are clear on the matter of finance: this was not a French project; it was to be financed, built, and maintained by an international company appropriately named, the "Universal Company of the Suez Maritime Canal." Thus he sought money from investors in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Holland, Russia, Austria, the Netherlands, Tunisia, Egypt, and the U.S.A. and printed up shares in Italian, English, German and Turkish. However, he focused most of his energies on England because he believed that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

her people had the most capital to invest. The *Edinburgh Review's* inability to admit an international financial alliance into their comprehension of the project, suggests a wider discomfort with global alliances.

A second and related emphasis of the article is that the canal, if built, would never "pay." That is, even if the monies were raised, the canal could not make a profit for its shareholders. Most interesting is why. Lesseps' plan, outlined in his 1855 pamphlet that Reeve quotes extensively, projects a tenfold increase in world commerce. Lesseps writes: "We may, therefore, be sure that the cutting through of the Isthmus will *increase tenfold the operations of commerce and navigation*" (132). Reeve strongly disagrees. Commerce, he forcefully maintains, would barely budge. Reeve presents many detailed and convoluted arguments to show why. One of them is that opening a new road to the Near and Far East would only facilitate the importation of luxury items, products that represent a number "so infinitesimally small as to defy commercial calculation" (134). It is easy to see the folly of this argument now, yet that he could earnestly float it in 1856 suggests that the Suez Canal caused people to have to grapple with complex ideas about the nature of commerce.

Reeve further argues that the canal would have no use at all, and presents many reasons why. Ships, he asserts, would prefer to sail around the Cape to avoid the turbulent Red Sea waters: "The Suez Canal must be considered as utterly useless, in so far at least as sailing vessels are concerned" (130). But what is true of sailing vessels is also true of steam, he continues. Although passengers and mails were now being transported by steam (the P & O had introduced steamers to their Cape route nearly twenty years earlier), goods, he projects, would never be transported by steam, for all past

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

experiments had failed. His arguments about sail or steam, the Cape or Red Sea are really about whether or not the canal would spark commerce. They lead him into questions about the relation of distance to time to cost, and he argues against Lesseps who proclaims that the Isthmus route, half the length of the Cape way, would amount to a savings in travel time which would translate into a savings in price: "Finding by their [Lesseps and Co.] maps that the distance in miles through the Canal would be only half, they jump at once to the conclusion that prices will be reduced in an equal ratio, and commerce in consequence doubled or quadrupled" (134).

He embarks upon even more complicated questions about commerce, including how the costs of insurance relate to the price of shipping and the costs of products. Anything shipped through the Red Sea, he asserts, will carry twice the insurance costs of anything shipped around the Cape because of the threat of ignition which was more likely to happen on the rough Red Sea waters. Thus, he claims that it would cost as much to send products around the Cape from Aden to England, a distance of 12,000 miles, as it would to send them from Aden to Suez, a distance of 1,400 miles. Further, he predicts how much the Canal is likely to affect commerce by studying contemporary trade patterns. The largest increase in shipping in the recent past, he shows, was to Australia: from 1844 to 1854 it had grown by more than seven times. Reasoning that since it would take longer to go to Australia by the Canal than by the Cape, he predicts that the Canal was destined not to increase commerce by much—a dubious assertion not only because he was wrong in his estimates of comparative travel time, but also because he based his argument on the assumption that Australia would continue to be England's fastest-growing trading partner and that no other nation would emerge to take its place.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He concludes that due to delays in navigation, canal dues, turbulence on the Red Sea, the unimportance of luxuries, the cost of insurance, and persistent trade patterns, the canal would not increase commerce by more than two percent, if at all. Thus he predicts:

> These data will no doubt be thoroughly investigated before English shareholders, at least, will embark their money in it; and as they will inevitably find that the route round the Cape is infinitely preferable for commercial purposes, we may rest assured that the Canal will never be executed; or, if it were opened, it would as in ancient times, soon be closed again, as it could never pay its working expenses. (131)

While Reeve argues that engineers know nothing about commerce, he shows that this condition was more widespread. His seventeen-page article presents a variety of proofs for why an increase in commerce is in no way dependent upon the establishment of transnational finance, global cooperation, new inroads in communication, and the development of new products and markets. His models are inflexible, and in his assessment technology, goods, and trading partners are fixed. He does not imagine that steam technology could be adapted to carry goods as it was shortly after the opening of the Canal. Nor does he predict that better routes and cheaper prices might stimulate the consumption of luxuries. And it fails to occur to him that Australia may not be the only growth market.

So how can we account for the influence of this article? It became so influential, I suggest, because it raised questions important to the age: How does commerce work? Who pays for commerce? What makes it grow? If commerce were the key to the strength and vitality of the world's largest free-market economy, it would need to become

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

less of an abstraction. Reeve's article attempts clarification. Asking his readers to do the math along with him, Reeve shows how the canal will only save two percent on goods, and then does more math to demonstrate how two percent was not enough to stimulate trade on a global scale. Even if the canal were to save as much as five percent, he asks, what effect would that have on world commerce? "Would it enable Indian cottons to compete with Americans, or Bengal sugars with those of Havanna? Would it induce the Indians to use more goods from Manchester, or the French to drink tea instead of coffee, or to change their fiscal laws as regards sugar or silk?" (134) The implied answer is "no"; it would not affect "world" trade (here configured as British) in the least. However, with the benefit of hindsight, these questions do not seem as absurd as he meant them to be.

Imaginary Projections

One of the rare positive pieces written about the canal appeared six years prior to Reeve's in Charles Dickens' *Household Worlds*. Two companion pieces published in April and May of 1850, both titled "Short Cuts across the Globe," urged on the building of a Panama Canal and a Suez Canal respectively. The articles, jointly authored by William Weir and W.H. Wills, briefly discuss the technical obstacles to the canal and their remedies, optimistically concluding: "These difficulties, though great, are not insuperable. The advanced state of marine architecture and engineering ought surely to be able to cope with them" (May 168). Next, Weir and Wills summarily dismiss the financial obstacles, suggesting that the idea that the projects would not "pay" is preposterous. Unlike Reeve, however, they do not discover their proof in tedious accounting. Instead, they find it in traffic.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The articles place "traffic" at the heart of the issue, arguing that the world now has sufficient traffic to support a Suez and a Panama Canal. Weir and Wills never define traffic; however, they appear to combine older notions of the word, having to do with trade or commerce, with more modern ones developed in the nineteenth century. According to the *OED*, which finds its first modern usage in 1825, traffic is "The passing to and fro of persons, or of vehicles or vessels, along a road, railway, canal, or other route of transport."[6] Thus, the modern sense newly incorporates the transport or movement of people as well as goods implicit in the older usage. And it is dependent upon the new travel technologies. Another significant difference is the emphasis on the repetitive movement of going to and fro. In order to illustrate the importance of traffic to the establishment of technologies such as railways, Weir and Wills use the example of the London and Liverpool railway, built in 1836. They claim that it was not built "Until the intermediate traffic between these termini had swelled to a sufficient amount in quality and value to bear reimbursement for establishing such a mode of conveyance" (April 66). Without traffic, they contend, "its execution would have been impossible, even though men had known how to set about it" (April 66). They then project this model to South America, where they would like to see a canal built at Panama, claiming that areas hitherto not in communication with each other are likewise now joined by traffic. What they have to say about South America is applicable to Egypt since the two articles are part of the same piece and are working in tandem to make an argument about technology and global shortcuts.

---

[6] Compare to older usages, such as this one dated to the sixteenth century: "The transportation of merchandise for the purpose of trade; hence, trade between distant or distinct communities; commerce" (*OED*). Or this one from the same period: "The buying and selling or exchange of goods for profit; bargaining; trade" (*OED*).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Traffic in their South American example connotes a general movement of people and goods. Weir and Wills present a picture of a vibrant place newly crisscrossed with human activity. Peoples are no longer isolated, and villages are no longer remote, they say. Instead, peoples are in conversation with one another across mountains and valleys and plains. Their representation of South America contrasts with other possible ways of viewing the area. For example, Mary Louise Pratt writes about a way of seeing developed by European travelers to South America and Africa in the eighteenth century which she calls the "Emperor of all I survey." In this model, explorers scurry up mountains to have a bird's eye view of the surrounding territory. Through their vision, they lay claims to all that they see. By contrast, Weir and Wills represent South America as a busy landscape with a network of villages laced together by well-traveled paths.

This vision resembles Benedict Anderson's theorization of Central and South American landscape during the nationalist movements in the early nineteenth century. In his depiction, Creole functionaries crisscrossed that landscape on their pilgrimages to the capital cities of Mexico or Chile or Peru. Unlike their counterparts in Spain, they were barred from access to the seats of power in Madrid. As a result, Creole functionaries neither move laterally, to make the trans-Atlantic journeys to Madrid, or, consequently vertically, to advance their career. Cut off from career advancement, they were fated to repeat their to and fro movements between the centers of administration located in the cities of in South and Central America. "Yet on his cramped pilgrimage he [the Creole's] found traveling-companions, who came to sense that their fellowship was based not only on that pilgrimage's particular stretch, but on the shared fatality of trans-Atlantic birth" (57). In other words, during these local pilgrimages Creole functionaries began to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

perceive themselves as interconnected with other Creoles on like journeys. Yet these pilgrimages "had no decisive consequences until their territorial stretch could be imagined as nations, in other words until the arrival of print-capitalism" (61).

Print gave Creoles the ability to imagine their territorial stretch as a national landscape and to envision themselves as part of that nation. Anderson argues that the novel and newspaper provided the "technical means for 're-presenting' the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation" (25). The "technical means" of the novel and newspaper is found in their employment of "Homogeneous, empty time," a term he borrowed from Walter Benjamin to mean a type of time based upon temporal coincidence and measured by the clock or calendar. In other words, it is "a complex gloss on the word meanwhile" (25). In a novel, for example, characters' actions can be represented simultaneously across physical divides, so that while character X sits in a debtor prison, character Y does needlework at the bedside of a sick woman. Meanwhile, character Z throws the greatest party the world has ever seen. These characters may never meet, yet they are joined together through their coincidence in the text. Further, they are imbedded together in the readers' minds. Newspapers similarly enabled Creoles to imagine a community of characters and incidents held together only by their coincidence on the page and through a shared community of readers. Anderson shows how print culture facilitated the breaking down of the great landscape divides and ultimately sparked peoples to imagine communities of the like-minded across vast distances.

Weir and Wills show that this connective way of thinking was not just found in the domain of novels and newspapers. It is possible that Weir and Wills projected a novelized vision onto South America. Or perhaps the novel, the newspaper, railways and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

telegraphs share similar technologies, capable of turning vast territorial stretches into well-trafficked imagined communities. Indeed, one of the publicity stunts that George Hudson, the Railway King, pulled to celebrate the opening of a new line was to have a newspaper delivered from the town at the start of the line to the town at its end. He awed crowds who could not fathom reading the paper on the same day that it was delivered. Hudson's stunt demonstrates how similar the technologies of the railway and the newspaper were. And through Anderson's understanding of the Creole pilgrimage, we can see how words like "traffic" point to a new technology at work, performed by good roads, trains, telegraphs, novels and newspapers, which give shape and form to landscapes.

Weir and Wills envision a much larger landscape than do Anderson's Creoles. They do not stop at the borders and imagine only nations, but widen their compass to contemplate "the realization of the unity of mankind" (May 68), for "Every short cut across the globe brings man in closer communion with his distant brotherhood, and results in concord, prosperity, and peace" (May 68). Their vision, with its bold confidence in technology, bores through borders and imagines distance dissolved entirely: "the distances which separated the different nations and parts of the globe are gradually vanishing before the achievements of modern invention, and we can traverse them with incredible speed; the languages of all nations are known, and their acquirements placed within the reach of everybody; thought is communicated with the rapidity, and even the power of lightening" (68). In this we hear echoes of the telegraph and the railway. And indeed this way of thinking was quite common to the railway era, when it was commonly feared that speed would abolish space.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Technology's capability to sweep away borders comes in conflict with the nationalist projects of the age which sought to shore them up. The Suez Canal brought this contradiction to the forefront. Lesseps' internationalist language is what most irks Reeve about the project: "They [Lesseps and Co.] stand forward in the garb of philanthropy as the champions of civilization, anxious to bring into communication nations that have now no means of intercourse with one another; to use their own motto, '*Aperire gentibus terram*;' and, by breaking down what they conceive to be the barrier between the East and the West, to spread wealth and good will to the remotest corners of the globe" (134). The English, when talking about their own technological projects, often opted for a less visionary style. Samuel Smiles, the propagator of the great engineering feats of the century, plays down visionary language in his account of English engineers, and plays up their hard work and plain speech. He also makes the engineers' domestic projects the focus of his work, downplaying the important extra-national projects of his engineers.

Reeve's article represents a world that is not dynamic. It traces one path—the Cape route—with two points at either end--Australia and England. And it uses one question, "Will it Pay?" to determine all movement. Weir and Wills dismiss that question outright. They don't get bogged down by the economic details. Instead, they create a dynamic model world interconnected by a multiplicity of paths. But their more cosmopolitan way was not chosen by England. It was Reeve's view that was quoted, advocated and built upon by journalists throughout the following decade. I suggest, however, that this was not the whole case. While journalists shut off the possibility of a dialog about this international undertaking, novelists did not. The nineteenth-century

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

novel's interest in the habitual movements of people through space made it a forum to at least consider the types of questions that the Suez Canal raised. I am not suggesting that novels offer literal discussions or representations of the Suez Canal. Instead, I posit that the novel as a generic form encourages the performance of the complex issues at the heart of the canal crisis.

Literary Projections

One issue at the center of the canal crisis, or what I am describing as the conceptual failure of the British to imagine the Suez Canal in the 1850s and the 1860s, is England's ambiguous relation to the rest of the world. J. A. Hobson, the first theorist of imperialism, argues that it was the inability of nation states to live within their "natural banks" and to foster expressions of "humane cosmopolitanism" across those banks with other nations that ushered in the New Imperialism in the 1870s (6). This analysis of imperialism is useful because it seemingly describes England's situation, the inability to accept those kinds of visionary bridges across worlds that Weir and Wills projected.

This is precisely the viewpoint that Franco Moretti puts forth in *Atlas of the European Novel*, only he places the blame squarely on the novel. He argues that the nineteenth-century British novel's refusal to cross boundaries and insistence upon fortifying the national borders turns England into an island of provincialism. At the opposite pole from Moretti is M. M. Bakhtin who sees the production of encounters at the border as the essence of the novel form. In Bakhtin's understanding it is at the borders that voices meet and bubble up into a fountain of heteroglossic discourse. The novel accepts, accumulates, and absorbs frontiers, drawing in all genres and all social voices placing them in dialog with each other. Indeed, it thrives upon borders. Although these

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

two approaches to the border may seem impossible to bridge, it should be considered that within many theories of the novel, one can follow a thread out to the sea and beyond.[7] The novel, often theorized as a national form, contains within it seeds of international discourse. Anderson's theory too depends upon the articulation of pan-nationalism before nationalism sets in. The Creoles circulate around the undifferentiated territories of South America before they can perceive their own national landscapes of Chile, Peru and Mexico.

The nineteenth-century novel shores up borders, and it breaks them down, although it may not do so with equal energy. But its ability to do both, to shape space and organize peoples in the ways that Moretti, Bakhtin, and Anderson describe is what I am calling its particular technology. Throughout "Imperial Ways" I consider the ways that the novel both expands and delimits the nation, borrowing from abroad—co-opting, corrupting, and sometimes using what it borrows; exporting its generic techniques only to import them again in a varied form. I consider the importation and exportation of character types, investments, and technology. I argue that the Victorian concept of character develops its primacy because of the instability that the newly globalized market exposed it to. Thus, the Victorians not only expanded their repertoire of characters but altered their notions of what constitutes character. Related to the reevaluation of character is an alteration in sentiments about investing. From the largest and most devastating of the domestic speculative booms in the 1840s to the exportation of capital in the 1860s, Victorians gained a new confidence in investing. Technology was the

---

[7] Jürgen Habermas, for instance, sees the genesis of the bourgeois public sphere in the traffic of commodities and news created by early capitalist long-distance trading, while Michael McKeon locates the Royal Society's interest in dictating travel narrative format in the seventeenth century as having an impact on the novel form.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

beneficiary. It, in turn, altered Victorians' relation to time/space, bringing the colonies closer to home and the idea of colonization nearer to the heart.

The novel's generic ability to incorporate a plentitude of voices and speech types, as Bakhtin theorizes, in fact its compulsion to do so, makes it the form in which to find the most unlikely of characters. One such character is the projector type, or the person who organizes and raises money for a project, such as a railway, bridge, or canal. In the early nineteenth century he was often depicted as a schemer, a cheat, or a gambler. Yet projectors were vital to the building of the railways, canals, and tunnels that bridged the nation. Moreover, if such projects were to continue to be built into the 1850s, 1860s and 1870s in the colonies and beyond, England would need to revalue this much-maligned figure. This revaluation happens in the space of the novel.

In my first chapter, "French Imports: The Entrepreneur in England, Deciphering de Lesseps," I look at the way that Charles Dickens in *Little Dorrit* takes up the real-life figure of George Hudson, the much-maligned railway projector. And I suggest that Dickens discovers a way to make this type presentable. I place Dickens' new capitalist hero alongside Ferdinand de Lesseps, suggesting that a similar activity was going on in the positive shift that took place in the reputation of Lesseps from the 1850s to the 1870s. I argue that between Hudson, who was most productive in the 1830s and 1840s, and Lesseps, who was most productive during the 1850s and 1860s, a change took place in the cultural valuing of the men in charge of the productive factors that is reflected in the importation of the French word "entrepreneur." I argue that as international capital became more and more necessary for large projects, the man who was able to cross national borders, and collect it—the entrepreneur—became culturally valued in the nation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In the following chapter, "English Exports: Romantic Investments, Novel Technologies and Disraeli's *Tancred,*" I explore the relation between capital investments in the Near East and literary ones. I seek to understand the connection between the "exportation" of technologies of the novel and the exportation of railways, telegraphs, and steamships that happened during the same period. I consider Benjamin Disraeli's 1847 novel *Tancred* because of its unique generic structure that combines romance and the *Bildungsroman* and performs these two genres in the space of the Near East. I argue that it is through the combination of these forms and then their imaginary "exportation" to the Near East as technologies that *Tancred* achieves its political work—turning the Near East into a zone of imaginative investment for the British public.

Tancred precedes capital investment in the region by only a few years. In the 1850s the British began to export capital to the Near East, most notably to Egypt, laying telegraph lines and building railways. In the 1860s investors and businessmen poured into Egypt to take advantage of the financial needs of the country, generated by development projects and modernization schemes such as the building of the Suez Canal, the intensification of cotton growing, irrigation works, roads, ports and city infrastructure. The demands of modernization led to new forms of lending practices--characterized by their exorbitant interest rates and propensity to produce and escalate debt--often called "economic imperialism" by historians. But most important were new developments in how businessmen felt about their behavior. In spite of an awareness of the inappropriateness of their methods for the European market, they believed that what they were doing was not only ethical but good in the context of Egypt.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I write about *Tancred* in the context of economic imperialism in the Near East and show how, through its use of generic technologies, it authors the region as a zone of investment. I use genre theory as a tool to understand the positive revaluation of market practices that occurred in England sometime between the 1840s and the 1870s. It is a shift that coincides with, and I am suggesting is intimately connected to, the concurrent revaluation of imperial practices that turned "imperialism" from a dirty word in the 1840s into a national ideal by 1880. Considering generic practices as technologies is an exercise that will enable us to see how aesthetic practices that are often theorized as domestic, the *Bildungsroman* for example, actually have imperial import.

Continuing in my consideration of the Western development of Egypt, in my third chapter "Domesticating Egypt: Women's Writing, Space, and Everyday-Living Abroad," I look at travel narratives written by visitors to Egypt in the 1860s while the Suez Canal was being built. During this period, as already observed, the West also invested in the intensification of cotton growing, the building of irrigation works, canals, roads, ports and the remodeling of Cairo to look like Paris. Timothy Mitchell in *Colonising Egypt* shows how along with these developments, Westerners imported their own technologies of seeing, ways of bifurcating the world into an object and its representation, a vision that manifested itself in the rise of world fairs and exhibitions which often sought to represent the world in miniature. I look at the way this reorganization of vision is further internalized through technologies developed in the novel form and imported into the travel narrative. I argue that in the 1860s, Western travelers venture inward for the first time, newly exploring Egyptian interior spaces.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This venture into the Egyptian interior was taken up by women travelers. I consider the travel narratives of two women who lived in Egypt over an extended period and recorded what they saw in journals and letters home, Emmeline Lott and Lucy Duff Gordon. They adapted novelistic methods of everyday accounting into their writings. I show how they use the novelistic device of the everyday to describe/delimit/change their world.

I conclude by examining the international cooperation involved in imperial projects. In my final chapter "World-Girdling Technologies: Around the World Travel Narratives of the 1870s" I consider Jules Verne's 1872 *Around the World in 80 Days* within the context of newly emerging international globe-trotting aesthetics. While in my first chapter I allude to that international cooperation found in the borrowing of words and ideas like "imperialism," and "entrepreneur," and show the way that England herself borrowed from the visionary imperialist and entrepreneur Ferdinand de Lesseps, in my final chapter I look at a genre born of international cooperation—the round-the-world travel narratives of the 1870s. These narratives appeared only after the building of three new routes that facilitated global travel: the Pacific Railway across America, the India Peninsular Railway spanning India, and the Suez Canal, connecting the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. Travel narratives about global travel represent nothing new, but the circumnavigations of the 1870s were radically different than the ones that came before. They reconfigured the spatial and temporal conventions of the travel genre, imagining the world as a temporal and spatial unity.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter I

French Imports:
The Entrepreneur in England, Deciphering de Lesseps

When the Suez Canal was completed to world fanfare in 1869, the British were shocked that they did not do it themselves. They were right to be shocked. There was no reason that they couldn't have built the canal, for they had everything they needed to do so. They had the technology and the expertise. They had the most-prepared set of vessels to navigate the canal and an industry poised to build new steam ships. They had an educated and skilled body of workers. And they had the right political connections with Turkey and the Egypt. Most importantly, they had the need, a direct route to India. So a simple question remains: why didn't they build the Suez Canal? One answer may be that they did not have the right character. They did not have a Ferdinand de Lesseps. In this chapter I posit a relation between market forces and novelistic enterprise in the shaping of the nation's imperial character/s.

Hudson's Statue

In 1845 George Hudson was one of the most celebrated men in England. Journalists wrote that his wealth and his influence were unparalleled. He was a new man representing a new age: a large-scale projector of the railways that were quickly spreading across the nation. By the boom year of 1845, Hudson had distinguished himself from the many other promoters who were speculating upon and investing in the new industry by successfully completing all of his projects. While many projectors active in the 1830s lost credibility by promoting bubble schemes or becoming involved in ill-advised speculations, Hudson rode the waves of the speculation booms and avoided the fallout of the busts, so that during the peak years of the railway expansion period of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the mid-forties, known as the "railway mania," Hudson too was at his peak. His enterprises encompassed industry, finance, land acquisition, and politics. By 1845 he had controlled four railway lines, promoted docks, colliers, and glassworks, and dealt in iron. He had promoted and managed two banks. He acquired two Yorkshire estates, and by some reports the largest privately owned house in London. He had recently gained a seat in Parliament, and there wielded an influence that was unprecedented. Stories about his latest projections, land purchases, and arrival to Parliament appeared in newspapers across the nation, while faith in his projections were at an all-time high. Just evoking the name of Hudson could fill a subscription list.

His wealth, power and importance to the nation are best represented by the testimonial which was collected by various boards of directors of railways and thrown open to the public in October of 1845. Testimonials were popular public declarations of a person's achievements or service, which usually involved collecting a sum of money and presenting a gift. So prevalent were testimonials in the early Victorian era that Charles Dickens included a satire of the tradition in his 1857 *Household Words*. In "A Testimonial in Praise of Testimonials" Rev. James White mocks the nation's propensity to pay tribute in this manner to just about anyone, including a butcher and a tobacco salesman. But Hudson's testimonial was by no means of the mundane variety: in three short months £25,000 to £30,000 were raised for the Railway King. Silverware, china, and linen, the mainstays of testimonial purchases, were not to be considered: Hudson would receive a much larger, public offering. The form that it would take quickly became the talk of the nation, as Thomas Carlyle sourly noted at the end of the decade: "The £25,000 subscribed, or offered as oblation, by the Hero-worshipers of England to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

their Ideal of a Man, awoke many questions as to what outward figure it could profitably take" ("Hudson's Statue" 221). Most likely the tribute would take the form of a brass statue, a prospect that made Carlyle cringe, but kept the nation talking. In a flurry of articles that appeared in newspapers across the country people discussed the size, shape and significance of the impending Hudson Statue.

Yet, in the end, the nineteenth century left behind neither a statue nor a biography of Hudson. Despite one contemporary journal's proclamations that "The biography of Hudson would sell in thousands at the railway station" (Troup 320), his first book-length biography did not appear until 1934, more than half a century after his death in 1871. And his second biography wasn't written until the last decade of the twentieth century. By 1850 Carlyle knew that no statue of Hudson would ever be built, and that the question of what to do with the monies collected in his name would go unanswered. The testimonial question, he said, was "never finally settled; nor ever now to be settled, now when the universal Hudson ragnarok, or 'twilight of the gods,' has arrived, and it is too clear no statue or cast-metal image of that Incarnation of the English Vishnu will ever be molten now!" ("Hudson's Statue" 221) Carlyle was clearly right.[1] Yet, the reason that Carlyle supplies for Hudson's lack of memorial, "the universal Hudson ragnarok," is not so obvious.

Historians give two reasons for Hudson's downfall. First, Hudson was a victim of the turbulent and unpredictable economic cycles that characterized the railway

[1] One senses that the issue may not have been so definitively decided during the period. *Punch*, for instance, writes in the same year: "We are almost prepared for the time when Mr. Hudson's reputation will be made so very 'pleasant,' that a remorseful and conscience-stricken generation will appear by deputy at Albert Gate, to present Mr. Hudson the keys of the Bank of England" (*Punch*).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

expansions. Moreover, he was unlucky enough to be actively projecting during the year of the most radical of the economic downswings, 1847. And second, Hudson's fraudulent business practices finally caught up with him. From 1849 on, boards of directors from the lines that he had formerly directed began to bring him to trial on various accounts of fraud. Like many of the speculators, promoters and investors who were felt to be responsible for destroying the fortunes of a wide segment of the population, he was meant to pay the price. In his trials that began in 1849 and lasted throughout the 1850s Hudson was accused on many counts including forgery, falsification, cooking accounts, mismanaging funds, taking dividends from capital, creating false speculation sheets, misallocating funds, and bribing members of Parliament. Although Hudson was never convicted of any of these charges, the accusations ruined his reputation and career. By 1850, the Railway King was permanently dethroned. In spite of the fact that he maintained his seat in Parliament throughout most of the next decade, he had no real political power; his seat was increasingly vacant, and his incompetence in Parliamentary matters became a public scandal. Stories of Hudson's outrageous blunders appeared in all venues, from regional and national newspapers to journals and national lampoons. Hudson was shown to know nothing about politics, language, and common human endeavors. One frequently reported story is that during the discussion of the spending of public money on the funeral of the Duke of Wellington in December of 1853, Hudson referred to "the delight the occasion afforded to such a vast number of our countrymen who witnessed the scene" (Lambert 285). Most sources claim that his only interest in Parliament now was in keeping himself out of debtor's prison. While the trials of the early fifties were damaging

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to Hudson's reputation, probably the most-lasting damage was Carlyle's vituperative attack in his *Latter Day Pamphlets* of 1850. In "Hudson's Statue," Carlyle hurled negative epithet upon epithet at Hudson, and one in particular stuck: "big swollen Gambler." It is hard to find a source after 1850 that does not cite Carlyle's words.[2]

Eighteen fifty also marked Hudson's last successful projection. To much fanfare and a crowd of 50,000 he opened the Sunderland docks; after that he disappeared from public life. He lived the next twenty years in and out of exile, slowly shedding his various properties, and dabbling occasionally in projection. In Spain, he tried to project a trunk line, but he failed to raise the appropriate funds. He moved to Paris, and there shuffled from cheap hotel to cheap hotel. Back in England there was almost no word of him. On returning from a trip to Paris in 1863, Dickens caught sight of him taking leave of his friend Manby and penned the following:

> Taking leave of Manby was a shabby man of whom I had some remembrance, but whom I could not get into place in my mind. Noticing when we stood out on the harbour that he was on the brink of the pier, waving his hat in a desolate manner, I said to Manby, "Surely I know that man." "I should think you did," said he: "Hudson! He is living—just living—at Paris." (Lambert 296)

---

[2] Carlyle's negative treatment of Hudson should be considered in relation to his positive treatment of the industrialists outlined in "Captains of Industry" in 1843. In this essay, Carlyle calls for the "captains of industry" to form a new Aristocracy with the aim of "managing the working classes" (267). He envisions their leadership as a way to protect the country from the "chaos" which would ensue if labor organized itself. While Carlyle does not mention Hudson in this piece, he does posit his ideal industrialist as a solution to a seedier sort--those who, like Hudson, raise money through speculation. In this way, Carlyle clearly separates making goods from making money, praising the practitioner of the former while castigating he who partakes in the latter.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In 1863, Dickens had all but forgotten one of the most talked about men of his generation, and by the time of Hudson's death, it is as though the man who changed the landscape of England forever never existed. Hudson's obituary read: "There was a time when not to know him was to argue one's self unknown; now he is only a tradition" (*The Times* 16 December 1871).

However, both of Hudson's biographers concern themselves with his displacement in history and seek to blame more than just the man and his historical circumstances. In 1834 Hudson's first biographer, Richard Lambert, accuses Hudson's native town of York of a "deliberate excision of the Hudson page from York and English History" (13), and he blames that excision on the public shame about Hudson that ensued after his speculations began to fail in 1848. Of that shame, he says, "So many had put their faith in him that when that faith was violently and suddenly uprooted, the only refute—after a shortlived outburst of execration—seemed ashamed silence" (Lambert 15). Lambert begins his book by lamenting that instead of constructing a memorial to Hudson, York constructed one to his rival, the solicitor who had a hand in Hudson's downfall, George Leeman. And he finishes his biography by suggesting that Hudson's memory may be lost forever, "In Scrayingham churchyard the tall grass half hides the Hudson family grave, and the grey lichen eating into the stone all but obliterated the names carved about its base" (299). In spite of Lambert's efforts to restore the memory of Hudson to the nation, he seems to have failed. The man who Lambert said had "a dazzling popularity and influence unexampled in our commercial history" (14) remained uncelebrated: Lambert's biography stirred little response. Hudson's story wasn't taken up again in the form of biography until Brian Bailey wrote a second biography in 1995.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Like Lambert, Bailey laments the lack of attention paid to Hudson, but while Lambert blames Hudson's hometown of York for being unable to see past the scandals of the late forties and look to the accomplishments, Bailey accuses "politically correct" historians and scholars of refusing to recognize capitalist subjects. For Bailey Hudson falls into the ranks of the early speculators, projectors, and investors who were vital to capitalism and who should therefore be memorialized. He sees the dubious fundraising and accounting methods that precipitated Hudson's fall as part and parcel of the period. Lambert, he hints, had not gone far enough in his rescue of Hudson, and Bailey's biography is an attempt to correct Labert's slight.

Lambert and Bailey's blame-placing is useful because it introduces reception as a factor in the understanding of Hudson's fall. I would like to consider Hudson's downfall in terms of the national reception of him during the period in which his reputation was being drastically revised. What did Hudson represent to the British in the mid to late forties? And why was that representation rejected? We know that Hudson was a scoundrel of sorts, and yet we also know that many a scoundrel has had his memorial. Hudson is most interesting to study because nobody wanted to claim him for history. I argue two related points: first, that it was important for Victorian England to understand Hudson not just as a man, but as a character type. Understanding Hudson's character became key for a nation grappling with a new lot of characters: the speculators, projectors and investors of the 1830s and 1840s associated with domestic railway building. And second, Hudson was a representative man, but of a type that England was not quite ready to own. England was not prepared for what it was to become, nor for the men it needed to revere in order to get there. The study of the rejection of Hudson will

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

show the confusion and ambivalence that England had about the type of man that would be necessary for the promotion of England's future projects. In other words, Hudson had no nineteenth-century biography precisely because he is representative of the type of man that capitalism increasingly needed: the morally ambiguous, yet economically productive character, an enterprising man who could get things done on a large scale--who could, for example, promote the Suez Canal.

One peculiar characteristic of Hudson was the amount of work that his name alone could achieve: "A hint that 'Hudson' was going to 'take up' such-and-such a line, would send the shares up in the market with magical buoyancy" (Francis 215). But the magic of the Hudson name was only symbolic of an entire economic process that was mystified and mystifying. Nobody as of yet understood overall the large-scale, unregulated investing, speculating, and jobbing that was occurring at unprecedented rates in all parts of the nation in the 1830s and 1840s. To understand the power of the Hudson name, one must understand what he did for a living. Indispensable to this knowledge is the biography. Although Hudson had no full-length biography during the period, biographical information was nevertheless in circulation. Certain details of Hudson's life were commonly known and often repeated in newspaper accounts. The following is a redaction of common biographical sketches of his life that appeared in contemporary sources:[3] Hudson was a farmer's son born in Hawsham, near York, who at an early age was apprenticed to a draper at York because of his father's death. There he worked his way into a partnership, and finally became one of the most successful drapers in York. Before he reached thirty, a relative died and left him £30,000; soon after he entered

---

[3] Taken from sketches that appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*, *Tait's Edinburgh*, and *The Times*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

political life in York and became Lord Mayor. He was involved in all sorts of endeavors from the promotion of banks to docks, but he excelled in the field of railway speculation, and by 1845 had built many lines in England. In 1845 he became M.P. of Sunderland and purchased one of the largest homes in London.

This skeletal biography, circulated as common knowledge, served to produce a sense of Hudson, especially a sense of his "character." Two of his most often repeated character traits were his "energy" and his "activity." Yet these characteristics are not drawn from known biography, but instead are used to help understand the unfamiliar parts of his life. There are two leaps in Hudson's story that were difficult to comprehend: the first is his movement from draper's apprentice to wealthy partner in the firm, and the second his jump from someone with an inheritance of £30,000 to someone whose wealth is so extensive as to be uncountable. These social leaps, I suggest, were explained through the rather vague character traits of being "energetic" and "active."

Much of the writing about Hudson in the period is characterized by the attempt to describe his characteristics. Most frequently he was described as unpolished, peremptory, brusque, simple, abrupt, pushing, bustling, talkative, polite, able, organized, clear-headed, monosyllabic. A cursory examination of these traits reveals that some of them are contradictory: monosyllabic and talkative; polite and unpolished. Others just seem puzzling. If he is monosyllabic, how could one determine his clear-headedness? This confusion arises because Hudson's character is merely a redaction of descriptions of his work. And his work was something that nobody quite understood. In the following we can see how two of his professions, draper and amalgamator of railways, engendered two contradictory traits, what *Fraser's* calls "brusquerie" and politeness:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> If he gave his orders to an errand-boy with the same rough peremptoriness that in after years conveyed the railway dictator's will to some non-amalgamating line, he would unfold a roll of linen to some fair and favoured customer with the same profusion of courtesy, the same incoherent professions, the same short, heavy duckings and bowings, with which he will now apologize to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after having pertinaciously plagued him for ten minutes about what has, perhaps, arisen from some mistake of his own, but maintained with his accustomed self-relying determination. ("Outlines in Parliament" 217)

Understanding Hudson's character thus involved understanding his day-to-day affairs. After his move to London in 1845, people began to make pilgrimages to his Albert Gate home to watch him at work: "You found him immersed in a multitudinous sea of papers—estimates, evidence, correspondence—surrounded by clerks, giving audience to deputations, or members of parliament, or engineers" (Francis 219). What he did and how he did it fascinated people: "he would throw his head on the back of his chair, cover his eyes with his hands, arrange expenses, and form the most elaborate combination of figures" (Lambert 73). In the context of his home office his character is revealed in terms of his business: "Your business must be cut and dried. He listened, not always patiently or politely, but with sundry fidgettings and gruntings, to your story, gave you your answer in a few brief monosyllables, turned his back, took up the affair that came next, and--you were shewn out" (Francis 219). Because he is so good at what he does, he behaves brusquely: "His experience and clear insight make him impatient of details—he cuts off the most anxious applicant or the most convincing statement with a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'Yes!' or a 'No!' or a 'That won't do!' and, having got so much distilled from the royal lips, the sooner you abscond the better" (Francis 219).

The Victorians were fascinated by what Hudson did for a living because he represented the rise of a new social breed. Yet what Hudson did for a living represented a challenge to narration, for the morality of his endeavors was ambiguous, and narration without morality for the Victorians was hard to navigate. For this reason vague and sometimes contradictory traits were ascribed to him. Hence, Hudson's "energy" came to stand in for a whole group of work activities that were not fully understood by the general public, and his "brusquerie" mystified market practices by not giving him a voice, for Hudson when he did "speak" voiced the ideology of monopoly capital and unregulated industry better than any other. He is credited with "winning" the mid-decade arguments with Gladstone, who advocated state-controlled expansion of railways, while Hudson argued that monopoly and unregulated growth were the best way to promote railways in England.[4] The result was that because England's transportation system was largely left to the market, and not to government planning, and few laws were in place as to how that market would be governed, a breed of sometimes reputable, often disreputable characters arose and flourished--the jobbers, speculators, investors, promoters and projectors who helter-skelter raised the monies for the projects. Hudson was representative of these men. And what he stood for became unbearable for the nation, so much so that it chose not to represent him, and by so doing could ignore what he did represent.

---

[4] In 1844 a sharp increase in railway company rivalries coupled with a large number of railway bills coming into Parliament prompted William Gladstone, president of the Board of Trade, to set up a House of Commons committee of inquiry into the railways. Many railway proprietors saw this as the beginning of state control, and Hudson headed a campaign of opposition. In a private meeting with Gladstone a compromise was made which removed the immediate prospect of railway nationalization (Reed).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Through the discourse surrounding the Hudson Testimonial, we can best see the anxieties about what Hudson represented. The testimonial coincided with two events that raised his status as a national figure: the purchase of his London home, an act that was symbolic of a move from the periphery to the center, and his entrance into Parliament. Both of these events raised Hudson's national presence, but it was the testimonial, which was opened to the general public through various boards of directors, that made Hudson's significance a public concern. When the testimonial opened in October of 1845, subscriptions poured in from all parts of the nation until it closed three months later with £25,000 to £30,000 received. The testimonial opened up a site for people to discuss and evaluate the type of man whose activities were frequently called "unparalleled and unprecedented." Up until this point, critical discussion had not often reached the public realm; there were even suggestions that it was impolitic to criticize the "King" publicly. However, through the testimonial responses in the form of letters to newspapers across the country, Hudson was converted into a representative figure.

The advertisement for the testimonial that appeared in the nation's principal papers in October stressed its public nature:

> The committee feel that it is wholly unnecessary for them to attempt to urge the powerful claims of Mr. Hudson to the gratitude and respect, not only of all who are shareholders in the several lines of railway with which he is concerned, but of the public generally. His pre-eminent services are universally appreciated and acknowledged: and of the success that has attended his labours the public have experienced the most abundant and satisfactory proof. (*The Times* 6 October 1845)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Within only a couple of weeks, £20,000 had been raised towards the testimonial, and money kept pouring in. But as directors, politicians, engineers, contractors, and lawyers paid tribute to the hero, others began to question his worthiness. The critique warrants attention because although it often took the form of ad hominem attacks against a "greedy" and "selfish" man, more was being challenged than just Hudson. In the following response to the Hudson Testimonial, for example, what begins as an attack upon Hudson's character, ends with a question about Hudson's relation to the nation:

> George Hudson, a man reared behind a counter in York, with scarcely two ideas in his head, was left money by some relative or other, and speculated in railway scrip and railway shares, by which means he accumulated vast wealth, bought estates from Dukes, lords and commoners, and latterly he sought and found admission into the House of Commons as M.P. for Sunderland. He never did any great thing for his country. All he has done has been for himself. (*The Times* 23 March 1846)

Implied here is that a great man should serve a nation and not himself.

Often the testimonial responses take the form of comparison pieces. As above, the "greedy," "selfish" Hudson is compared either directly or implicitly to an unselfish, humane man. For example Sidney Bernard and Thomas Waghorn were compared to Hudson. Sidney Bernard was an English surgeon who boarded the *Eclair*, a ship that contracted a plague off the port of Madeira and was forbidden to dock, and then guided the ship home, only to perish on the way. *The Times* commented, "A more signal act of cool disinterested heroism is not on record" (28 November 1845). Similarly, Thomas Waghorn was perceived as contributing to the public good. According to *The Times*, he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dedicated his life to building a road through Egypt to India, and in 1846, in a contrast piece between Waghorn and Hudson, Waghorn came out on top:

> Thomas Waghorn, a brave officer, has crossed the burning sands of Egypt again and again to find out a short route between England and India. Whereas that journey, a few years ago, could not be accomplished in less than two, three, four, and sometimes six months, Thomas Waghorn has succeeded in throwing it open within the space of 30 days. (23 March 1846)

Further, *The Times* described Waghorn as "opening up a communication between millions of the human race. He is adding to the grandeur and glory of England" (23 March 1846). By comparison, Hudson was perceived as achieving nothing for England and nothing for the human race.

Bernard had no testimonial despite his lofty contributions to humanity: "Alas, for Sidney Bernard and the gallant volunteers of the *Éclair*; alas, for their widows and orphans! No testimonial is proposed to record their daring humanity; no subscription is raised for the families of the dead" (*The Times* 19 November 1845). And Waghorn was only a little better off:

> He is enriching its [England's] merchants—stretching out incalculable bounds for their enterprise; and what have they done for him? There was laid down at the bar of the Royal Exchange, the other day, a subscription paper for some 'testimonial' to Thomas Waghorn. It lay there for four days—it lies there still. Some 10 or 12 Glasgow firms have subscribed in all £70 to it. Blush, ye mammon-worshippers of George Hudson! And let

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> our ears tingle ye ungrateful recipients of the matchless services of Thomas Waghorn! (*The Times* 23 March 1846)[5]

Comparing Hudson to Bernard and Waghorn made clear that Hudson was not a humanitarian and not a civilizer.

Underlying the testimonial critiques is the question: what type of man should represent our nation? This suggests that the real agenda in the comparison is the creation of a "character" for the spot of national hero. The problem is that the projector, speculator, or investor cannot be ignored in this project at this time. Yet to have a projector represent the nation would be, in *Punch's* words, "monstrous." However, Hudson's testimonial and the critique that followed did in fact turn him into a representative figure of the age, as *Tait's Edinburgh* observes of Hudson at the end of the decade: "Mr. Hudson will be accepted as the most appropriate illustration of the speculative and railway spirit in the current decennial period" (Troup 320). But the anxieties in the reports about this figure show not just a reservation about Hudson but one about the role of the projector in the nation.

By 1849 it was clear that Hudson's Statue would not be built, yet Carlyle still wrote a piece of invective against its erection one year later. Carlyle saw clearly that Hudson was representative of the age, or perhaps more importantly, he saw that the character of the age was reflected in Hudson: "If Odin, who 'invented runes,' or literatures, and rhythmic logical speech, and taught men to despise death, is worshipped in one epoch; and if Hudson, who conquered railway directors, and taught men to

---

[5] Thomas Waghorn, however, did gain the national recognition that *The Times* believed he deserved only four years later upon his death when a moving "Diorama of the Overland Route to India" was shown in Regent Street and widely attended.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

become suddenly rich by scrip, is worshipped in another, --the characters of these two epochs must differ a good deal!" (238) Carlyle may have argued that he wanted Hudson's memory expunged—"if you would have sunk a coalshaft . . . deep coalshaft, there to bury him and his memory, that men might never speak or hear of him more" (226)--, yet what he argued more effectively was that he wanted an age expunged. Carlyle wanted to rid the epoch of the projectors, investors, and speculators that made it distinctive. He wanted to stamp out the *laissez-faire* morality that defined the age. In short, he wanted to rid the age of its character.

Merdle's Complaint

Few Victorians were more vocal in their dislike of Hudson than Charles Dickens, who said, "I find a burning disgust arising in my mind—a sort of morbid canker of the most frightful description—against Mister Hudson. . . . There are some dogs who can't endure one particular note on the piano. In like manner I feel disposed to throw up my head and howl, whenever I hear Mr. Hudson mentioned" (Bailey 70). Yet there are few writers who grappled more productively with the Hudson tradition. Dickens recognized on some level that England must celebrate its risk-takers and capital raisers if it were to compete on an international level. In the late fifties, the promoter was beginning to be revalued, and we can see this revaluation process in Dickens' *Little Dorrit* (1855-57). Reading *Little Dorrit* offers us the chance to view the social death of the character of the projector, a phenomenon that we already saw with Carlyle's "burial" of Hudson. But *Little Dorrit* is most important because it allows us to see the necessary reconstitution of this character into a socially acceptable form.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dickens ushered the Hudson type into literature with the figure of Merdle, of whom he said, “If I might make so bold as to defend that extravagant conception, Mr. Merdle, I would hint that it originated after the Railroad share epoch, in times of a certain Irish bank, and of one or two other equally laudable enterprises” (*Little Dorrit* xxi). Merdle was not meant to represent Hudson, but rather John Sadleir, the Irish MP. Sadleir was a railway and bank promoter who had perpetrated extensive fraud and committed suicide in 1856 after the discovery of his involvement in the Tipperary Bank scandal. However, Dickens was critiquing a type not a man, and Hudson’s indecipherability was more representative of that type than Sadleir’s transparency. Everybody knew what Sadleir was--he was a scoundrel and a swindler--but Hudson’s contribution to society was not fully understood. Despite Carlyle’s attempts to limit his cultural significance, the ambiguity surrounding Hudson was still alive. Merdle’s character relies on a cultural moment of indecipherability of the Hudson type.

Merdle is a mystery that muddles its way through Dickens’ text. The essence of his character is the muddle that his name evokes.[6] Dickens introduces him in a chapter called “Merdle’s Complaint,” in which Merdle has a complaint, but nobody knows what it is, not even his doctor, “I can find nothing the matter with Mr. Merdle. . . . He may have some deep-seated recondite complaint. I can’t say. I only say that at present I have

---

[6] Merdle, of course, is a scatological pun. But even as such its meaning is opaque. Christopher Herbert argues that Merdle “is money incarnate” (202). Thus Merdle’s transformation from gold to shit during the course of the novel follows the famous Freudian formula of the equivalence of money and excrement. Herbert uses Merdle to reveal the taboo nature of money during the century, thus challenging James Frazer’s notion of “taboo” originating in “primitive” societies. Frazer, studying Polynesian societies, argues that the concepts of the sacred and the filthy are originally the same, while Herbert, studying Victorian England, points out that money for the Victorians was a taboo in that it was considered both divine and polluted.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

not found it out" (*Little Dorrit* 212). Merdle is inscrutable, and it is precisely this inscrutability that is essential to the Merdle plot, which can function only if nobody understands what he does. "Nobody, as aforesaid, knew what he had done; but everybody knew him to be the greatest that had appeared" (476). Merdle's profession is as incomprehensible as the money system itself: "nobody knew with the least precision what Mr. Merdle's business was, except that it was coining money" (331). Slyly, the text avoids clear labels: Merdle is vaguely called "a world-famed capitalist."

Merdle's inscrutability is reinforced by novelistic devices. In the exposition of his theory of heteroglossia, Mikhail Bakhtin turned to *Little Dorrit* to demonstrate the hybrid nature of discourse in the British comic novel. Hybrid utterances belong grammatically and compositionally to single speakers, but actually contain mixed within two utterances, manners or styles (Bakhtin 304). Bakhtin quotes from *Little Dorrit* to demonstrate this:

> It was a dinner to provoke an appetite, though he [Bar] had not had one. The rarest dishes, sumptuously cooked and sumptuously served; the choicest fruits, the most exquisite wines; marvels of workmanship in gold and silver, china and glass; innumerable things delicious to the senses of taste, smell and sight, were insinuated into its composition. *O, what a wonderful man this Merdle, what a great man, what a master man, how blessedly and enviably endowed*—in a word, what a rich man! (304)

Bakhtin explains that the passage starts with a "parodic stylization of high epic style," and then beginning with the italicized portion moves into "concealed speech of another." This concealed speech represents a chorus of enthusiastic Merdle worshipers, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

society in general, but is undercut by a return to an authorial utterance, "in a word, what a rich man." Hence, the hypocrisy of the social chorus is unmasked. Bakhtin says that here the merging of authorial speech with common opinion exposes the hypocrisy and greed of the common opinion.

All of Bakhtin's examples of hybridity in the English novel circle around Merdle. Bakhtin turns to *Little Dorrit* because Merdle is a heteroglossic composite. His character is most often produced by a mixture of two or more social voices. Authorial input is so diluted in this process that one feels as if one is never getting a clear view of Merdle. This is not to say that readers do not know he is bad; we do. And hybridity allows us to be privy to this knowledge. However, Dickens' use of hybridity in Merdle is extreme. Authorial utterances concerning Merdle are never anything but hybrid or heteroglossic. This is not the case with other characters in the novel such as Clennam, Pancks, or Little Dorrit herself. It is even not the case of the other comic characters of the novel, Rigaud and Casby. Merdle is unique in that he does not exist outside of the context of the hybrid or heteroglossic utterance.

Thus, stylistically, Merdle is a Hudsonian conundrum. On the one hand, the lack of authorial sanctioning makes him the most unstable character in the novel. On the other hand, he has foundations firmly rooted in society. His character, like Hudson's, is a pure social formation; born, as Dickens had said, of the Railway share epoch and great bank failures, he is a record of the social voices of speculative mania, and as such a unique narration of this period. Dickens has found a way to narrate *laissez-faire* morality. Moreover, this endeavor takes the form of a "character" for whom the narrator

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

refuses responsibility. And in the production of this character, Dickens absolves himself of authorial responsibility, allowing Merdle to arise from the depths of the novel itself.[7]

Merdle's emergence from the belly of the novel makes it difficult to fix his meaning because we have so few authorial markers to hold onto. One way to know a person is to know what he does for a living; however the plot of *Little Dorrit* insists on an inexact knowledge of his profession.[8] He, like Hudson, is a projector, investor, speculator, but these words are vague. Further, in the novel, the vagueness about who Merdle is allows others to be ensnared by his schemes. Notice this slippage between the description of Merdle and his schemes: "He's a man of immense resources—enormous capital—government influence. They're the best schemes afloat. They're safe. They're certain" (487). The person who is most affected by Merdle's schemes is Arthur Clennam, who has just returned from operating his family's business in China. After twenty years, he comes home to extricate himself from the business and to "set things right." Clennam, characterized by his carefulness, is the very last person we expect to find investing with Merdle. Yet he invests all of the money of his friend and business

---

[7] Merdle arises from the novel if we accept Bakhtin's definition of the novel as a diversity of social speech types and individual languages as opposed to other genres which rely heavily upon authorial input. If we couple Bakhtin's definition with his idea that the novel is the only form in direct contact with developing reality, we can see why Merdle is produced stylistically as a heteroglossic composite and why he is the most "novelistic" of Dickens' productions.

[8]This may be a function of what Mary Poovey calls the "cultures of investment." Poovey argues that beginning in the late 1840s novelistic plots began to incorporate features of the financial journalism that arose in the 1840s, such as the normalization of what she calls the "dynamic of disclosure and secrecy." Financial journalism is characterized by a style that both reveals information necessary to a functioning economy, and keeps hidden business secrets. Novelists adopted this style. Thus, in Poovey's reading the inexact knowledge about business that circulates in this text is an example of financial journalism's influence on the novel.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

partner, Daniel Doyce, into Merdle's projects, a move which lands Clennam in debtor's prison. Instead of putting things in order, he succumbs to the chaos of the market. How does the text explain such an incongruent step? What causes him to take this financial misstep can be traced to a conversation that he has with his friend Pancks about Merdle's enterprises. A fundamental lack of understanding about the workings of the market economy of the thirties and forties allows Clennam to make this grave error. Clennam asks Pancks:

> "is it not curious, Pancks, that the ventures which run just now in so many people's heads, should run even in little Cavalleto's?" "Ventures?" retorted Pancks, with a snort. "What ventures?" "These Merdle enterprises." "Oh! Investments," said Pancks. "Aye, aye! I didn't know you were speaking of investments." (*Little Dorrit* 486)

Ventures, enterprises, investments are all words suggesting similar activities; however, they have slightly different meanings. Pancks considers Clennam's original question, but does not answer it. Instead, he gets stuck on a word; he continues: "Yes. Investments is the word" (486). In turn Clennam doesn't follow; instead he returns to his original question, but chooses the wrong word, "speculate": "Right in sharing Cavalletto's inclination to speculate with Mr. Merdle?" "Per-fectly, sir," said Pancks. "I've gone into it. I've made the calculations. I've worked it. They're safe and genuine" (487). Still Clennam doesn't stay with the word "speculate," and when the subject comes around again, Clennam chooses another, "And you have really invested," Clennam had already passed to that word, "your thousand pounds, Pancks?" (488) Stranger than Clennam's conversion from the word "speculate" to the word "invest" is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the narrator's need to make note of it ("Clennam had already passed to that word.") The conversation finishes with the word "invest" and Clennam decides to "invest" with Merdle.

This self-conscious word play shows the importance of the developing terminology of business in the period as well as an underdeveloped understanding of that terminology. Pancks steers the conversation away from certain words like "venture" to which he reacts with a bold snort. He is aware of the connotations of such words, while Clennam is not. "Venture" is a risky word and it is an old word, having too many associations with the merchant-venturers, who beginning in the sixteenth century, criss-crossed the seas with their wares, risking in the process life and material loss. "Venture" could be the death knell of a new economy. To raise the massive amounts of money necessary to create railways throughout England, capitalism needed to cast its net wider than the few hero-adventurer types who would risk life and product for material gain. Too few people wanted to take on that adventure; instead they wanted something, as Pancks states, "safe." Pancks knows intuitively that "investments" is a better word, a safer word, yet he does not seem to understand the nature of the word "speculate."[9] The meaning of speculate was ambiguous, and was more indicative of the general lack of understanding about capital raising in the period. In some cases, "speculate" was used synonymously with "invest." But in many cases "speculate" had more risk attached, and had associations with get rich quick schemes and fraudulent

---

[9] At no period in history does the *OED* record "invest" as having a negative connotation. Commenting upon the positive valuation of the word invest in the early nineteenth century, Mary Poovey argues that words like invest helped to normalize radical business cycles of the first half of the century, because they created the illusion that there were "good" as well as "bad" investments (called speculations.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

activities. In this latter usage, "speculator" describes the first one on the scene--buying quickly and quickly unloading what they bought as in this 1849 usage: "railway speculators who invested merely for the day, to sell again to-morrow, if the market rose" (Troup 321).[10] The "investors" followed seeking a smaller but more permanent return on capital. Thus when Pancks steers Clennam away from words like "venture" and "speculate," he is demonstrating a developing consciousness of a morality of the market that is associated with safeness and stability.[11] Pancks knows more about the market because he, as a rent collector, has been exposed to money matters. Clennam, on the other hand, a "stranger in England," has no recent knowledge of the English economy. He is not aware of England's radical speculative growth cycles, and the new aggressiveness of the free market economy. But most importantly, he has no knowledge of this new market's principal characters as he learns to his and Daniel Doyce's sorrow. For soon after this scene between Pancks and Clennam, we discover that Merdle's Complaint had been "simply Forgery and Robbery" (*Little Dorrit* 594). Merdle murders

---

[10] Timothy Alborn shows how "speculation" in early railways in the 1830s and 1840s was qualitatively different from trading in other sorts of company shares due to railway's unique political circumstances which involved winning Parliamentary approval. The result was that "during the long period between projection and incorporation, railway investors were traders" (189). This (along with increases in volume and amount of people trading) explains the anxieties surrounding the manias of the 1830s and 1840s, and it also explains the widening difference between the words "speculate" and "invest" in the period: "In railways there was a clearer distinction between the 'speculative' period when the line was still being debated in Parliament and when cost estimates were being bandied about, and the 'construction' period when permanent investors settled down to pay calls and collect dividends" (189-190).

[11] Elaine Freedgood's theorization of risk in the nineteenth century is useful here. She argues that England is textually constructed as "safe" between 1832 and 1897 so that risk could be either avoided in England or engaged on a voluntary basis. In contrast to Anthony Giddens, Niklas Luhmann, and Marshall Berman, who believe that modernity is characterized by an acceptance of risk, she argues that it is characterized by risk's geographical containment in space constructed as "safe" in a wide range of literatures.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

himself with a penknife to the jugular in a public bath. With that, the text seemingly absolves itself of its major conundrum. Dramatic as his death may seem, Merdle's death comes from a re-labeling of him--from Banker to Forger, from Projector to Swindler. His character is killed along with its ambiguity.

Even after Merdle's death Dickens in *Little Dorrit* continues to be concerned with the problem of Merdle. More precisely, he is concerned with Merdle's progeny and with the nation's productive future. How will the nation continue to raise the capital needed for its large projects without relying on criminals (or the criminalization of men) like Merdle? How will the nation learn to evaluate and understand its risk-takers and capital raisers so as to compete productively--and safely--on an international level? Dickens in this novel comes up with a creative solution to capital reproduction, and one that seems to be a specific response to the Merdle/Hudson phenomenon. He posits a new sort of character, one who can take care of the nation's business without taking on the ugly undertones of such associations.

Little Dorrit posits a strange cartography. Amongst its gloomy streets and its repressed and stifling prisons and governmental institutions exists a variety of Victorian business activity, almost all of which could be described as is the Clennam family business, "out of date and out of purpose" (37). The Clennams, the Dorrits, Monsieur Blandois, Casby, Pancks, the Plornishes, and Daniel Doyce all dabble in business. A business debt structures the first half of the novel, for Mr. Dorrit sits in prison because he had signed a bond for "the performance of a contract that was not at all performed" (471). Because of the debt he incurred, his business in "spirits, or buttons, or wine, or blacking, or oatmeal, or woolen, or pork, or hooks and eyes, or iron, or treacle, or shoes"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(471) went bust, and he went to prison. Further, Arthur Clennam returns home to a family business with which he wants nothing more to do.[12] Housed in a gothic setting of nocturnal perambulating, subterranean meetings, and family secreting, this home business is "on the decline" and marked by a sense of decay and lack of currency. In the end, it mysteriously collapses, taking with it all of its supporters. Monsieur Blandois, who often visits the house on "what he calls business," disappears under the rubble. This French wife-killer and swindler ran a dubious blackmailing business. Another type of business is represented by Casby, the real-estate mogul, the patriarch who has Pancks collect his rents, giving him "all of the dirt of the business" while he takes "all the profits." Pancks exposes him as the rackrenter that he really is, and shears him of his flattering locks. Exhibiting a wide-ranging vocabulary for such cheats, Pancks publicly outs his dirty dealings calling him a driver, screwer, wringer, squeezer, shaver, deceiver, sneak, and bottle-green smiler. Even the unemployed working-class Plornishes are set up in business in the Bleeding Heart Yard by Mr. Dorrit who helps them establish a local store, but they are plagued with cash-flow problems, for their poor neighbors buy on credit, which they never pay off.

Indeed, the outlook of business of all sorts in this novel appears to be grim: business seems to be losing its productive capacities. But actually the novel presents it in all of its stereotyped connotations in order to finally present a viable model. The way that the word "business" is in play can be seen in its application to Mr. Meagles. Mrs. Gowan, an aristocrat with no money of her own, describes Mr. Meagles, the banker who

---

[12] The nature of the Clennam business is never clarified in the text. Wenying Xu argues that the silence on this matter suggests that the Clennam's were trading in opium; thus he reads Clennam's sickness with the family business as his guilt (and national guilt) about being involved in the drug business.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supplies her son with money through his marriage to Mr. Meagles' daughter, Pet, "as a man of the world and one of the most business-like of human beings—for you know you are business-like, and a great deal too much for us who are not" (435). An authorial voice then explains that what Mrs. Gowan means by "business-like" is "artful schemer" (435). By the end of the novel, however, Mr. Meagles proudly claims, "I am a man of business" (677), suggesting that that term has been shaken of such negative connotations.[13]

For the type of revitalization that we see here to occur, two of its inhibiting objects must be disposed of. First, business must be cleared of provincial attitudes that hold back its growth. The houses of Dorrit and Clennam represent a stagnant provincialism about business practice. Both of these businesses live within the family name. Dorrit's comfort in his prison cell suggests a certain provincial mindset. The Clennams, who branched out to China, came home empty-handed. They are literally housebound. Mrs. Clennam is a prisoner of her home, never leaving it until the day of her dramatic death. When the Clennam house crumbles to the ground, the Clennam firm is no more. And second, business must be rid of deep-rooted cultural prejudices that are raised by its mere presence. These attitudes hold that all business activity is synonymous with fraud or gambling, and that dabblers in the market are either swindlers or, as Carlyle called Hudson, gamblers swollen big. Blandois and Casby, for example, are produced as unambiguously corrupt swindlers and frauds. Blandois represents the fear of free-trade's potential: the creation of unimpeded and uncontrollable flows across

[13] I am not suggesting that Meagles is the first positively presented businessman in a Dickens' novel. The Cheeryble brothers of *Nicholas Nicholby* are of course presented in a positive light. I am however suggesting that through Meagles we can see how business is valuated through the text.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

borders; he crosses no less than six borders. He is a self-proclaimed "cosmopolitan," and he is at home in the world as his accent-less speech shows. His threat is not only the threat of the Other—the not-French, French swindler, who sucks the lifeblood from the country, while filling his own purse—but also the threat of unfettered trade. Casby, on the other hand, represents the opposite. He is home based, and his business is profoundly English, one of collecting rents on property. The profundity and richness of the vocabulary that Pancks hurls at him shows how long his type has been around. He symbolizes economic stagnation resulting from an old way of doing business. Clennam notes that Casby was "as unchanged in twenty years and upwards, as his own solid furniture" (121), and he associates Casby's establishment with his own unchanging family business ("The house . . . is as little changed as my mother's" (120)). In the end, however, Casby's treatment differs from that of Blandois and Clennam's mother. He is not expunged, but rather changed. His appearance is drastically altered, when Pancks takes scissors to his hair.

Merdle should be understood in relation to these two men. Like Blandois, he is a man without a country, and he stands for the threat of the free flow of goods and ideas. While he is of a much newer breed of businessman, he has become affectively tied to these other two through his greediness, lack of human concern, and hypocrisy. The cultural prejudice against Blandois and Casby also bleeds onto him. The fate he suffers, though, is that of the foreigner, suggesting which prejudice is more dangerous.

Of all the businesses in *Little Dorrit*, the Plornish "grocery and general trade" store is most puzzling. It neither gets expunged nor reformed. Instead, it impossibly hobbles on with all of its credit problems, miraculously producing goods from behind

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the counter, which are faithfully consumed, never paid for, and always replenished. Further, the store represents the influx of a new type of product into the Bleeding Heart Yard to which its working class inhabitants were "unaccustomed"--the luxury item. Perhaps the Plornishes represent the fantasy of modern empire: endless consumption without an evaluation of the cost. At the very least, their presence raises the question: where do they get their money? Since Mr. Dorrit set them up in business, we may assume that it is he who continues to fund them, but his untimely death negates that possibility. The mystery that the Plornishes provoke, especially how the consumption habits of the Bleeding Heart Yard will continue to be met, lead us to turn to the only other business in the Yard, located at its "other end." If the Plornishes raise questions about consumption, the Doyce and Clennam company do so about production. Dickens frames the latter as a problem of management.

Doyce's business goes through more changes than any other in the novel, but they are only registered at the management level. In the beginning of the novel Doyce is the primary owner of the foundry; he also performs the duties of projector, manager, inventor, engineer, and keeper of books. Soon, however, a deal to split the ownership of the factory with Clennam saves Doyce from going out of business. The novel ends with the promise of the adoption of a third partner, Pancks, projecting the firm's growth into the future and suggesting that this business is the most productive of the novel.

Business Matters

Though Clennam, the character with the strongest anti-business sentiment in the text comes home from abroad precisely to abandon his family business ("I have given up everything in life for the business, and the time came for me to give up that" (30)), he is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

recouped by this text, and re-established in business in a new way. Clennam's relation to a changing business climate is established when he returns to his family business in which "nothing has changed" in over twenty years and refuses to move into the Clennam House of business. Instead, he lives separately and establishes "daily business hours" (47) at the Clennam House, two acts which represent a more modern way of doing business. But more importantly, Clennam's new role is established when he becomes partners with Daniel Doyce, who is an inventor, engineer, and projector but is not fit for the business side of business, as he explains to Clennam ("No inventor can be a man of business, you know" (161)). He is a projector and an inventor, not a calculator and keeper of books. The split between these two functions is strongly upheld by Doyce when he explains his need to partner: "so I find that I must have a partner who is a man of business and not guilty of any inventions" (161). Thus the Doyce/Clennam partnership is a solution to an economic problem. It is also a solution to Clennam's personal problem, invigorating him and giving his life modern meaning, "it opened to him an active and promising career" (222). The word "career" depends upon modern ideals of personal advancement and only obtains its current meaning in the nineteenth century.[14]

But it is not a solution to the national problem. Doyce sees his work as part of a national project. He says he wants to do "something serviceable to the nation" (168). Doyce's patriotic conception of business differs from what is expected of Clennam when

---

[14] The *OED* defines "career" in its most modern sense as: "A course of professional life or employment, which affords opportunity for progress or advancement in the world," and dates it to the early nineteenth century. That it is first used in the context of the diplomatic career, "A more difficult negotiation than you have ever had in your diplomatic career" (Wellington *Disp. II.* 424 1803), suggests the nationalistic undertones that the word must have carried when applied to other types of employment.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he returns home to his family business. Mrs. Clennam believed that he "would infuse new youth and strength into it, and make it a great profit and power" (44), that is profit put to the private use of the revival of the family fortunes. In contrast, Doyce only has the "public interests" at heart. But because the Circumlocution Office does not recognize public interests, Doyce reasons, he must seek work abroad, saying of England and its governmental Circumlocution Office: "Have you ever heard of any projector or inventor . . . whom it did not discourage and illtreat?" (103) Thus he goes abroad to a place where projectors and inventors are encouraged, while Clennam runs their business at home. Unfortunately Clennam is no more fit for business than Doyce; his calculations are off. He speculates with Merdle, and ends up in jail. The partnership, as configured, is shown to be unproductive.

The text dramatizes this unproductive partnership in order to fix it. It uncouples the business/inventor pair in order to reunite them in a much stronger and more productive form. In the final chapters, Clennam sits depressed and in prison, not unlike Mr. Dorrit before him. Outside of the prison walls Little Dorrit is poising herself to marry him. All is in place for the anticipated marriage. But something must be done before the marriage can happen. Mr. Meagles explains: "We must have Dan here . . . we must have Doyce here. I devote myself, at daybreak tomorrow morning, to bringing Doyce here" (678). Thus Doyce is fetched from abroad and brought back to England. But on returning he makes a proposal of his own. After telling Clennam that all was right, he tells him the real news: "that a new and prosperous career was opened before you and me as partners" (686). Of course Doyce and Clennam were already partners, but Dickens raises their partnership to a new status. He places it on the level of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

marriage, having Doyce and Clennam's partnership take place in the same temporal frame as the Clennam/Dorrit wedding. And most importantly he moves the partnership scene to the textually privileged position in the novel. Thus, *Little Dorrit* ends with a second marriage, the Partnering of Doyce and Clennam, the successful joining together of the engineer/inventor/projector with the man of business.

Lesseps' Visit

Little Dorrit is divided into two unlike parts. The first begins in a French prison and swiftly relocates to the prison cells and suffocating rooms of England, and the second begins in the Swiss Alps and weaves through Europe following the spatial logic of a grand tour. While the first part is claustrophobic and close, the second is loose and open. Structurally, it is almost two separate novels. Actually, this two-part structure can be understood as a part of the business plot. It enables Dickens to reconsider business in a wider perspective, adding life-blood to English business, by encouraging a flow of people and goods across borders. Critics have commented upon the items that the Meagles bring home from abroad with which they decorate their home. Indeed the Meagles' exotic baubles distract one from the other goods that flow into England from abroad in this novel. The most important inflowing commodity is information. In Antwerp Blandois receives the information that makes his blackmail trade possible. Meagles gathers important information in France when he collects the suitcase that holds the long-concealed codicil to the will that threatens to alter Little Dorrit's life. And most importantly Daniel Doyce comes home from his sojourn into "barbaric" lands with knowledge that is vital for his business and necessary for his country.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In fact, Doyce comes home a better man than he left: richer, more prosperous, and better able to take care of business. Furthermore, Doyce has done the impossible: he has circumvented the Circumlocution Office. The fact that it took years to put Mr. Dorrit's financial affairs in order, while it only took Doyce a few days to clear up Clennam's accounts makes one want to know exactly what Doyce learned abroad. The little we are told of Doyce's experience in an unnamed Arab-speaking land is impressive: "Dan is directing works and executing labors over yonder, that it would make your hair stand on end to look at. He's no public offender, bless you now! He's medaled and ribboned, and starred and crossed, and I don't-know-what all'd, like a born nobleman" (685). In 1891 Richard Theodore Ely wrote in his *An Introduction to Political Economy*, "We have been obliged to resort to the French language for a word to designate the person who organizes and directs the productive factors, and we call such a one an entrepreneur" (Ely 170). I suggest that abroad Dan Doyce learned to be an entrepreneur.

Throughout the fifties the Frenchman Ferdinand de Lesseps visited England to promote the Suez Canal to the British Public. He canvassed the country visiting business groups, newspapers, and politicians in every major city. He carried with him maps and drawings and plenty of calculations. While the business community embraced him, the government and its officials did not. After consulting the prominent railway engineer, Robert Stephenson, Lord Palmerston labeled Lesseps' project 'impracticable,' and nearly no British people invested in his shares.[15] Although he was not able to

---

[15] Samuel Smiles records that Stephenson said, "I have surveyed the line . . . I have traveled the whole distance on foot, and I declare there is no fall between the two seas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

persuade them to purchase his wares, they did seem interested in a more intangible offering. His arrival into England was simultaneous with another: in the fifties the British imported the French word "entrepreneur" into common parlance, and the *OED* attributes the first everyday usage of the word to Carlyle in 1852. Before that, it had only been used academically by British political economists who had borrowed the term from the French in the 1830s.[16] Lesseps came to represent the ideal of the entrepreneur to the British public just at the moment when the nation was in need of such a representation. He embodied the spirit of enterprise and investment, and represented culturally what figures like Hudson and Merdle did not.

According to Bert F. Hozelitz, the most common term in use in nineteenth century England to describe men like Hudson and Merdle was "capitalist." But this word was overly general, while other words, such as "projector" and "promoter," perhaps more precise, became increasingly opprobrious.[17] While Hozelitz suggests that "capitalist" was used by the British throughout the nineteenth century until "entrepreneur" was adopted at the century's end, I will argue that earlier than this there was a cultural need

---

Honourable members talk about a canal. A canal is impossible—the thing would only be a ditch" (*Lives* 463).

[16] Maxine Berg points out that G. Koolman argues that it was not until the 1830s that British political economists recognized the role of the entrepreneur. G.P. Scrope, Samuel Read, and George Ramsay took the idea of the entrepreneur from the French philosopher J.B. Say, who claimed the entrepreneur as his own concept at the turn of the century (Berg 123).

[17] Before the advent of the nineteenth century the most common word used to describe the entrepreneur was "undertaker" or "adventurer." Adam Smith, for example, chose the word "undertaker" to translate the French word entrepreneur; however, by the nineteenth century the economic sense of undertaker became obsolete and only the funerary sense remained (Hozelitz 243).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to have a term that was both more specific and more positive than the ones in existence, and that this desire was related to colonial expansion.

"Speculate," "promote," and "project" were three commonly used words in the beginning of the century. Although they always had had a seamier side, these words became less flattering as the century progressed. "Promoter" from the French *promoteur*, which had been in use since the mid-fifteenth century, and had the relatively neutral meaning of "one who or that which promotes, advances, or furthers any movement or project; a furtherer, an encourager" (*OED*), began to take on negative undertones in the nineteenth century. Thus by the 1870s readers of *World* had to be assured that: "A promoter, *quoad* promoter, is not necessarily a bad man" (*OED*). "Projector," borrowed from the French, *projecteur*, was popularized in the seventeenth century. Like "promoter," its early usage was relatively free of negative connotations. It simply meant "one who forms a project, who plans or designs some enterprise or undertaking; a founder" (*OED*). However soon it accumulated negative connotations which are apparent in a 1667 usage by S. Primatt: "There are as many Projectors (who have more of fancy and imagination in their Designs, than of any real operation) that do undertake in the dreining these and other sorts of mines" (Hoselitz 242). By 1729 the word is adopted in a truly ironic form to name the profession of the speaker of Swift's "A Modest Proposal." Henceforth the projector is potentially suspect. In the nineteenth century "promoter" and "projector" are imbued with hybridity. On the one hand they signify productivity and generation; on the other the cool calculation of a schemer or cheat.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The word "entrepreneur," however, took on positive connotations early. It gets the business done without the negative undertones of its predecessors. According to the French philosopher J.B. Say, who is often credited with introducing the concept of the entrepreneur into economic literature in his 1803 *Traité* (translated as *A Treatise on Political Economy* in 1834), an entrepreneur was the "master of all that was known in a particular branch of industry, and who had collected the requisite capital and labourers" (Berg 91). As the organizer of production, he is at the center of a web of relations, holding together landlord and capitalist, technician and laborer, producer and consumer (Koolman 273). Since the English had no word for entrepreneur when Prinsip first translated Say's *Traité* into English, he chose the word "adventurer." The English did not distinguish between the supply-of-capital function and the enterprise function (Koolman 273). Thus, Say's theorization of the entrepreneur is important because it creates a new identity for and appreciation of what was once called an "adventurer" and was now being called variously capitalist, projector, speculator, and promoter. Say is the first to justify entrepreneurial income, which he does on three counts: as a return for the moral qualities of the entrepreneur, for ensuring that an enterprise had capital, and for undertaking risks of enterprise. Thus, the entrepreneur draws on three sources of income: a wage payment, interest on capital, and a premium for risk (Berg 91). Say criticized Adam Smith for ignoring the difference between gains of superintendence and the return on capital, arguing that the profits from superintendence were dependent upon skill, activity and judgment. By thus justifying the entrepreneur's income, Say newly values this actor, giving him a role to play (justified by a wage) at the center of the economy, instead of at its periphery on the high seas. The primary quality of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

entrepreneur, according to Say, is judgment and an "unerring market sense" in the face of market uncertainty and flux (Koolman 275).

Lesseps was a visible example of this new type. He was revered for his skill at bringing together diverse elements, for his incessant activity, and his superior judgment. Like the word he came to embody he was a much-needed injection to a nation that had larger projects, imperial projects to undertake. Although Lesseps' project was not the biggest engineering feat of the century, it was widely believed to rely upon the most skill in its execution, for it involved the coordination of various elements including an international body of labor, investors, and politicians. Though the English had next to nothing to do with his project, the promoter of it occupied the minds of the Victorians for the entire second half of the century.

One can perceive this preoccupation in the first nineteenth-century British biography of Lesseps, published in 1876, by Percy Hetherington Fitzgerald. He marks Lesseps' difference in the way he raised funds for his project: "De Lesseps did not lack applications from the horde of pseudo-financiers and rich gamblers that bred and flourished under the Empire; but he had determined from the outset that they should have no part in the enterprise; he would not even allow the legitimate magnates of the stock exchanges of Europe to lend him their rather costly assistance" (Fitzgerald 119). Two things are apparent in this quotation. First, Lesseps turns his back on institutional support; thus Fitzgerald places the onus of the project on Lesseps' individual skill at seeking out financial sources from ordinary, often middleclass investors. Second, Fitzgerald stresses Lesseps' lack of greed. Cordoned off from the greed that marked his predecessors in the public mind, Lesseps came to represent a new type, a man not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tainted by the same rapaciousness as Carlyle's big swollen gamblers. If England was going to extend the type of projects that Hudson and his compatriots did in the forties into the fifties, sixties and beyond, and do so without negative consequences, it needed some respectable role models, even a hero. Fitzgerald offers us a romance hero, complete with more difficulties to overcome than Bunyan's Christian on the way to the Celestial City. Thus Fitzgerald writes in his introduction, "The story of the Suez Canal, together with that of its persevering projector, who has finally succeeded in triumphing over all obstacles and all opposition, has ever seemed to contain something romantic, and to be worthy of being made the subject of regular narrative" (vii). In Fitzgerald's "regular narrative" Lesseps overcomes all odds, including lack of labor, lack of water, lack of towns and a port, lack of funding, lack of support from the Ottoman Empire, lack of stable ground to dig in, and lack of experience. But most importantly, Lesseps overcomes the lack of support from the British Government. Like Doyce and Clennam, Lesseps succeeds in spite of the English government. He too circumvents the Circumlocution Office.

By 1876 Lesseps could safely be hailed as a hero. The English had purchased the majority of the shares in the canal from Egypt just one year earlier, effectively becoming the owners of the canal. Hence, celebrating Lesseps was a form of self-affirmation. However, the story of Lesseps was long in the making. Fitzgerald embellished it and made it conform to the conventional narrative form of cultural affirmation, biography. Lesseps' story begins to unfold in the English press and journals in 1854 when he surprised the world, and England, by obtaining a concession for the making of the Canal from the Viceroy of Egypt, Said Pasha. In the eyes of the international press, this was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an ingenious political coup, for Lesseps had single-handedly bypassed the formidable power of the Ottoman Empire by obtaining permission straight from the Egyptian ruler. But the British government adopted an obstructionist policy towards him and his project. *The Times* explains how the English government used their influence with Turkey to interfere with Lesseps' project:

> What business had any third parties with this affair? When the Pasha and the company had agreed upon the project why should England interfere, or how? The thing was done in this way:--Egypt is not exactly an independent state. Its Viceroy has a Sovereign above him, and that Sovereign has always seen good reason for listening to the counsels of England. So the British ambassador spoke to the Sultan and the Sultan spoke to the successive Pasha of Egypt, and M. de Lesseps occasionally found obstacles in his path. (*The Times* 15 August 1863)

Ironically, by blocking Lesseps at all roads, the British government created a fascinating "romance" narrative, one in which a Doycian hero emerges to counter the government's blockage. In summing up Lesseps' early problems with navigating between the Viceroy of Egypt and the Sultan of Turkey, which were aggravated by Britian's attempt to obstruct the project by manipulating the Sultan, for example William Hamley notes in *Blackwoods*:

> M. de Lesseps procured a concession from the Viceroy sanctioning the commencement of the works; but this concession was not good without the Sultan's ratification, and great pressure was put upon the Sultan to induce him to withhold his approval. The difficulty was at length

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> overcome through the perseverance and insistence of M. de Lesseps, who forthwith made a demonstration by commencing the works. (741)

In the face of British-induced adversity, Lesseps' heroic traits of "perseverance" and "insistence," emerge. The more the British government and press criticized Lesseps, the larger his implied heroic character grew. In Britain's principal papers, every obstacle that Lesseps faced, whether real, theoretical, or just imagined was published and dwelled upon. Commenting upon this phenomenon, Hamley provides a sense of the things that were said about the canal in the British press:

> "The Canal will be a stagnant ditch," said some. "It will be filled by the sand of the Desert." "The bitter lakes, through which it is to pass, will be filled up with salt." "The Mediterranean entrance cannot be kept open." These, and many more, were the cheering prophecies that M. de Lesseps was complimented with in English journals. (741)

Beginning in 1854, when the concession was granted, and continuing until 1869, when the canal was completed, British journals and newspapers carried these sorts of stories about the insurmountable problems that Lesseps would face. They did not foresee that as they stacked up the problems, they fortified the character when he overcame each declared obstacle. The press insisted that his efforts at digging the canal would be futile, for the land had no rock-base and would continually fill up with sand. But Lesseps employed native building techniques to pat dry the sand and mud, and let it dry in the sun, thus creating a solid base that did not cave in as expected. They predicted that the Red Sea would cause a problem because of its rock-hard coral reefs at bottom, and Lesseps and his company would have to perform the Herculean task of drilling to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

remove all of the reefs from the Red Sea. But the coral reefs turned out to pose no problem at all. The press predicted that he would not be able to find enough workers in labor-poor Egypt to build his canal, and that even if he could procure the labor, he would not be able to provide the workers with enough water in the desert. But he negotiated a contract with the Pasha to provide him with four-fifths of all labor that he would need, which the Pasha fulfilled by *corvee.* And he engineered a channel bringing fresh water into the desert. They predicted he would never be able to replace the Egyptian workers after the Pasha pulled them out to work in the newly robust cotton industry in 1863, and that this blow would be fatal to his relations with the Pasha. But Lesseps brought labor in from Southern Europe, Syria, Greece and Albania and when he still didn't have enough workers, he replaced labor with machinery, massively employing the dredger and the elevator to international critical acclaim. Then he mended the poor relations with the Pasha, and continued to work. Time after time, Lesseps faced real problems with real solutions. Thus British obstructionism produced a truly resistant "character" as Hamley admitted in *Blackwoods* admitted in 1869:

> If there had been only smooth sailing—if there had been no imputation, no misrepresentation, no prophecy of failure, no scoffing—then the perseverance, energy, and confidence of M. de Lesseps could not possibly stand out as they now do. The opponents of the scheme have given opportunity to M. de Lesseps of proving himself to be one of the great. (740)

A distinctive vocabulary began to settle around Lesseps. He was full of energy, perseverance, and determination. He was confident. He was full of zeal and faith, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he was visionary. Some of these characteristics are nineteenth-century commonplaces. Energy, for instance, was the word often used to describe engineers, projectors and industrialists. Samuel Smiles, who wrote biographies about engineers, industrialists, philanthropists, and iron workers throughout the 1860s and 1870s, attests to the importance of energy in the character of his subjects. Perseverance and determination were also important for Smiles, but the perseverance which Smiles describes in his 1859 *Self Help* looks somewhat different from the perseverance of Lesseps as found in popular accounts of him throughout the 1860s. In a chapter called "Application and Perseverance" Smiles equates perseverance with patience, especially while working. Labourers for the public good, he writes, "have to work long and patiently, often uncheered by the prospect of immediate recompense or result. The seeds they sow sometimes lie hidden under the winter's snow, and before the spring comes the husbandman may have gone to his rest" (70). Clinging to the planting metaphor, Smiles trots out example after example of scholar, writer, missionary, natural historian, and inventor who had benefited from his long-laboring patience. His treatment of Adam Smith is typical: "Adam Smith sowed the seeds of a great social amelioration in that dingy old University of Glasgow where he so long laboured, and laid the foundations of his *Wealth of Nations*; but seventy years passed before his work bore substantial fruits, nor indeed are they all gathered in yet" (71). Smiles' chapter is filled with word pairings such as "long laboured," "incessant industry," "indefatigable industry," "incessant toil," showing that Smiles' "perseverance" is synonymous with habitual work. Obstacles that the persevering must overcome are predominately figured as bad habits: laziness,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

drunkenness, sleeping late. Smiles' aim, it appears, is to use the idea of "perseverance" to inculcate good work habits to his readership.

Three years later, however, in Smiles' *Lives of the Engineers* (1862) perseverance takes on a different meaning. In this work Smiles documents the biographies of the prominent canal, road, bridge, and railway builders of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, using techniques so similar to Fitzgerald's that it seems probable that Fitzgerald borrowed from it in his depiction of Lesseps. Smiles documents how each engineer overcame nearly insurmountable obstacles to achieve his goals. In addition to physical obstacles, such as mountains, and technological obstacles, such as locomotion, engineers faced recalcitrant land owners, competitive companies, and local prejudices, usually stirred up by competitors. George Stephenson (father of Robert), the railway engineer famed for his successful introduction of the locomotive, for example, experienced a local critique flamed by canal companies that circulated anti-locomotive pamphlets:

> It was declared that its formation would prevent cows grazing and hens laying. The poisoned air from the locomotives would kill birds as they flew over them, and render the preservation of pheasants and foxes no longer possible. Householders adjoining the projected line were told that their houses would be burnt up by the fire thrown from the engine-chimneys; while the air around would be polluted by clouds of smoke. There would no longer be any use for horses; and if railways extended, the species would become extinguished, and oats and hay be rendered unsaleable commodities. Travelers by rail would be highly dangerous,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> and country inns would be ruined. Boilers would burst and blow passengers to atoms. (*Lives* 195-196)

In the face of such obstacles, George Stephenson took on the motto "Persevere!"

Although Fitzgerald and the English journalists who wrote about Lesseps may have borrowed from Smiles, the representation of Lesseps is more than just a throwback to Smiles' old-fashioned engineers. In other words, Fitzgerald is not just co-opting Lesseps and forcing him into an accepted British model. Fitzgerald's projector differs from Smiles' engineer, for Smiles carefully maintains a separation between the qualities of the engineer and the projector. For example, though the stories of the eighteenth-century canal engineer, James Brindley, and the projector of his canals, Francis Duke of Bridgewater, are intertwined, the functions of each character are different. The Duke raises the capital and pulls the political strings, while Brindley hones his practical skills and perseveres at his work. When the Duke ran out of money in mid project, Smiles writes that he inquired of Brindley: "'What's to be done now? How are we to get at the money for finishing the canal?' Brindley, after a few long puffs, answered through the smoke, 'Well, Duke, I can't tell; I only know that if the money can be got, I can finish the canal, and that it will pay well'" (109). In the context of Smiles' text, this quote works to clear Brindley of the taint of money (and its making). This maintenance of a separation between the capital raiser and the engineer is one of Smiles' accomplishments in *Lives*, and can further be seen in his depiction of George Stephenson. Smiles works hard to clear Stephenson of George Hudson's taint, for Hudson famously projected a line on which Stephenson worked, repeatedly claiming that Stephenson, "would have nothing to do . . . with stock-jobbing speculations" (471). Not only does Smiles maintain the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

difference between Hudson and Stephenson, he also shows how the Stephensons were unlike the engineers better known for their speculations and projections into international markets, the Brunels. While the Stephensons were "inventive, practical, and sagacious; the Brunels ingenious, imaginative, and daring. The former were as thoroughly English in their characteristics as the latter perhaps were as thoroughly French" (397).

Smiles excludes the "French" Brunels from his *Lives*. He rather sticks to the "English" variety whose "humble" and "inarticulate" character he can celebrate. He portrays George Stephenson as an "untaught, inarticulate, genius" (203). Appearing in front of Parliament, he "struggled for utterance" (203). Smiles leaves the capital raising and the articulation of a project upon which it relies to the projectors who populate only the background of his account. Smiles' engineers are a humble lot. If he does not make this clear in his repeated usage of this word, the many drawings of their humble homes and cottages that illustrate his writings persistently argues it for him. And he does not allow his engineers to stray far from this domestic image that he takes pains to create. For example, he frames the story of Robert Stephenson's youthful mining venture in South America in the mid 1820s as an utter disaster, replete with a shipwreck and a spooky chance encounter with Richard Trevithick, the famed builder of the first railway locomotive, who has become so destitute in South America that he has to beg money from Stephenson to get home. Stephenson himself does not stay long in Marquita where he has been hired to work as an engineer in a silver mine, for he gets homesick. He excuses himself from his job, claiming that he has a "duty" to his father at home.

Robert Stephenson died in the year that work on the Suez Canal began, but he was one of the most influential and frequently quoted critics of the canal. He had said that it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was 'impracticable' and could not be built, and his expert opinion was then touted by every politician or journalist who took up the subject, most famously, Lord Palmerston. Hence, when the canal was completed in 1869, Robert Stephenson was frequently blamed, and Lesseps' triumph became Stephenson's failure. The Suez Canal suggested that one of England's most important engineers lacked what Lesseps had in abundance. Ironically, Stephenson lacked perseverance; he gave up before he even started.

Perhaps for this reason, Fitzgerald chooses not to directly compare Lesseps to the Stephensons; rather he draws a comparison between Lesseps and the lesser known Thomas Waghorn, the Englishman who claimed to have established an overland route through Egypt. According to Fitzgerald, Waghorn shares Lesseps' perseverance: "There was a certain resemblance between the persistent efforts of De Lesseps and the heroic perseverance of this projector [Waghorn]" (Fitzgerald 6). Yet Waghorn was not appreciated in his lifetime, as *The Times* noted in 1846 when a testimonial for him raised a mere £70. Fizgerald's comparison of Lesseps to Waghorn, however, is important because it marks the cultural revaluation of Waghorn in the context of empire building at mid century. Upon Waghorn's death in 1850, the moving "Diorama of the Overland Route to India" was shown in Regent Street and many came to see it. According to Freda Harcourt, "The pictures confirmed Egypt as Britain's high road to India, and Waghorn's . . . exploits served as symbols for Britain's expanding empire" (*Oxford DNB*). Nineteen years later England, faced with the prospect of nothing to show at the international grand opening ceremony of the Suez Canal, chose to unveil a statue of Waghorn to rival the monument to Lesseps. Ironically, scholars have since demonstrated that Waghorn's claim to have discovered an overland route through Egypt

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was false. It was just one of many stories that Waghorn invented in order to try to raise money for his exploits. The fact that without an iota of proof and not even one eye-witness to validate Waghorn's claims, the British Government built a monument to him to rival a statue of Lesseps, shows the importance of manufacturing national heroes in the face of empire building. Clearly Hudson, who had left miles of track behind him, had done more. Yet the difference seems to be in the ability to articulate a humanitarian claim. Waghorn was "opening up communication between millions of the human race" (*The Times* 23 March 1846). While Waghorn's story suggests the new importance of entrepreneurial heroes, it also reveals character itself to be a construct. That Waghorn stands memorialized next to Lesseps indicates that Lesseps may have been of the same mettle. Few, for instance, remember that a French court found Lesseps guilty of gross mismanagement of the international project that he undertook in the 1880s, the Panama Canal, for which he was fined heavily and sentenced to lengthy imprisonment.

Waghorn, however, is ultimately no match for Lesseps, Fitzgerald admits: "he had the same energy, but unhappily, not the wonderful gift of our projectory—that of fascinating those to whom he addressed with his plans, and of inspiring them with an amazing belief in him" (11). Fitzgerald draws a further distinction between Waghorn, a not-so-common projector, and Lesseps, an extraordinary one, at the same time that he lays British claims on Lesseps ("our projectory"). The distinction seems to be in Lesseps' vision. "Visionary" was the kind of word that could produce a smug smile in England, as Lord Clarendon knew it would when he dismissed Lesseps' project as "wholly visionary." Yet Fitzgerald made Lesseps' visionary powers into his greatest asset. Being a visionary implies an ability to see something as a whole, a quality which

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Smiles notes that George Stephenson lacked: "so long as he was confined to locomotive engines and iron railroads, with the minutest details . . . he felt at home . . . but when the designs of bridges and the cost of constructing them had to be gone into…his evidence was less satisfactory" (207). In addition, visionary powers depend upon the ability to articulate that whole vision to others. But not only that: visionary language can stir people to action or belief; in other words it is performative.[18]

The success of Lesseps is the success of a personality type—a type that could face up and match obstacles such as the English Government with nothing more than a vision. Some of the most often quoted words of Lesseps are: "All of a sudden I saw a brilliant rainbow display itself and spread across the sky from west to east. I own that my heart began to beat violently, and I seem to see in this sign the true union of east and west, and a prophetic notice that the day was to be marked by the success of my scheme" (Fitzgerald 20). In light of this it is no surprise that Lesseps became the hero entrepreneur and not Hudson whose most often repeated words are, "make em all come to York."

Lesseps had a way of inspiring confidence—just like Doyce, who comes home and says he'll "put matters right," and he is believed. Doyce's longest speech in the novel occurs upon his return home, (he is given twenty-four uninterrupted lines), and his language here is different as well; his words are newly persuasive and performative. They give Clennam the confidence that he needs: "you will profit by the failure," "you have it in your power" (*Little Dorrit* 686). In this final speech Doyce reveals not only

[18] J. L. Austin describes the performative utterance as one that enacts what it seems to be describing. In other words, something is performative when the saying of it makes it so. Austin's classic example of the performative utterance is the wedding vow, "I do."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that he straightened up the accounts of the firm, but that it is on firmer footing than it has ever been. Although we know that Doyce has already done that work, his words have the effect making it so (by in fact hiding the work from Clennam's and the reader's sight). Doyce also projects a vision of the future, "a new and prosperous career was opened before you and me as partners" (686). Further, it is Doyce who predicts the Clennam/Dorrit wedding: "if this young lady will do me the honor of regarding me for four-and-twenty hours in the light of a father and will take a ride with me now towards Saint Paul's Churchyard, I dare say I know what we want to get there" (687), a prediction which is immediately followed up by the real thing on the following page. Indeed the new Doyce seems to usurp authorial power, "putting matters right" so that this mid-century Victorian novel can close with all in order.

* * *

Hudson was brusque, he was opaque, he was bulky. Like the trains that he came to symbolize, he lacked subtlety and diplomacy. Pictures of him exaggerate his size. He is portrayed as being as big as a locomotive. Also depicted frequently was his oversized house, rumored to be the most expensive privately-owned home in England. Yet Hudson's unprecedented power of material accumulation was in the end impotent. It could not be articulated or made sense of by him or his culture. Literal representations of his type were similarly mute and never long-lived, as was the case with Dickens' Merdle. Lesseps was different. In pictures of him, his head is often oversized, nearly twice the size of his body in one contemporary cartoon. He is depicted surrounded by people rather than objects, as in a widely-circulated drawing of him amidst politicians and heads of state, or another popular picture of him in the bosom of his large family—a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wife and nine children. Another common cartoon of him shows him dressed as a caveman standing with one foot firmly planted in the East and the other in the West purposefully poised between two continents, his body forming a bridge. In this same picture his half-naked body ripples with muscles and a club dangles from his waist. Similarly in another cartoon, he carries a shovel in one hand, and proudly gestures to his work with the other. Lesseps is never represented with symbols of his material wealth as Hudson is, instead, with his tools which make him appear to have a purpose. Lesseps is never pictured as awkward; even as he straddles two continents, he does so with strength and grace. Hudson, on the other hand, always looks out of place, possibly something Dickens picked up on when he characterized Merdle as shuffling from room to room, never quite knowing where to put himself. In one cartoon of Hudson, he stands on top of a globe but looks as if he might topple off at any moment; he is not at home in the world.

Lesseps, straddling the globe with ease, represents a new comfort in the wide world. Like Doyce, he confidently slips over borders, only gaining from his movement.[19] The pictorial representations of Lesseps, like his words, are more articulate than those of Hudson. They work to make sense of him and his type, to articulate him into the social body, to give his exploits imperial purpose and to value that purpose.

[19] I am not going so far as to claim Doyce as a cosmopolitan; however, I am suggesting that he is as close as Dickens gets to creating such a figure. Doyce might be thought of paradoxically as a "national-cosmopolitan."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter II

English Exports:
Romantic Investments, Novel Technologies and Disraeli's *Tancred*

Half a century after the death of Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Minister in 1868 and again from 1874 to 1880, Hollywood came out with a movie celebrating his role in the making of the British Empire. Alfred Green's 1929 film, *Disraeli*, is a romantic comedy about Disraeli's purchase of the Suez Canal in 1875 and his conferment of the title "Empress of India" upon the Queen the following year. In the movie an avuncular Disraeli, played by George Arliss, overcomes all obstacles to purchase the canal from Ismaïl Pasha, the Egyptian Khedive whose regime totters on the edge of bankruptcy. The movie shows that by purchasing this direct route to India, Disraeli spared Egypt from bankruptcy, saved England and the world from the rapacious Russia, and ushered in a new age of imperialism.

Disraeli's role in Green's movie is peculiarly Lesseps-like. While everyone around him questions his desire to spend four million pounds on an "Egyptian ditch," he moves forward with visionary resolve. First he asks the Governor of the Bank of England to loan him the funds, but this stodgy representative of William Gladstone's "little England" adamantly refuses, saying, "Your scheme is harebrained, unconstitutional, and the bank will be no party to it." Adding insult to injury, he continues: "You have the eastern imagination. Because this canal runs through a desert, you see it in a dream--a mirage." Undaunted, Disraeli moves ahead and attempts to secure a loan elsewhere. As Disraeli courts bank after bank, a pair of Russian spies lurk about his office attempting to thwart his plans by stealing correspondence, spreading gossip, and sinking a ship of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Argentinean bullion heading Disraeli's way. But Disraeli outwits the sly duo at every turn.

While Disraeli is busy circumventing the Bank of England and out-maneuvering the Russian spies, he also becomes involved in plotting a marriage. He takes an interest in the career and love life of a certain underling, a young and handsome minister without much initiative. Clarissa, a beautiful girl of nineteen, and a daughter-figure for Disraeli, has just refused a marriage proposal from this man, claiming that he'll never make anything of himself. Disraeli turns matchmaker and decides that the way to get the couple together is to make the young man into a hero. Thus he sends him on a "dangerous" mission to Egypt where he is instructed to give Ismaïl Pasha a check to pay for the Suez Canal. Disraeli's plot works. The minister hands the check to the ruler, and he returns to England a hero. Such heroism not only secures the canal; it secures his marriage.

In a quiet moment of this busy movie, Disraeli's wife compliments her husband saying, "Ah Dizzy, always dreaming a romance." It is not clear whether it is his matchmaking skills or his canal dream that earns him this accolade. But it is clear that the movie valorizes and conflates Disraeli the romantic, Disraeli the visionary, and Disraeli the imperialist. In the crowning scene of *Disraeli,* which takes place at a Royal fete, a marriage is proposed, the Suez Canal is purchased, and the title of Empress is conferred upon the Queen—all brought about by the hand of the enterprising Disraeli.[1]

---

[1] The Suez Canal was purchased in 1875, but the Queen was named Empress of India a year later. The temporal conflation that this scene enacts, alongside its spatial referencing of England, Egypt and India, nicely suggest the relation of the canal purchase to the project of imperialism. In addition, the overlaying of a marriage plot onto the scene intimates the way that generic conventions can be used to package political ones.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Conflating domestic happiness with imperial success, the movie reveals a popular ideology of empire from a prior period. It was Disraeli who fifty years earlier popularized the idea that imperialism abroad would bring status and prestige to the domestic realm. Up until Disraeli's 1874-1880 ministry, "imperialism" was a word applied exclusively to foreign despots. It was first used in the 1840s to describe the desire of *le parti imperialiste* in France to revive the glories of the Napoleonic era. During the next two decades, it was commonly associated with those who practice despotic rule at home and aggressive policies overseas. It wasn't employed in British domestic politics until 1876 during the acrimonious debates on Disraeli's Royal Titles Bill that made the Queen "Empress of India." *The Times* stigmatized the new title as "threatening the Crown with the degradation of a tawdry Imperialism" (Eldridge 26). And the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Spectator*, and *Punch* followed suit. Thus the word "imperialism" was popularly linked to Disraeli in the press. For the next four years, Disraeli's political opponent, Gladstone, and the Liberal Party accused Disraeli not only of practicing imperialism abroad but also argued that Disraeli would bring despotic rule home to England. Imperialism became a smear-word used by Gladstone and the Whigs against Disraeli and the Conservative Party (Eldridge 26-27).

But Gladstone's plan backfired. Disraeli preached that imperialism would bring England prestige, power and status. He called for a more active foreign policy, emphasizing the role that Great Britain could play on the world stage. In his Crystal Palace speech of 1872, famous for its forceful call for Empire, Disraeli trumpeted,

> It [the issue] is whether you will be content to be a comfortable England, modeled and moulded upon Continental principles and meeting in due

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> course an inevitable fate, or whether you will be a great country,--an Imperial country,--a country where your sons, when they rise, rise to paramount positions, and obtain not merely the esteem of their countrymen, but command the respect of the world. (Eldridge 89)

Disraeli's appeal for empire became increasingly attractive to a public that was at first leery of the idea. In 1880, *The Times* noted that the Liberals' attempts to injure Disraeli by portraying him as an imperialist had failed[2]:

> "Imperialism" was a word invented to stamp Lord Beaconsfield's supposed designs with popular reprobation. But the weapon wounded the hand that wielded it, and a suspicion was engendered, which seriously injured the Liberal cause, that Liberalism was in some sort an antithesis of Imperialism. It will cost Lord Hartington and his associates not a little pain to eradicate this popular belief. (11 March 1880)

By the end of Disraeli's ministry "imperialism," a word that hitherto held only negative connotations, was a word that glittered. *Disraeli*, the movie, captures the brief glory days of British imperialism and the long-lived nostalgia for Empire that followed. It captures a romantic, visionary and thoroughly imperialist Disraeli.

Although it is clear that during Disraeli's 1874-80 ministry imperialism became a popular ideology for the first time, Disraeli's precise relation to imperialism is still contested. Disraeli's ministry coincides with the rise of the "New Imperialism," a term used to describe the aggressive accumulation of territories by European nations in the last

---

[2] It should be noted that Disraeli did lose the election in 1880.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

quarter of the century.[3] Although England's numerous territorial acquisitions during Disraeli's ministry is un-debatable, historians question just how responsible Disraeli was for England's expansion. In *Disraeli and the Rise of the New Imperialism,* C.C. Eldridge seeks to answer the question, "Was Disraeli the prophet of the new imperialism?" and concludes that he was not. Rather, the territorial acquisitions of his 1874-80 ministry occurred in an unplanned and haphazard manner. Eldridge writes, "Disraeli was not the expansionist he is so frequently alleged to have been" (50). Disraeli lacked a plan and a theory of imperialism. He was not interested in administrative details, and he made no legislative reforms. Advancements into the tropics were not a part of a new expansionist Conservative philosophy of empire; instead, Eldridge argues, they resulted from Disraeli's failure to oversee ministers and control men.[4]

Eldridge searches for material evidence of Disraeli's imperialism by tracing his involvement in wars and acquisitions in places such as the Fiji Islands, the Gold Coast, the western Malay states, the Transvaal Republic, and Cyprus. He concludes that

---

[3] Just how new "New Imperialism" was has been the object of much historical debate. John Gallagher's and Ronald Robinson's 1953 article, "The Imperialism of Free Trade," broke with the widely held belief that imperialism began in the 1880s when the abandonment of free trade necessitated the extension of markets abroad through formal annexations. They argue instead that imperialism, which they redefine as having political as well as a commercial causes, was continuous throughout the century, and that "formal" annexations only were resorted to when "informal" methods failed, as in the case of Egypt in the early 1880s.

[4] Here it is evident that Eldridge understands imperialism to be premeditated physical expansionism. More recently, the definition of imperialism has been reevaluated to include the role of financial expansionism. P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, for example, argue that it is through the growth of the service sector, especially after 1850, and the exportation of service through what they call "Gentlemanly Capitalism" that imperialism takes hold. Cain and Hopkins downgrade the importance of formal acquisitions, favoring the explanation that commerce and finance were the most dynamic elements in the nation's economic thrust overseas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

although Disraeli's imperialism cannot be located in his relation to any of these physical spaces, it still cannot be altogether denied. Eldridge suggests that Disraeli provided England with a "concept of a powerful England, strengthened by the resources and peoples of a far-flung empire playing a decisive role in world affairs" (73). For Eldridge, Disraeli's contribution to empire lies in an idea: "Colonial administration had never been of deep concern to Disraeli. It was the idea of empire, India and the East which fired his imagination" (46). In the last few pages of his text Eldridge gestures in yet another direction: "Disraeli was a man of ideas who prided himself on his imaginative leadership. India and the Orient, which he had visited in his youth, fired his imagination. It was the grandeur and the romance of it all that captured him" (65). Thus, Eldridge concludes by suggesting that one might locate Disraeli's imperialism not only in his ideas but in his sense of romance.[5]

Disraeli, who is infamously difficult to pin down, becomes only more so in Eldridge's conclusion. For many scholars, Disraeli's "slipperiness" is related to his outsider status, as a Jewish man constantly in the need of "self-fashioning" for his own survival in an anti-Semitic nation.[6] But Eldridge also seems to suggest that Disraeli's indecipherability is a generic problem: "He delighted in creating an air of romance and mystery" (66). And in Eldridge's final paragraph, he asserts: "He loved romance and mystery" (73). Because Eldridge cannot fully unveil Disraeli as a prophet of the New Imperialism or debunk this long-held belief, he suggests rather that what motivates

---

[5] Eldridge here is guilty of exoticising Disraeli, as are many writers, including Disraeli himself. I am suggesting that this general exoticisation of Disraeli works to both "other" Empire *and* embody it in a literary form.

[6] See Charles Richmond and Paul Smith (eds.), *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818-1851* (1999).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Disraeli is romance. And he intimates further that we might also find Disraeli's imperialism in the genre that Disraeli was so fond of writing. In Hollywood's *Disraeli*, when Disraeli's wife compliments, "Ah Dizzy, always dreaming a romance," she also hints that her husband's imperial dreams are related to his literary ones. Thus, I follow Eldridge's and Green's leads and take a generic turn in the explication of Disraeli's imperialism. I turn to what was reportedly Disraeli's favorite novel, and one of his most perplexing romances about the Middle East, *Tancred* (1847). And I suggest that we begin looking here, in the complex form of this novel/romance about a young man's quest for religious and political truth in the Middle East, for signs of Disraeli's imperialism.

Joint Ventures: The Romance and the *Bildungsroman* in the Middle East

Much of the contemporary criticism of *Tancred* focuses on its content as opposed to its form. *Tancred* is a novel of ideas. In it the young and idealistic Tancred, disgusted with the ways of the West, travels to the East to "penetrate the mysteries of Asia." He seeks ways to rejuvenate a Europe that is obsessed with progress and not enough concerned with prophesy. "Christendom," he declares, "cares nothing for that tomb [the Holy Sepulcher] now, has, indeed forgotten its own name, and calls itself enlightenment Europe. But enlightened Europe is not happy. Its existence is a fever, which it calls progress. Progress to what?" (231). Tancred believes that in the East he will find the spiritual model for a necessary revival of the West. Instead, he becomes embroiled in political battles and falls in love with a young Jewish woman, Eva. At the end of the novel, Eva suggests that all of Tancred's hopes have been disappointed and that he no longer believes in Arabia.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Contemporary reviewers responded to the grand ideas proposed by Disraeli in *Tancred*: "The great merit of the work is the grandeur of its conceptions; it always suggests the supremacy of the spiritual over the material; one principal pervades the whole which may be briefly stated—'Asia thinks and lives; Europe works and perishes'" (Taylor 389). But not all were so enthusiastic about what they understood as Disraeli's denigration of the West: "All that has been done by the Reformation, by the English and French revolutions, by American Independence—is here proclaimed an entire delusion and failure; and we are taught that we can now only hope to improve our future by utterly renouncing our past" (Monckton 141). Moreover, many critics were taken aback by Disraeli's desire to revive a dying Europe with ideas culled from the East, specifically from Judaism. Although some praised Disraeli for his propensity to hold out Judaism as the source of a European renewal ("He holds with a fervour in every way honourable, a belief in the marvelous endowments of his race" (*Stephen 430*)), most did not. Some critics were outraged at what they considered Disraeli's audacity in desiring "to make Europe don the graceful and variegated costume of the nations of the East, and—hear it, hall of Exeter!—to convert the whole world, converted Jews and all, back to Judaism!" (*The Times* 2 April 1847).

It is difficult to find a piece of contemporary criticism that does not limit its analysis of *Tancred* to the ideas that it contains. The same is true of modern criticism. Edward Said revived critical interest in *Tancred* in 1978 when he used Disraeli's novel to illustrate *Orientalism*:

> His novel *Tancred* is steeped in racial and geographical platitudes; everything is a matter of race, Sidonia states, so much so that salvation can

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> only be found in the Orient and among its races. There, as a case in point, Druzes, Christians, Muslims, and Jews hobnob easily because—someone quips—Arabs are simply Jews on horseback, and all are Orientals at heart. The unisons are made between general categories, not between categories and what they contain. An Oriental lives in the Orient, he lives a life of Oriental ease, in a state of Oriental despotism and sensuality, imbued with a feeling of Oriental fatalism. (102)[7]

Said and other critics of Orientalism discuss *Tancred*'s content in detail, but write little about *Tancred*'s perplexing form. Genre critics have left *Tancred* relatively untouched. However, studying *Tancred*'s generic split can yield a fuller understanding of imperialism in England. Therefore, in this chapter I examine the two dominant genres which undergird *Tancred*, the romance and the *Bildungsroman*, and argue that it is through the combination of these forms, and then their "exportation" to the Middle East, that *Tancred* does its political work.

Like many novels of the 1840s, *Tancred* is made up of a variety of forms--from the romance, born in the twelfth century, to the political novel, of which it was in the vanguard. Some critics credit Disraeli with inventing the political novel, and *Tancred*,

---

[7] For an alternative interpretation of Disraeli's orientalism see Patrick Brantlinger's "Disraeli and Orientalism." Brantlinger believes that Disraeli's orientalism is less unified, more hybrid, and more positive than Said recognizes. Further, Brantlinger argues that the most important feature of Disraeli's orientalism is that he orientalizes himself as a part of a "bold, aggressive defense against the anti-Semitism that he had to combat throughout his career" (91).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

following *Coningsby* (1844) and *Sybil* (1845), was his third novel of this kind.[8] But *Tancred* can also be considered a travelogue, and many contemporary critics felt that one of its strongest features was its evocations of the East: "It contains brilliant and beautiful descriptions of eastern scenery" (Waller 266). Indeed whole sections of Disraeli's diary recording his 1830-31 trip to the East can be found in the pages of *Tancred.* But Disraeli was also interested in local scenery, and he spent the first third of his novel describing English country estates, balls, festivals and parties of England's aristocrats. The first two books of *Tancred* are written in the style of the Silver Fork novel, a form which Disraeli had never quite given up since the publication of his first Silver Fork novel, *Alroy,* in 1827.

Most importantly, *Tancred* is also a romance, as Daniel R. Schwarz notes:

> *Tancred* reflects Disraeli's continued admiration of romance plots. Like Byron's heroes, Childe Harold and Don Juan, or Scott's hero in his historical romances, Tancred inhabits an imagined world where diurnal details rarely intrude in his quest. An imaginary voyage, *Tancred* is loosely held together by the hero's physical journey which introduces him to incredible people and fantastic places. (61)

Schwarz's claim rests on commonly-held critical notions about the type of scenery, action and character romance contains. Scenery in *Tancred* is unreal: Tancred inhabits "an imagined world" full of "fantastic places." And the novel lacks "diurnal details" or the everydayness that is often associated with the nineteenth-century realist novel form.

---

[8] See Joseph W. Childers *Novel Possibilities: Fiction and the Formation of Early Victorian Culture* for a discussion of the ways that Disraeli's works made political discourse available to the novelistic form.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The action of *Tancred*, too, is like the action found in romance; the hero heads out on an "imaginary voyage" organized by a "quest." Schwarz implies that *Tancred*'s characters are not believable, are rather "incredible people," thus reflecting many critics' sense of the lack of character development in romance.

Schwarz describes *Tancred* accurately, in part. But there is another reality to *Tancred*, as a contemporary reviewer notes: "It will be read again and again with renewed pleasure, and with equally renewed perplexity, for it is at once the most brilliant of dreams, and the most sober of realities" (Taylor 385). As much as *Tancred* could be said to be marked by its imaginary settings, it also could be said to be characterized by its "sober realities." *Tancred* also participates in the conventions of the dominant novel form of the century, the *Bildungsroman*. We can see this by considering the shape of the novel as a whole, for although *Tancred* contains novelistic elements throughout, it demonstrably veers from the romance form towards the end, as Disraeli attempts a conclusion. Unlike the ending of the typical plot of the romance, where the hero returns home after a series of adventures, Tancred stays in the Middle East. Both his declaration of love to Eva, and the arrival of his parents in the very last line of the text, suggest that Tancred will not return to England and that the Middle East is now his new "home." What appeared to be a romance plot as defined by Northrop Frye—a series of adventures only stopped by the achievement of the final quest—turns out to be more like a classical *Bildungsroman* plot as defined by Franco Moretti—a form that aims for the integration of the protagonist into a "homeland." Tancred's "integration" into the Middle East—his *Bildungsroman*--I will argue is the project of this novel.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Tancred is thus poised between romance and novel. Its ambiguous stance towards genre allows us to see how these two technologies—romance and novel—work together to turn the Middle East into an imaginative zone for the British public. Through analysis of *Tancred* we can see the ways in which space becomes activated to incorporate new prose technologies. These technologies in turn circulate notions of investment, occupation and ownership. Most importantly, the production of ownership is an imaginative cultural practice that happens through prose structures. For example, romance encourages an imaginative investment in an unknown world. It organizes the symbolic investments needed for a "novel" way of knowing. On the other hand, the novel, with its technologies of settlement—quotidian concerns, particularization, and everydayness—stakes out claims of home. The particular nature of the novel—the *Bildungsroman*, a form with a teleology of integration--has further implications to the newly novelized world.

My concern in this chapter is to see a similarity between the "exportation" of technologies of the novel and the exportation of railroads, telegraphs, and steamships in the same period. The "exportation" of the novel outside of Europe coincides with the exportation of transport and communication technologies and the financial thought structures which made these industrial technologies possible.

Beginning in the 1820s the British began to build railways in England, and in the 1840s they first exported capital to Europe, building railways in France and Germany. In the following decade, they began to export railways and telegraphs and their financing structures beyond Europe. England was now jump-starting Europe on what would become an intensive investment in transport and communication technologies around the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

globe. In the process England's own identity as investor and developer began to change; a new relation was being forged between England and its peripheral investments. An important place to view this change is in Egypt, for it is in Egypt that England invested in the 1850s, building the railways and telegraph lines that would ultimately aid in tightening England's grip on its India.[9] As a result, in the 1850s a new culture of investing and national ownership begins, one that dreams of expansion. And England's expansive dreams are incorporated not only in material exports but also in newly exported romance and novel technologies. *Tancred*, with its undiscriminating setting in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Egypt, represents an imaginary exportation of romance and novel, in this case, to the Middle East.

For the remainder of this chapter, I will investigate the dual generic structure of *Tancred* and its implications to the construction of the imperial imagination. To do so, I turn to the work of two critics who have done a great deal in the way of restoring history and place to genre criticism, Fredric Jameson and Franco Moretti. First, I will use Jameson's insights into genre criticism to achieve a better understanding of *Tancred* as a romance. Jameson's project is to historicize romance by exposing the universalist tendencies imbedded in the two types of genre criticism practiced in the twentieth century: semantic criticism typified by the work of Northrop Frye, and structural criticism,

---

[9] In 1854 Abbas Pasha invited Robert Stephenson to build Egypt's first railway, from Alexandria to Cairo, and in the same year the electric telegraph was laid along this route. Two years later a railway from Cairo to Suez was begun and was finished in 1859, the same year that work on the Suez Canal began. Egypt emerged in the 1850s as a trading country of major importance. In the years from 1848 to 1860, Egypt went from twenty-sixth to twelfth place as a customer for British products, and in the period from 1854-1860, from tenth to sixth place as a source of British imports (Landes 85). By 1865, England was noted for its extensive loaning practices in Egypt: "The British lent money generously—185 million francs subscribed in the space of a few years; the French had yet to admit an Egyptian loan to quotation" (Landes 271).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

practiced by Vladimir Propp. I will begin my analysis with Frye's conceptualization of the "world" in romance to understand romance worlds in *Tancred*, and also use Jameson's historicization of Frye's concept of the "world" to answer the question, "Why does Tancred go to the Middle East?" Similarly, I will use Propp's concept of the "donor function" in quest romance to better understand character in *Tancred*, and again use Jameson's historicization of Propp's "donor function" to answer the question, "Who is Tancred?" I will conclude by turning to Moretti's work on the *Bildungsroman*. Moretti's determination to show that genres are a production of space has led him to assign to genre a geographical location. I will use Moretti's theorization of generic spaces and his work on social "integration" and the *Bildungsroman* to frame my concluding question, "Why does Tancred stay in the Middle East?"

Romantic Investments: Tancred in the Middle East

I. Romance Worlds, or Why does Tancred go to the Middle East?

Tancred comes home from college to find waiting for him everything a young man could want. His wealthy parents have prepared for him a banquet of royal proportions. They have gotten him a seat in parliament, and have found him a rich, aristocratic, beautiful young wife. He need only say the word, and all this would be his. But the words that Tancred says are not the ones that his parents expect to hear. He tells them that he will leave England and go to the Middle East, for he wants to see the Holy Sepulcher and "penetrate the great Asian mystery" (128).

Why does Tancred go to the Middle East? I am not only asking why the titular character chooses to leave England and travel to the Middle East, but mainly why the dual generic structures of *Tancred* are "exported" there as well? What is the purpose of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

constructing a romance and a *Bildungsroman* in the Middle East? And what is the importance of place in these generic choices? It is a historical question as well as a geopolitical one. Why export romance in a period in which domestically produced romance had long been on the wane?[10] And why send the *Bildungsroman* abroad when it was on the verge of experiencing its heyday at home?

When Tancred leaves England at the end of Book II, he steps out of a comfortable, elite world into an unknown one. Similarly, *Tancred* shifts from the indigenous style of a Silver Fork novel to the foreign-born one of romance. That the portion of the novel that deals with the Middle East is largely a romance sheds light on Edward Said's accusation that *Tancred* is an orientalist novel. As we have seen, in Disraeli's Middle East a vast range of peoples including "Druzes, Jews, Christians and Muslims" blurs together, and "all are Orientals at heart" (Said 102). Landscapes too are largely undifferentiated, and it is often difficult to know whether one is reading about Palestine, Syria or Lebanon.

Disraeli uses the conventions of the Silver Fork novel for the same reasons he relies on the conventions of romance. He can create worlds that are strange and wonderful to the majority of his readers. But upper-class readers complained that Disraeli knew nothing about their world and depicted it unrealistically. The same could be said of his depictions of the Middle East. These distortions are part of the romance genre. One way to understand the resulting obfuscation is through Frye's concept of the

---

[10] Patrick Brantlinger argues that there is an "upsurge in romance writing" (231) at the end of the nineteenth century and believes this late romance to be found in popular forms such as imperial Gothic, Wellsian science fiction, invasion fantasies, and spy stories all of which "betray anxieties characteristic of late Victorian and Edwardian imperialism both as an ideology and as a phase of political development" (*Rule of Darkness* 236). Judith Wilt has likewise argued for the existence of links between late Victorian Imperialism and the resurrection of the Gothic romance formula (618-628).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

romance "world," in which he sees three operative elements: the world, its twin protagonists (the hero and the villain) and their semic organization (high and low, good and evil, spring and winter). Outlining these three elements, Frye writes:

> The hero of romance is analogous to the mythical Messiah or deliverer who comes from an upper world, and his enemy is analogous to the demonic powers of a lower world. The conflict however takes place in, or at any rate primarily concerns, our world, which is in the middle, and which is characterized by the cyclical movements of nature. (187-188)

According to Jameson, the world that matters in romance is "our world"--the middle world in which the conflict takes place. Jameson is concerned that this world, characterized "by the cyclical movements of nature" not be naturalized; thus he attempts to historicize Frye's romance "world." Although the romance world often consists of nature, the "bower of bliss" or the "enchanted wood," Jameson argues that this world should not be accepted as natural without examination of its socio-historical formation: "What is misleading is the implication that this 'nature' is in any sense itself 'natural' rather than a very peculiar and specialized social and historical phenomenon" (112). Jameson amplifies the importance of "world" in romance, drawing on Heidegger to make the world actually the defining element of the genre: "we may borrow his [Heidegger's] cumbersome formula to suggest that romance is precisely that form in which the *worldness of world* reveals or manifests itself, in which, in other words, *world* in the technical sense of the transcendental horizon of our experience becomes visible in an inner wordly sense" (112). Jameson's revision of Frye's "world" as the defining element of romance is useful in understanding *Tancred*'s "world" of the Middle East. Or more

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

precisely, it will help answer the original question of this chapter, "Why does Tancred go to the Middle East?"

Worlds in *Tancred* often overtake Tancred. They enchant him, surround him, and take possession of him. Upon arrival in the East, Tancred heads to see his banker, but on the way he falls asleep in a garden. He seems to drop right into the "natural" world of romance:

> Like a prince in a fairy tale, who has broken the mystic boundary of some enchanted pleasaunce, Tancred traversed the alleys which were formed by the lemon and pomegranate tree, and sometimes the myrtle and the rose. His ear caught the sound of falling water, bubbling with a gentle noise; more distinct and more forcible every step that he advanced. The walk in which he now found himself ended in an open space covered with roses; beyond them a gentle acclivity, clothed so thickly with a small bright blue flower that it seemed a bank of turquoise, and on its top was a kiosk of white marble, gilt and painted. . . . His hat had dropped from his head; his rich curls fell on his outstretched arm that served as a pillow for a countenance which in the sweet dignity of its blended beauty and stillness might have become an archangel; and, lying on one of the mats, in an attitude of unconscious gracefulness, which a painter might have transferred to his portfolio, Tancred sank into a deep and dreamless repose. (190-192)

Tancred awakens to his romance plot. He finds Eva, who will become his love interest and one of the objects of his quest. And he learns of her "brother" Fakredeen, his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

nemesis, and the villain whom he will have to overcome to fulfill his quest. Thus Frye's three operative elements of romance are introduced: the world (the Middle East), its twin protagonists (Tancred and Fakredeen), and their semic organization (high/low, good/evil, West/East).

Tancred also awakens to what Frye considers the core of the romance plot: adventure. First Tancred fights a battle against a cabal of kidnappers, organized by Fakredeen, then struggles for his liberation from them, then leads a band of Arabs into a bloody battle in the name of their liberation from the Turks and a united Arabia, and finally charges on to try to "conquer the world." It is this ongoing sequence of kidnappings, struggles and battles only stopped by the achievement of the quest that further defines *Tancred* as romance.

In the action-packed world in which Tancred finds himself an agent, the battle scene comes to figure the "world" itself. In one instance, a band of Arabs surround him: "They [Tancred and his supporters] looked up, they looked around; the crest of every steep was covered with armed Arabs, each man with his musket leveled" (239). The Arabs become the landscape, and the romance world is enlivened by their figuration. An anthropomorphized landscape then rushes Tancred, surrounding him, and carting him off: "There was a continuous volley, however, from every part of the defile, and the scene was so involved in smoke that it was impossible for Tancred to see a yard around him; still he galloped on and felt conscious that he had companions, though the shouting was so great that it was impossible to communicate" (241-242). The smoke engulfs Tancred and he is stabbed and dragged away to the kidnappers' mountain hideaway.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Worlds overwhelm Tancred: the paradisal world lulls him to sleep; the battlefield engulfs him. While in England Tancred was free to come and go as he pleased; in the Middle East, he is a prisoner to his setting. The activated landscape of the battlefield literally surrounds him and carts him away to his kidnappers' lair. This liveliness of the "world" in *Tancred* may be the key to understanding why Tancred himself seems so lifeless. Typical of the romance hero, Tancred is a difficult character to get hold of—his desires are abstractions to us. He wants to penetrate the mysteries of the East; he wants to visit the holy sepulcher; he wants to "conquer the world." He is misunderstood by his parents who can't fathom his motives for traveling to the Middle East, and by the Christians, Jews, Muslims and Animists that he meets there. They mistakenly refer to him as the "brother of the Queen of England" and think of him only as a source of money or a Christian fanatic. In spite of his energetic campaigns, Tancred is a flatter character than one usually finds in a novel.

Jameson shows that there is a connection between the flatness of character in romance and the fullness of the "world," and he demonstrates that this connection is the function of the romance genre. In Frye's conception the world is the middle ground, the space in which the meaning of the hero/villain conflict can be realized. Jameson's most potent analogy in discussing Frye's "world" is to compare it to the great ocean of Stanislaw Lem's *Solaris,* which absorbs all of the meaning around it, literally sucking out the meaning of the hero's life. The relation of the characters to the world in romance is that their semic organization provides the world with its meaning. Coming from opposed worlds, they meet in the "middle," and the organization of their opposition is what gives that middle its worldliness.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Using this configuration, we can begin to see how intricately connected are "world" and character in *Tancred.* Knowing the "world" in the novel depends upon understanding the semic organization of its twin protagonists. Tancred, the Messiah-like figure searching for spiritual origins in the Middle East, comes from the cartographically organized "upper" world of England; Fakredeen, the shifty, double-dealing, clever and even charming figure comes from some vague "below." His active obfuscation of his origins and his chronic shape-shifting, claiming to be Moslem, Christian, Jewish and Animist at different moments, echo traits of Mephistopheles. The meeting of these two types in the middle gives the world meaning and that meaning will define *Tancred*'s Middle East.

Tancred's character was first revealed in his two explicit reasons for leaving England: he wants to penetrate the mysteries of Asia, a motive familiar to those found in scientific travel accounts such as Edward William Lane's, and he wants to visit the Holy Sepulcher, a desire that became increasingly popular in the 1840s for the sightseer to the Holy Land. In one sense, then, Tancred is a traveler/tourist to the Middle East. But his itinerary differs from the travel/tourist's when he forsakes his journey home. At the end of *Tancred*, we find our hero sitting comfortably in the house of his banker, professing his love for his daughter, Eva. A return to England is not in his plans. This then suggests that we not only consider his motives in the light of travel/tourism, but also in the light of colonialism/imperialism.

Tancred has a third unstated reason for leaving England that motivates him more than the other two. When Tancred's parents learned that their only son was bent on heading east, they enacted a plan to dissuade him: they offered him money to buy a yacht

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

so that he would become so caught up in the time-consuming task of yacht shopping that his trip would be delayed indefinitely. Their plan almost worked. While tracking down a suitable yacht, Tancred located a lovely soul mate. She too was an aficionado of the East, and she had a yacht for sale. They spend hours discussing their mutual interest, until Tancred considers staying in England. But she then drops these fateful words: "If Jerusalem were only a place one could get at, something might be done; if there were a railroad to it for example" (167). Tancred responded with disgust, "'A Railroad!' exclaimed Tancred, with a look of horror. 'A railroad to Jerusalem!'" (167) and fled the country soon after he learned that his soul mate had been speculating in railways abroad.

Tancred's horrified response shows what really activated his travels. Tancred wants his Middle East "underdeveloped"--without railroads, telegraph equipment, canals and ports. Thus he flees England and the type of character that his soul mate represents, the railway speculator who became so notorious for his headlong participation in the railway booms of the thirties and forties. But as his soul mate's words suggest, the space between England and Jerusalem, for so long an immutable entity, could now be altered. This alteration in both physical distance and cultural remoteness is the very process that Tancred fears and *Tancred* anticipates. Telegraph lines, the development of more efficient steamship routes, and the building of railways across Egypt that will begin to happen in the 1850s will alter the Middle East's physical and cultural distance from England forever.[11] *Tancred* is on the cusp of dizzying technological changes in Egypt that will revolutionize that country and bring "India to England's doorstep" by the end of

---

[11] This is not to say that development in Egypt began with the English in the 1850s. Modernization began much earlier in the century during the reign of Muhammad Ali. See Michael Brett on Muhammad Ali and modernization.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the decade. As *Tancred* is being written, the idea of having the colonies next door is not yet current. *Tancred* as a result can open up an imaginative space for a re-visioning of the colonies.

Ironically then Tancred's soul mate is his nemesis. He flees an "inveterate woman gambler" in England, who it turns out has been investing heavily in foreign railways, only to encounter an ever-scheming and speculating Fakredeen in Syria whose plots include igniting civil wars, arms trading, intriguing between Turkey, France, and England, and playing them off each other so he can carve up a little piece of the action himself. Most importantly, Fakredeen's plots involve investments in technology. His most burning desire is to buy 5,000 British muskets. And he has other investment plans: "We might improve the condition of the people; we might establish manufactures, stimulate agriculture, extend commerce, get an appalto of the silk, buy it all up at sixty piastres per oke, and sell it at Marseilles at two hundred" (280). Fakredeen is the kind of man whom Tancred is running from. With his political scheming and his plans for improvements, Fakredeen is a sure candidate for bringing a railway to the Middle East.

The "world" in *Tancred* thus emerges as a battleground of modernization. Important to Frye's theory of romance, Jameson asserts, is that the world is in the midst of becoming, a world in transformation: "Romance, therefore, does not involve the substitution of some more ideal realm for ordinary reality . . . but rather a process of *transforming* ordinary reality" (Jameson 110). The Middle East emerges as a world that cannot escape the expansion of capital—a world that is to be incorporated into that ever-expanding system. Fakredeen/Tancred represent the competing forces in this new world that give it its meaning under Frye's reading. They expose its transitional state and the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conflicts the process of transformation will cause. This is why the romance hero appears to lose his final battle. He does not expel the Turks, unite Arabia, and conquer the world. Nor does he, as a true romance hero would, return home. Instead he loses the battle, and stays in Egypt, suggesting a deviation from the romance trajectory. But this deviation, I suggest, should not be understood as a failure of the hero, or as a generic failure. Instead, it should be recognized as a sign that romance ultimately is not an adequate form for the completion of this particular story. A tale of colonialism and modernization needs a dynamic form more suited to its purpose. Thus Disraeli resolves the problems in his romance form by adapting to the romance a *Bildungsroman* conclusion.

II. The "Donor Function" in Romance, or Who is Tancred?

The relation between the twin protagonists, Tancred/Fakredeen, can be formulated in another way. Tancred arrives in the Middle East with two letters—a letter of introduction and a letter of credit. The first establishes him as one who is searching for the great Asian mystery, and the second promises him unlimited credit with the only banker in the region, Besso. It is the second letter that firmly marks Tancred's difference from Fakredeen. In it Besso is told to loan Tancred all of the money that he may need: "let him have as much gold as would make the right-hand lion on the first step of the throne of Solomon the king; and if he wants more, let him have as much as would form the lion that is left; and so on, through every stair of the royal seat" (171). Conversely, Fakredeen cannot get a loan, and he is deeply in debt. Here is yet another formulation of the semic organization of the twin protagonists: infinite credit/profound debt.

Fakredeen needs Tancred to complete his various capital-intensive projects; Tancred has just what Fakredeen lacks. Yet, if we consider *Tancred* as romance, it is the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

hero's lack that matters according to Jameson, who argues that it is through the identification of the hero's lack that the genre of romance can be historcized. Vladimir Propp, in seeking to locate the deep structure of Russian folktales, reduces all tales to a sequence of actions that happen in a specific order. He names these actions "functions" and suggests that they are all equally important and occur independent of the nature of the actor who carries them out. Jameson, however, disagrees, arguing that the "donor function" is the most important function precisely because it exposes a relation between the function of the donor and the surface character of the hero, a relation that is born of the hero's lack:

> In the beginning the hero is never strong enough to conquer himself. He suffers from some initial lack of being: either he is simply not strong enough or not courageous enough, or else he is too naïve and simple-minded to know what to do with his strength. The donor is the complement, the reverse of this basic ontological weakness. (*The Prison-House of Language* 67)

The function of the donor directly identifies the hero's lack because it is the donor who materializes in order to fill it, usually with something magical such as a weapon, a mighty bow, or a steel sword. Jameson strategically focuses on the donor function because he sees the possibility of re-establishing the historicity of romance through it. He quarrels with Propp's theory because it leaves no place for character; what is important to Propp is what gets performed, not who performs it. Jameson wants to realign surface character with its deep structure of function, and he does this by invoking A.J. Greimas' work to demonstrate that if a rupture is shown between the function of the surface character and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the surface character, then there exists a wedge into the historicity of the surface character.[12] Such a rupture occurs in *Tancred*. Considering the function of the donor in *Tancred* will make Tancred's flat character available as a historical production. It will also let us see the historical contours of the romance terrain of the Middle East.

The need for a donor is established after Tancred is kidnapped. After he is imprisoned in a mountain village, his adventures stop as the payment of his ransom is awaited. Fakredeen, who has had Tancred kidnapped, expects the ransom will be paid without difficulties, for Tancred is thought to be the "brother of the Queen of England." However, fulfilling the donor function turns out to be more difficult than Fakredeen had assumed, for an unexpected donor steps forward. Fakredeen's adoptive father, Besso, wants to pay the ransom, but Fakredeen declines the offer because he is embarrassed to accept the money from family. As a result, Tancred's ransom remains unpaid, forcing Fakredeen to come up with another plan. That plan is so complex that it calls attention to the primary difficulty of *Tancred*'s romance plot—locating a character to fulfill the donor function.

Fakredeen's plan involves trading arms for the release of Tancred. Fakredeen unfolds his scheme to Eva: "I tell you how I will manage the whole business. The great Sheikh wants arms; well, I will give him five hundred muskets for the ransom" (309).

---

[12] Jameson argues that Greimas's methodology is important because it can show a disjunction between the narrative surface and the underlying *actantial* mechanisms. Further, Greimas's method is most useful "in those instances in which the surface unity of "character" can be analytically dissolved, by showing . . . that a single character in reality conceals the operation of two distinct *actants*" (*The Political Unconscious* 126). Jameson performs Greimas's process in reverse, showing that a single *actant* in reality conceals the operation of two distinct characters. He uses Greimas's findings to argue that both Propp and Greimas's narrative systems are most productive when they deviate from their basic schema. The donor function, then, because of its particular relation to the surface character of the hero, becomes the key for Jameson to locate this deviation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yet the problem of how Fakredeen, infamously in debt, is to pay for the weapons is yet to be solved, as Eva points out, "But how are we to get these arms?" Fakredeen plots on: "Why, Scheriff Effendi, to be sure. You know I am to meet him at Gaza the day after to-morrow, and receive his five thousand muskets. Well, five hundred for the great Sheikh will make them four thousand five hundred; no great difference" (309). Still, the original problem remains as Eva points out: "But who is to pay for them?" Fakredeen then reveals how he will get Tancred to pay for the muskets, thus paying his own ransom: "Why, if men want to head the Asian movement, they must have muskets . . . and, after all, as we are going to save the English prince two millions of piastres, I do not think he can object to paying Scheriff Effendi for his goods; particularly as he will have the muskets for his money" (309).

Fakredeen's plan is circuitous, and as Eva's questions suggest, far from clear. It does not invoke a simple romance solution, in which a donor, whose sole function is to supply the hero with what he needs, steps forward with his magical weapon, enabling the hero to continue on his quest. Instead, the solution to the donor problem involves a combination of characters and character traits; only Fakredeen's resourcefulness and Tancred's unlimited credit can set Tancred free. A rupture exits between the donor function and the surface character in Propp's analysis, the donor cannot be the hero or the villain or a combination of both, but an independent actor. As Jameson suggests, such a rupture points to the historicity of the surface character.

That Fakredeen and Tancred are historical figures should come as no surprise. Yet cloaking these characters' actions in the romance trope of ransom obscures *Tancred*'s own historic contribution. "Ransom," it turns out, is just another term for "loan" in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fakredeen's lexicon, and his elaborate plan to hold Tancred hostage is simply the easiest way to get a loan. *Tancred* both proposes the historical problem of getting a loan in the Middle East and suggests a solution. The problem is twofold: first, Fakredeen can't get a loan, and second Tancred can't give a loan, as Fakredeen makes clear when he raises the issue with Tancred: "'If I could only raise a loan,' said the Emir [Fakredeen], 'I could do without France and England' 'A loan!' exclaimed Tancred; 'I see the poison of modern liberalism has penetrated even the Desert. Believe me, national redemption is not an affair of usury'" (259). As Fakredeen's claim suggests, getting a loan in the region was not easy, and thus he must look elsewhere—to France and England--to obtain financing. But Tancred's impassioned reply shows that British shame and moralism surrounding lending practices stood in the way of Fakredeen's desires. *Tancred* discovers a way to solve both historic problems.

One reason that Fakredeen has difficulty obtaining a loan in the region has to do with the exorbitant rates of interest charged by local money lenders, "I am paying sixty percent at Beiroot, Tripoli, Latakia, and every accursed town of the coast at this moment" (303). Hence, he tries to persuade Eva to convince her father, Besso, to lower his rates from sixty to thirty percent. According to the historian, David S. Landes, high local rates of interest in the Middle East were chronic: "there were few banks but many money-lenders, little investment but much hoarding, no credit but much usury" (57). Fakredeen's solution to the high interest rates is to turn outside of the local economy, refusing the loan/ransom from Besso, the "only" local money-lender, and attempting to get it from abroad. *Tancred* anticipates this historical turning away from local sources of capital, in favor of cheaper money from abroad.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But it is not enough for Fakredeen to look outside of the region to obtain a loan, if those outside sources are not willing to lend him the money. Tancred blushes every time money is mentioned, and he tells Eva, "My cheek burns while I say it; but I think, in Europe, what is most valued is money" (199). Tancred must learn to think about money in a different manner if he is going to become an investor in Fakredeen's projects. Yet, it is only outside of England that Tancred unlearns his shame about investing, and Fakredeen is his teacher. When Eva asks Fakredeen how he will get Tancred to pay for Fakredeen's British muskets, Fakredeen comes up with a project, as we have seen: "Why, if men want to head the Asian movement, they must have muskets" (309). Fakredeen convinces Tancred that he, Tancred, wants to head the Asian movement, to unite the Arabs and throw out the Turks. Fakredeen teaches Tancred to invest in the name of a higher good. He instills in Tancred a belief in investing for the sake of "world-conquering" and "empire."

Tancred shows that Empire is the key to Fakredeen's getting a loan and Tancred's giving one. In the 1850s the employment of the joint-stock company in foreign adventures encouraged large-scale investments in the Middle East. In addition, high local rates of interest made it not just possible, but profitable for foreigners to loan at slightly lower rates. Desperately trying to modernize, governments took advantage of the new sources of funds. Western lenders too took advantage of the situation. Because local interest rates were so high, they could charge lower rates and be guaranteed a profit because rates were still higher than they were in their home countries. Thus, investing in the Middle East was always a profitable business. Such a situation was a recipe for what Landes calls "economic imperialism": the production of unmanageable debts and the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

subsequent foreign "solution" to the debt problem. Landes' primary example of economic imperialism in the region is the situation that led to the British purchase of the Suez Canal. Ismail Pasha borrowed heavily from the West to build the Canal, and in the 1870s could no longer afford to pay off his loans. Overwhelming debts forced him to sell the Suez Canal to the British in 1875. Egypt went bankrupt the following year.

Trying to understand the gross double standard that Western investors in the Middle East engaged in, loaning money at exorbitant rates while knowing that such rates would never be considered fair at home, Landes comes to the conclusion that investors believed that what they were doing was for the good. He argues that Westerners who loaned to the Middle East believed that they gave more than they received. I am suggesting that *Tancred* shows that it is through the production of belief in the Imperial project that the British unlearned their shame about the market and learned to feel good about investing. Guaranteed profits only helped. Distance helped even more, for there were no examples of ruin next door. And when economic ruin clearly did happen, as in the case of Egypt, it was reinterpreted in a new framework: national triumph. Thus, when Disraeli purchased the Suez Canal from the nearly bankrupt regime in 1875, the British thought nothing of Egypt's tragedy, but unanimously cheered England's success.[13]

---

[13] Disraeli's purchase was applauded in the press across the political spectrum. Hepworth Dixon's portrayal of the event in *Gentleman's Magazine* is typical: "I have seen nothing to compare with the fever of London society during the past and present week. . . . When we are agreed, our unanimity is wonderful! In these early days of December, 1875, England appears to have only one thought. She has done a great thing, and made her neighbors stare" (38).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Debts have a special place in *Tancred.* While as Landes argues, in the Middle East they come to be a major tool of economic imperialism, in *Tancred*, they produce the energy and energetic characters necessary for a romance plot. They not only provide Fakredeen with purpose, ("I should be incapable of anything, if it were not for my debts" (303)), but they lead him into his fantastic plot:

> He was perpetually in masquerade; a merchant, a Mamlouk, a soldier of fortune, a Tartar messenger, sometimes a pilgrim, sometimes a dervish, always in pursuit of some improbable but ingenious object, or lost in the mazes of some fantastic plot. . . . he was perpetually in Egypt, Baghdad, Cyprus, Smyrna, and the Syrian cities. He sauntered away a good deal of his time indeed in the ports and towns of the coast, looking after his creditors; but this was not the annoyance to him which it would be to most men. Fakredeen was fond of his debts; they were the source indeed of his only real excitement, and he was grateful to them for their stirring powers. (381)

Chasing his creditors, and hiding from them, Fakredeen is constantly in motion and incognito. "I have the two greatest stimulants in the world to action," he says, "Youth and Debt!" (213) Debts, indeed, author this fantastic character and his action-packed romance plot.[14]

---

[14] Disraeli's positive spin on Fakredeen's debts belie the real-life dependency that debt would come to represent in the Middle East. While debt is portrayed as Fakredeen's greatest ally, prompting him on to great deeds, it would plague the reigns of the Egyptian rulers Said Pasha (1854-63) and Ismail Pasha (1863-1879), finally causing the bankruptcy of Ismail's government in 1876. Said is known for stepping up the modernization process begun under Mohammed Ali, and slowed under Ali's successor, Abbas Pasha (1849-1854). Said's initiation and support of many modernization projects,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fakredeen also ushers Tancred into his romance plot, kidnapping him, and providing him with a quest in which to invest. But Fakredeen enables Tancred in yet another way. The fictionalization of the scheming promoter figure, and the projection of him onto a space far away, makes the fiction of Tancred's fair lending practices all the more possible. Contemporaries considered Fakredeen's character to be original: "Fakredeen, a sort of prurient graft of eastern subtlety on western politics, is quite original, and very amusing" (Monckton 153). Yet his originality lay not so much in his character, but in Disraeli's geographical projection of it: "almost the only character which has any pretensions to originality and novelty is that of Fakredeen, the ambitious chieftain of Lebanon, and his prototype we are inclined to believe must be sought nearer home" (Taylor 389). Although contemporaries pointed to the originality of Fakredeen's political behavior, I suggest that what was really new was Disraeli's positive spin on Fakredeen's financial prowess. Disraeli's originality lay in taking the promoter figure, not well liked at home, and by the trick of geography, making him loveable, as Lady Blessington points out: "I consider Fakredeen one of the finest conceptions ever painted, and how painted! Never was there so true a portrait of a misapplied Genius, and an unprincipled mind. With what wonderful skill have you managed this character forcing your readers to love, while they cannot esteem him" (238).

---

including improved streets in Alexandria, better water transport, irrigation projects, cotton cultivation, the dredging of the Mahmoudieh canal, and the granting of the concession for the Suez Canal, caused him to seek two substantial foreign loans in the early 1860s, which propelled him into debt. Ismail inherited that debt, which grew exponentially under his reign: from £3,300,000 to £91,000,000 in the period from 1863-1877 (Landes). Ismail's pursuit of huge public works, empire in Africa, and the completion of the Suez Canal were some of the factors that contributed to the growth of debt under his government. In the West, Ismail gained a reputation of being a profligate spender—a reputation that should be evaluated within the context of debt production, rather than morality, as it so often has been.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In England Fakredeen would just have been another schemer, like George Hudson, the "Railway King" but by being projected outward and into romance, Fakredeen does not have to meet the fate of his British contemporary. Abroad, he is a sensation. Fakredeen makes way for Tancred, whose development is stunted in England. He gives Tancred purpose, and belief in something worth investing in. Fakredeen can propose empire to Tancred and make it palatable, coloring it foreign, at the moment that it is most English. Fakredeen's originality, then is much like Disraeli's—he can embody empire, creating the fiction that it is "other" at the point when it is most at home.

Novel Technologies: The *Bildungsroman* Abroad

Novel Worlds, or Why Does Tancred Stay in the Middle East?

It is telling that Northrop Frye begins his analysis of the genre of romance by discussing its ending. This is because romance threatens to go on forever: "At its most naïve it is an endless form in which a central character who never develops or ages goes through one adventure after another until the author himself collapses" (Frye 186). He cites comic strips, where the main characters persist for years in a state of "refrigerated deathlessness," as an example of the rudimentary form (186). It is only the end that can put a stop to romance's persistence, and thus provide it with its literary form:

> as soon as romance achieves a literary form, it tends to limit itself to a sequence of minor adventures leading up to a major or climacteric adventure, usually announced from the beginning, the completion of which rounds off the story. We may call this major adventure, the element that gives literary form to the romance, the quest. (186-187)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

According to Frye, "the complete form of the romance is clearly the successful quest" (187), and such a completed form has three stages: the *agon*, the perilous journey along with its minor adventures; the *pathos*, the critical struggle which may end in death for the hero or his opponent; and the *anagnorisis*, the exaltation and recognition of the hero.

Tancred's romance plot follows the pattern that Frye outlines. Initially Tancred roams throughout the desert, fighting various battles; he then escapes near death at the hands of the Ansarey; and finally, he is exalted as the hero, over and above the only other character who contends for that slot, his friend and rival, Fakredeen. However, after Tancred is revealed as the hero, the story does not end, and the novel does not finish with the conclusion of its romance plot. Instead, I shall argue, the romance plot is shed in order to conclude on more familiar territory. *Tancred*, a novel that conforms in many ways to the romance tradition, resorts to a *Bildungsroman* conclusion.

Contemporary critics did not like *Tancred's* ending. One, who otherwise marveled at the novel, wrote:

> It is impossible to give any idea within a moderate space, of the poetry and the beauty that lingers on the steps of the crusader. Pity that this effect is marred by an abrupt and somewhat frivolous conclusion (no doubt a temporary one) and which is not for the time being, in keeping with the tone that pervades the rest of the work. (Taylor 526)

Indeed, the ending is abrupt. On the last page of the novel, with no warning and no foreshadowing, Tancred's parents come to visit. The very last line of the novel introduces the pair who have not been mentioned for over three-hundred pages: "The Duke and the Duchess of Bellamont had arrived at Jerusalem" (501). Disconcerting as it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

may have been for Tancred and his critics to have his parents arrive unannounced, I believe that critics who were not happy with the ending were responding to a rupture in form that happens before the arrival of the Duke and the Duchess.

A review of Tancred's final adventure, leading up to what Frye calls his *anagnorisis*, and what follows, will show the disjuncture in form with which the novel concludes. In the crowning adventure of the novel, Tancred and Fakredeen set out to "conquer the world," a phrase that they use to describe their plan to unite Syria by convincing two tribes to join together to fight the region's occupiers, the Ottoman Empire. Together, they decide to visit the Ansarey, a mysterious and isolated mountain tribe, who are ruled by the brave and beautiful Queen Astarte. The Ansarey are the most exotic of the many tribes that Tancred visits; unlike their Arab, Jewish, and Christian neighbors, they are polytheistic, and worship the Ancient Greek gods. As soon as Astarte sets eyes upon Tancred, she falls in love with him. Unfortunately, Fakredeen has fallen in love with her, but astutely detects that Astarte desires Tancred. In order to take revenge upon Tancred, Fakredeen tells the Queen the truth--Tancred is in love with another, Eva. In a fit of jealous rage Astarte kidnaps Eva, who happens to be passing through the desert, and brings her to the mountain village. Astarte then plots with Fakredeen to have Eva murdered. But Fakredeen, instead, reveals to Eva (who is his half-sister) what mischief he has caused, and he and Eva flee the jealous Queen, leaving Tancred behind to fend for himself. Tancred is indeed left in a troubled spot, for he must contend with the Queen, who not only is jealous of his love, but has recently been double-crossed by Fakredeen.

It is partly Tancred's ability to work his way out of this precarious situation, calming the furious Queen and securing his release, that makes him a hero. More

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

important, though, is what happens next. As Tancred is about to leave the Ansarey, it is announced that five thousand Turkish troops are on their way to invade the land of the Ansarey. Astarte tells Tancred to flee for his life, but he bravely chooses to stay, saying: "I cannot leave it in the hour of peril. . . . This invasion of the Ottomans may lead to results of which none dream. I will meet them at the head of your warriors!" (480) With these words Tancred's mettle is revealed. He will fight the Empire, and he will do it alone, without Fakredeen, his partner in "world conquering." With few soldiers and even fewer weapons, Tancred fights until he and his men are cut off and surrounded. Outnumbered by more than ten to one, they make their getaway into the desert.

Tancred arrives at the desert "on the third day, before sunset." Drawing from biblical tradition, Disraeli makes the desert the site of Tancred's *anagnorisis*. There he is finally recognized by the locals, not as the "son of the Queen of England" for which they mistakenly had taken him all along, but for the brave warrior that he has proved himself to be. He is feted and celebrated: "sheep were killed, bread baked, coffee pounded, and the pipe of honour was placed in the hands of Tancred" (490). A "long and rather elaborate" "Arabian revel" ensues. In addition to the biblical connotations of the desert, Disraeli draws on nineteenth-century meanings as well. In a period when roads were increasingly being built in the most out-of-the-way places and the new tourist industry was depositing tourists in all corners of the globe, the desert held out the promise of something else: the escape from civilization, unbounded freedom, and a space for man to return to nature, in a manly way. The traveler and explorer Sir Richard F. Burton writes of his 1853 trip to the desert: "nature returns to man in the desert," where he says, "there is a keen enjoyment in mere animal existence" (150-151).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In the desert Tancred escapes civilization and returns to his natural manliness. Yet even more important, Tancred enjoys the sense of boundlessness that the desert landscape offers. Surveying the desert from above, Tancred sees unbounded space: "When Tancred had gained an undulating height, and was capable of taking a more extensive survey of the land, it presented, especially towards the south, the same features through an illimitable space" (488). When Tancred's attendant Baroni cries, "The Syrian Desert!" Tancred responds, "My heart responds to it. . . . What is Damascus, with all its sumptuousness, to this sweet liberty!" (488) Thus in the final scene of Tancred's romance, when Tancred is discovered as the hero, he himself discovers "sweet liberty." But this liberty proves to be too much for him, and he falls asleep. The last words of the chapter freeze Tancred in his sleep: "'Indeed, great Sheikh, the longer I live and the more I think'— and here the chibouque dropped gently from Tancred's mouth, and he himself sunk upon the carpet" (491). With Tancred fast asleep on an Arabian carpet, the final chapter of this romance closes.

Tancred wakes up to a novel world. New bodies, new objects and an entirely new set of energies inhabit the text. We learn secondhand that Tancred has just returned from Egypt: "He has been absent six months; he has been in Egypt" (493). The text offers no explanation for the temporal disjunction. Yet it might be understood as a way to distance Tancred from the moment when he was closest to "going native" in the desert. There, he ate, drank, smoked and reveled with the natives. The only other reference to Egypt in the text supports this reading. Earlier, when Tancred is asked if he will visit Egypt, he answers: "I should not be sorry to visit Egypt. It is a country that rather perplexes us in Europe. It has undergone great changes" (407). Egypt, one of the oldest civilizations in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the world, now in the midst of modern development, can provide a buffer zone between Tancred's "native" lapse and the rest of the novel.

Yet Tancred's trip to Egypt provides another function. Tancred goes there in order to come home. In other words, Tancred goes to Egypt to establish Jerusalem as home. It is Tancred's return from Egypt that makes his home visible for the first time: "Tancred dismounted and entered for the first time his house at Jerusalem, of which he had been the nominal tenant for half a year" (494). Up to this point, Tancred's "house" has never been mentioned. The reader can surmise that Tancred bought this house at the end of his final adventure, just before he left for Egypt. But the house only became visible upon his return. It is typical of the romance hero to return home, rounding off the romance plot, but Tancred is establishing a new home, right in the center of what used to be his romance world.

Tancred's new home is more familiar, more like home than what we've seen thus far. His attendant, we are told, was "quite at home" in it (494). Tancred comes home to a whole new cast of characters, who seem to be ushered into the novel as so much furniture. They are simply referred to as Tancred's "friends": Colonel Bruce, the British Consul, the Reverend Mr. Bernard, and Dr. Roby. These men's presence in the novel remains unexplained. They just materialize along with the new house. The only time that they are wanted, they are absent: when Tancred expects them to welcome him home, they are all busy. The men are there in name only. Yet that is saying something: next to other names that populate the text, Barizy of the Tower, Pasqualigo, Scheriff Effendi, and Besso, these names are distinctively familiar. Along with these names an entire

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

professional and colonial structure is imported into the novel: a colonel, a consul, a reverend and a doctor.

Franco Moretti argues that it is "essential to build a 'homeland' for the individual" in the *Bildungsroman* (26). And this is precisely what the *Bildungsroman* conclusion to Tancred's romance accomplishes. *Tancred* builds a homeland in the Middle East for its long-wandering titular character. But more than this, Moretti says that the *Bildungsroman* is a form that evolved in order to convince the modern individual, confronted with an explosion of new freedoms symbolized by the French Revolution, to willingly give up his freedoms in exchange for happiness in his homeland. "Home," then, is an aesthetic category with the production of "happiness" at its core. The *Bildungsroman* seeks to both make the individual give up his new-found freedoms and feel at home with his decision. Thus, the freedom of revolution is exchanged for happiness of the hearth. The *Bildungsroman* solves the problem of how individuality can be made to coexist with "normality" by teaching the individual to coexist with "normality" by internalizing it. "Normality" must be internalized so that one can believe the statement, "I *desire* to do what I in any case *should* have done" (21). Marriage becomes the best way to accomplish this statement; thus, Moretti asserts, "the classical *Bildungsroman* 'must' always conclude with marriages" (22).[15]

---

[15] Moretti uses marriage as a metaphor for the social contract: "It has been observed that from the late eighteenth century on, marriage becomes the model for a new type of social contract: one no longer sealed by forces located outside of the individual (such as status), but founded on a sense of 'individual obligation.' . . . It is not only the foundation of the family that is at stake, but the 'pact' between the individual and the world, that reciprocal 'consent' which finds in the double 'I do' of the wedding ritual an unsurpassed symbolic condensation" (22).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moretti describes the *Bildungsroman* as plotted in Germany, France and England. But what would it mean to export the *Bildungsroman* plot to the Middle East? Because the *Bildungsroman* conclusion of *Tancred* is overlooked by critics, the ending of *Tancred* is often understood only in the context of Tancred's loss, as pronounced by Eva: "You no longer believe in Arabia" (500). Indeed, Tancred has lost his faith. But if we consider the novel in terms of its *Bildungsroman* conclusion, Tancred has also gained something; he has learned to internalize something of the world. Tancred now accepts modernization and the forces that make it possible. He no longer believes in the total corruption of the market. Consequently, the force that binds him and his twin protagonist in polar opposition can no longer hold. The fiction that Fakredeen is his evil twin cannot be maintained. Thus, with Tancred's proposal to Eva, he and Fakredeen become brothers—with equal access to Besso's capital.[16] The romance "world," then, that derives its meaning from the semic organization of the twin protagonists, as outlined by Frye, dissolves. It is replaced by a newly domestic world.

Disraeli embellishes the two final chapters of his novel with domestic objects. Whereas previously attention was paid to the description of exotic landscapes, dress, or

---

[16] It is interesting that Fakredeen gains access to Besso's capital at this point. Besso believes that Fakredeen saved his daughter from the Ansarey, and thus promises him unlimited loans as a reward. One would think that Tancred's new filial relation to Besso would give him new access to Besso's capital, as it would in a novel plotted in England. However, Tancred has always had access to Besso's capital. The twinning of the protagonists, then, which began as a function of romance, is what allows for the transfer of Tancred's conventional reward to Fakredeen. The remnants of the romance convention of twinning serve to produce a sense of brotherhood between the two, and all that that connotes—fairness, equality—when the romance resolves into a *Bildungsroman*. The real inequality of access to capital, then, is elided by the adoption of the new literary form.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

customs, Disraeli now turns his attentions to the placement of mundane articles: a book, hot water, and even plum pudding, which is described at length:

> Colonel Bruce was dining with the English Consul on an experimental plum-pudding, preliminary to the authentic compound, which was to appear in a few days. It was supposed to be the first time that a Christmas pudding had been concocted in Jerusalem, and the excitement in the circle was considerable. The Colonel had undertaken to supervise the preparation, and had been for several days instilling the due instructions into a Syrian cook, who had hitherto only succeeded in producing a result which combined the specific gravity of lead with the general flavour and appearance of a mass of kneaded dates, in a state of fermentation after a long voyage. (495)

This passage reminds us of what one critic disliked so much about *Tancred*: It "is marred by an abrupt and somewhat frivolous conclusion" (Taylor 526). In comparison to the "world conquering" that occurred earlier in the novel, the preparation of plum pudding indeed seems trivial. But the accusation of having a "frivolous conclusion" only holds in comparison to earlier events. Plum pudding would be at home in any novel.

This "frivolous" conclusion signals the resolution of romance into the "everyday" world of the novel, where events are indeed frivolous, or "unworthy of serious attention" (*OED*). In Moretti's understanding, the "everyday" is the space "to the side of" the world of work in which the *Bildungsroman* hero can become fully himself.[17] It is a space that

---

[17] Moretti places the "everyday" realm "to the side of" the bustling world, as opposed to placing it in the past, in the precapitalistic community and its craftsmanship, where it is often placed by theorists: "I would like to propose here a different type of historical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

purposely does not present the workings of capital. It is curious then, that once Tancred's reservations about the market are resolved, attention shifts "to the side of" this bustling world. According to Moretti, the *Bildungsroman* shows how pleasing life can be in a small world. It does not show the havoc that modernization is to wreak on the Middle East.

Tancred acts differently in his everyday world. He is newly fidgety, anxious, and sad. He seems bored: "Tancred roamed about the house, surveyed his court and garden, sighed, while Baroni rewarded and dismissed their escort. 'I know how it is,' he at length said to his intendant, 'but I never could have supposed that I could have felt so sad and spiritless at Jerusalem'" (495). His vocabulary has changed. This man who wanted to "conquer the world" and "unite Arabia" now says "I feel unstrung," and he uses words like "disappointed" and "anxious." But if Tancred is different, he is also familiar in a way that he has not been before. The readers can now relate to his activities: "Tancred passed the day alone in reading, or walking about his room with an agitated and moody step" (496). Tancred's unease in the world is familiar to the reader of the *Bildungsroman.* Like Jane Eyre, Dorothea Brookes, Wilhelm Meister, and Frédéric Moreau, he is out of sync with the world. In George Lukacs's formulation, his soul is too big for the world. In Moretti's, he is beginning to develop a personality. His moods, anxieties, disappointment, create interiority not apparent in his prior actions of charging through the desert.

---

interpretation, according to which aesthetic organicity, and happiness that comes with it belong not only to a past that precedes capitalist production and the 'mechanical' state, but endure in modern times as well. Except that now they are shifted 'to the side of' the great collective institutions, which they engage in a silent and unending border war" (33).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moretti believes that "modern personality lodges at the center of everyday life" (40), saving it from its humdrumness. He states the relationship between the two as such: "Everyday life: an anthropocentric space where all social activities lose their exacting objectivity and converge in the domain of 'personality'" (12). Because the world of work is not likely to encourage complex personality, the everyday world arises to exhibit the individual's multiplicity.[18] Tancred's personality is exhibited through his disenchantment with his everyday world: "I wish the battle of Gindarics had never ceased, but that, like some hero of enchantment, I had gone on for ever fighting" (496). Baroni answers, "Ah! There is nothing like action" (496). Tancred's response gives away just how much he has changed: "But what action is there in this world? . . . The most energetic men in Europe are mere busybodies. Empires are now governed like parishes, and a great statesman is only a select vestryman" (496). But it is Eva in the final scene of the novel who best describes Tancred's change, "I have a vague impression . . . that there have been heroic aspirations wasted, and noble energies thrown away; and yet, perhaps," she added, in a faltering tone, "there is no one to blame. Perhaps, all this time, we have been dreaming over an unattainable end, and the only source of deception is our own imagination" (499). Eva internalizes the change, suggesting that "imagination" is to account for it. She continues:

> Your feelings cannot be what they were before all this happened; when you thought only of a divine cause, of stars, of angels, and of our peculiar

---

[18] Taking his cues from Lukacs and Simmel, Moretti writes: "it is fairly difficult for modern 'personality' to reach its goal in a professional occupation alone, that is to say, work. Work has become too fragmented in its nature and also too 'objective', too impervious to 'living meaning'. Those who devote themselves to modern profession must give up their own personality" (41).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> and gifted land. No, no; now it is all mixed up with intrigue, and politics, and management, and baffled schemes, and cunning arts of men. You may be, you are, free from all this, but your faith is not the same. You no longer believe in Arabia. (500)

It is important to note that the newly faithless Tancred does not rush home at the onset of his change. Instead, he learns to desire something else:

> "Why, thou to me art Arabia," said Tancred, advancing and kneeling at her side. "The angel of Arabia, and of my life and spirit! Talk not to me of faltering faith: mine is intense. Talk not to me of leaving a divine cause: why, thou art my cause, and thou art most divine! O Eva! Deign to accept the tribute of my long agitated heart! Yes, I too, like thee, am sometimes full of despair; but it is only when I remember that I love, and love perhaps, in vain!" (500)

With this declaration Tancred rids himself of all of the desires, hopes and dreams that have been his life's ambition—beliefs that stirred him to leave his family, friends, a promised wife and a sure place in Parliament. He has given up the dreams that have generated a five-hundred page novel. And he has done it all in exchange for a woman. Textually this is represented without energy loss: "Arabia" is exchanged for "Arabia."

This elegant equation, in which all of what an individual hopes and desires is given up, and replaced with a bundle of equal value, with no loss to the individual, represents what Moretti believes the classical *Bildungsroman* does best. It teaches the individual to give up freedom by convincing him that what he will get in return is happiness. "How is it possible to convince the modern—'free'—individual to willingly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

limit his freedom?" (22). Precisely through marriage. The classical *Bildungsroman* "must" end with a marriage.

In the exchange of "Arabia" for "Arabia" no energy is lost. Romance energies are exchanged for novelistic ones. Building a homeland relies on energies that only the novel can provide—energies that domesticate. By substituting one "Arabia" for another, Tancred can shed his despair of the modern world. Nevertheless, we must take seriously his prior claim that "The most energetic men in Europe are mere busybodies," for in it, the forceful but sporadic energy of Napoleonic empire is exchanged for the persistent energy of the busybody. E.P. Thompson too notes a new type of energy in the century, one that he relates to the way that time came to discipline work: "By the 1830s and 1840s it was commonly observed that the English industrial worker was marked off from his fellow Irish worker, not by a greater capacity for hard work, but by his regularity, his methodical paying-out of energy" (399). He notes, "without time discipline we could not have the insistent energies of industrial man" (399). Moretti also discovers evidence of the century's new energy--not in work--but in that aesthetic space "to the side of" work—the everyday world of the *Bildungsroman*. This world is characterized by a protagonist who exercises his personality through the way that he directs his energies: "What is important is to be able to dispose of one's energies at every moment and to employ them for the countless occasions or opportunities that life, little by little, takes upon itself to offer" (45). It is the protagonist's ability to pick and choose amongst the clutter of diurnal details and events that the everyday world lets loose into the novel that shapes his personality. Events only become meaningful because he gives them meaning. Under this reading, the everyday world offers up a space in which the protagonist's personality is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

defined by its power to distinguish and choose. While Thompson makes visible the new productive energies of the century—organized by time--Moretti highlights the new consumptive ones—as an ordering of space.

The *Bildungsroman* creates appetites and habits of consumption. It is important that of the four new British characters that are imported into the novel's ending, the Colonel is the only one shown doing something. Tellingly, he is not leading men into battle. Instead, he is instructing a Syrian in the fine art of cooking plum pudding, "instilling the due instructions into a Syrian cook" (495). He is introducing traditions--the first "Christmas pudding" to be made in Jerusalem--and creating habits of consumption. Romance conquers by force, but the novel's conquest is economic. Disraeli conceives of Empire as a system that depends upon instilling appetites, habits, and traditions. In an age that understood Empire in relation to physical conquest, Disraeli imagined the power of consumption.

It is interesting then that the novel both begins and ends with the inculcation of tastes. It opens with the story of a French cook who worked in the "Imperial kitchen" of Napoleon, and is hired to "form the tastes" of the British aristocracy, represented by Tancred's family and friends, and the novel ends with a Colonel trying to teach a Syrian cook to cook a traditional English meal. The appetite for Empire, it seems, is being constructed on both ends—in England and in the colonies. By way of conclusion, I offer one thought on Disraeli's preoccupation with the production of taste and patterns of consumption.

Just before *Tancred* resorts to its *Bildungsroman* conclusion, as we have seen, Tancred is feted in the desert. There he feasts on bread and dates and coffee. There he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

experiences illimitable space and unbounded freedoms. It is in this space that the novel flirts with the possibility of Tancred's "going native." But the risk is alleviated when Tancred falls asleep and wakes up in an aesthetic form that can hold him firm. He participates in the domesticating energies of the novel, moving into a house, finding a wife. In Moretti's terms, Tancred sacrifices his freedom for happiness. Moretti argues that the *Bildungsroman* teaches the bourgeoisie how the French revolution could have been avoided. But what does it teach in the context of colonialization? Similarly, it teaches how to avoid revolution. But the revolution is of a different nature. In the desert, Tancred enjoys local appetites and he consumes local products. He does not eat plum pudding. Therein lies the threat of "going native": it teaches the Western subject a habitual resistance to consumption. The subject who "goes native" learns to consume (and prefer) local products. "Going native" ensures that one does not develop an appetite for Empire. And the *Bildungsroman* ensures that nobody "goes native."

The *Bildungsroman* addresses what could only have been a symbolic threat in the century, for the fictional accounts of "going native" far out-number the real ones. And this may suggest a final reason that Disraeli chose the classical *Bildungsroman* to contain his story. In Moretti's reading, the classical *Bildungsroman* only spans a short period in the history of the novel—the two decades immediately following the French Revolution, with *Wilhelm Meister* and *Pride and Prejudice* being his prime examples. One wonders why Disraeli would prefer such an outmoded strategy. Yet understood in the context of the new exportation of capital, and all that that would come to involve—a new valuation of the market and investments, an extended desire for exotic consumer goods—the classical *Bildungsroman* makes sense as a choice of genre because it encourages habits of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

consumption and gives those habits aesthetic value. Similarly, one wonders why most of *Tancred* is written as a romance. According to Jameson romance is a historic genre, and it emerges in transitional moments in history in which "two distinct modes of production, or moments of socioeconomic development coexist" (*The Political Unconscious* 148). It occurs at the beginning of the century as a result of "the new and unglamorous social institutions emerging from the political triumph of the bourgeoisie and the setting in place of the market system" (148). And it occurs again at the end of the century as a symbolic reaction to the "stepped-up pace of social change" (148). Thus the construction of a romance in the middle of the century is odd, unless considered in terms of space. Both the "setting in place of the market system" and the "stepped-up pace of social change" were features of the Middle East by mid-century. Disraeli's full title of his novel *Tancred, or The New Crusade* should be considered not only in its religious connotations, as it so often has been, but in its financial ones as well. With that in mind, the claim of *Tancred's* most prophetic character, Sidonia, can be seen as central to an understanding of the novel: "Well, the crusades were of vast advantage to Europe. . . . It seems to wane at present, but it is only the decrease that precedes the new development" (127).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter III

Domesticating Egypt:
Women's Writing, Space, and Everyday-Living Abroad

From Romance Exteriors to Everyday Interiors: Genre at Work in the Middle East

In the previous chapter I have argued that landscapes overwhelm Tancred in order to suggest that romance conventions overwhelmed nineteenth-century authors who set plots in the Middle East. Writers whose projects differed from one another's as widely as Lord Byron's romantic epics and John Murray's mass tourism guides made use of romance conventions, such as presenting space, or what Northrop Frye called the "world," as natural and outside of history. The social reformer Harriet Martineau, too, relied upon romance conventions for her 1848 account of her trip to the Middle East, *Eastern Life, Present and Past*, as did Florence Nightingale in her narrative of her Nile journey, *Letters from Egypt 1849-1850.* Mary Elizabeth Herbert also embellished her 1869 Egyptian account, *Cradle Lands* with romance landscapes. Even Edward Williams Lane, hailed for his realistic portrayal of Egypt and its people in his 1836 *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians,* incorporated romance conventions into his ethnographic study.[1]

Emmeline Lott, who traveled to Egypt in 1864, and Lucy Duff Gordon, who landed in Alexandria in 1862, however, do away with romance conventions altogether. These works register a change in generic presentations of Egypt--from a portrayal of Egypt as mysterious and otherworldly to one of it as familiar and domestic; from a

---

[1] One notable exception is Alexander William Kinglake's 1834 romantic narrative, *Eothen*, which describes his thoughts and feelings during his travels through the Middle East. Kinglake eschews any conventions of travel writing that have to do with portraying the external world in order to present his own feelings, explaining: "As I have felt, so I have written" (xxi). Therefore, he represents no landscapes whatsoever.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

representation that sees only the outside world--monuments, ruins, and sunsets--to one that ventures inside the Egyptian house and accounts the everyday life therein. Lott's work, *The English Governess in Egypt: Harem Life in Egypt and Constantinople* (1867), long out of print and not well received in its day, portrays life in the harem of the Turkish viceroy of Egypt, Ismail Pasha, in a cruelly "realistic" and unsympathetic manner.[2] Lott went to Egypt to work as a governess for the grand pasha Ibrahim, the five-year-old son of the new viceroy, and lived in Ismail Pasha's Cairo harem for five months. Duff Gordon's *Letters from Egypt, 1862-1869,* published first in 1865 and then expanded and republished in 1875, was hailed in contemporary journals as a success for its unprecedented realism and sympathetic portrayal of the Egyptian people. At the age of forty-one, Duff Gordon went to Egypt to recover from tuberculosis, and lived there for seven years until her death in 1869, all of the time writing letters about her experiences to her family in England. Living in Egypt, as opposed to just visiting, and accounting that life on a daily basis, prompted these women to reach for new methods to tell their stories. Prevailing generic conventions were not appropriate for the portrayal of their daily lives; nor could those conventions contain the quickly modernizing world in which Lott and Duff Gordon found themselves.

Although British women first started to visit Egypt in numbers in the 1840s, when the burgeoning travel industry laid the infrastructure for more comfortable travel, many

---

[2] All three of Lott's published accounts of her observations of the Ottoman harems received bad reviews: *The Governess in Egypt: Harem Life in Egypt and Constantinople*, 1865, (republished under similar names in America in 1865 and 1867); *The Mohaddetyn in the Palace: Nights in the Harem; or, The Mohaddetyn in the Palace of Ghezire*, 1867; and *The Grand Pacha's Cruise on the Nile in the Viceroy of Egypt's Yacht*, 1869. Contemporary reviewers objected to her overly-detailed accounts, and according to Michael Wojcik, "Lott's books brought her little profit or recognition" (235).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

women still felt a decade later that living in Egypt was not possible.[3] Nightingale, for instance, wrote in mid-century: "Let no one live in the East, who can find a corner in the ugliest, coldest hole in Europe" (176). Nightingale spent five months in Egypt and passed much of that time floating up the Nile in a dahabieh, refusing to go anywhere by steam. She represents Egypt as a natural world, unaffected by time. Her account is dominated by descriptions of landscapes, usually bathed in the light of the setting sun or rising moon: "the moon rising behind the trees on the Nile bank, and shining through them and the tall bulrushes, on the lonely waters, was the most striking thing I have seen" (41). Her belief that Egypt was not habitable has as much to do with her inability to see Egypt outside of the confines of romance landscape as it does with her never having lived there. For her, Egypt only existed as landscape; domestic objects did not intrude. Describing a church, for instance, she writes: "Fancy a church in the middle of alleys and tangles of palms, loaded with bunches of golden fruit, stretching every way in the forest, so that you lose the enclosure; daturas, bignonias, oleanders, cactuses, and bananas making the underwood; a great well in the midst, upon the edge of which sat the most beautiful group of Egyptian and Smyrniot women, and the radiant sunset behind" (23). The church, the women, and the well are not depicted as distinct objects, but only as part of the verdure that engulfs them. Landscapes threaten to "lose" all "enclosures," leaving interiors unduly exposed: "One rides out to see the sunset, but between you and the sun you see, crouching in a ditch, lumps of low huts, not even *pretending* to keep out the

[3] According to Billie Melman there were only four books written by European women on the Middle East from 1500 to 1821. By 1911, however, after having reached a peak in the 1890s, that number had reached 241.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

weather; the bulrushes which grow in the swamps round them droop over them" (39-40). Nightingale cannot imagine Egyptian abodes as having an interior.

Martineau, like Nightingale, floated up the Nile in a dahabieh. She too depicts the countryside in the soft rich shades of a setting sun, but she prefers to render her landscapes in what she calls the "afterglow," a mysterious light that appears after the sun has set: "everything begins to brighten again in twenty minutes;--the hills are again purple or golden, --the sands orange,--the palms verdant,--the moonlight on the water, a pale green ripple on a lilac surface" (18). Egypt appears in silhouette backlit by afterglow: "The effects of palm clumps standing up before these yellow backgrounds, which are themselves bounded by a line of purple hills, with silver stars hanging above them, and mysterious heavenly lights gushing up from behind all, exceeds in rich softness any colouring that sunshine can show" (125).

Duff Gordon was critical of the kind of vision exemplified by the works of Martineau and Nightingale that could not distinguish people from the scenery. Of Martineau's book she wrote: "It is true as far as it goes, but there is the usual defect—the people are not real people, only *part of the scenery* to her, as to most Europeans" (120). People in Martineau's account slip quietly in and out of the landscape, but their presence is never fully felt. For example, she treats a party that she meets in the desert much like a mirage: "We met a party of three men, a boy and a donkey,--one of them carrying a spear. They returned our greeting courteously, but stopped to look after us in surprise. Their tread and ours was noiseless in the wind; and the only sound within that wide horizon was of a barking dog,--far away on the opposite shore" (135).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Duff Gordon and Lott desired to exhibit Egypt in a new light. Duff Gordon expressed disgust with the unnaturalness of depictions of the Middle East in art. Quoting her friend, Shaikh Yussuf, with whom she agreed, she wrote, "'If the painter could not go to Es-Sham (Syria) to see how the Beduin really look . . . why did he not paint a well in England with girls like English peasants? At least it would have looked natural to English people'" (142). She continues, "Fancy pictures of Eastern things are hopelessly absurd, and fancy poems too. I have got a hold of a stray copy of Victor Hugo's '*Orientales*', and I think I never laughed more in my life" (142). While Duff Gordon felt that Europeans who depicted the East had little familiarity with their subject matter, Lott believed that Europeans who depicted harems, had never spent time in one: "Pray, kind reader, just picture yourself surrounded by such a motley group of beings, gabbling, chattering to me in their unknown tongues, and making grimaces like monkeys from four o'clock in the morning until ten at night incessantly; and then you may form some idea of life in the Harem—that myth-like Elysium of the fertile imagination of both Western and Eastern poets" (107).

Both women aspired to photographic accounts: "How much did I regret that I had not been taught the art of taking photographs, for then I could have daguerreotyped the whole of the inmates of the Harems of Egypt and Constantinople" (Lott 45).[4] Duff Gordon, conversely, was sure that she had achieved the photographic ideal: "At Geneva I sat next to one Arnaud Bey at dinner. He has been twenty-seven years in Egypt and says,

---

[4] Only a few years before the women arrived to Egypt, the first general collection of photographs of the Middle East was published, Francis Frith's 1858 *Egypt and Palestine, Photographed and Described.* For a discussion of the importance of photography in the colonizing of Egypt see Timothy Mitchell who argues that Europeans' obsessive photographing of Egypt was part of their desire to make it readable because colonial power needed a country to be legible.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

like Hekekian, that my letters are a photograph and he will endorse every opinion I have expressed" (234). I will argue, however, that their writings produced a different sort of realism, one inspired much more by the everyday life of the novel than by the detailed and timeless precision of the daguerreotype. And I will suggest that it is through the adoption of the conventions of the everyday that women participate in the domestication of Egypt.

While Nightingale and Martineau wax poetical about sunsets, Lott never once looks up at the sky. Instead, she presents a realistic and claustrophobic image of being trapped in a house with a spoiled child. During her entire stay, she only tells of leaving the harem three times, and then avoids all description of landscapes. She does however nicely describe everything inside of the palace, wandering from room to room, studiously detailing all that she sees, from wall hangings to floor coverings, from mirrors to bedsteads. Duff Gordon, on the other hand, describes landscapes, but she is far more interested in detailing the daily lives of those around her. And she describes domestic practices--what goes on in her kitchen, in the market, and in her neighbors' homes with unprecedented attention.

Lott and Duff Gordon rely upon a different sort of lighting than their predecessors. So accustomed to outdoor lighting is Nightingale, that when she peeps into a "hut," she sees none of its contours: "I saw a door about three feet high, of a mud hut, and peeping in, saw in the darkness nothing but a white-horned sheep, and a white hen. But something else was moving, and presently crawled out four human beings, three women and a child" (44). Lott, on the other hand, is accustomed to domestic lighting: by candlelight she views the whole of the interior of Ismail Pasha's palace. And Duff

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Gordon, living above the Luxor ruins in spacious and open rooms also relies upon indoor lighting. Natural light filters through her kitchen window, as she sits near it recording the everyday life of her household in letters to be sent home to her family.

In the lighting of everyday life, details emerge that hitherto went undetected. While Nightingale writes that "at Thebes one feels that detail matters little—it is the grave of a world that one has come to see" (133), Duff Gordon, also writing at Thebes, makes details the matter of her letters. Indeed, for many travelers to the East, details are less important than impressions. Edward Williams Lane, however, who traveled in the 1830s is one notable exception.[5] He turns the collection of domestic details into a profession in his proto-ethnographic study of the Egyptian people. Yet Lane's use of details is profoundly different from Lott or Duff Gordon's. For example, describing how Egyptians eat Lane writes:

> The master of the house first begins to eat; the guests or others immediately follow his example. Neither knives nor forks are used—the thumb and two fingers of the right hand serve instead of those instruments; but the spoons are used for soup or rice . . . To pick out a delicate morsel and hand it to a friend is esteemed polite . . . Each person breaks off a small piece of bread, dips it in the dish, and then conveys it to his mouth, together with a small portion of the meat, or other contents of the dish. The piece of bread is generally doubled together, so as to enclose the

---

[5] Another exception may be found in mass tourism guides such as John Murray's. However, these details are of a different sort than those found in Duff Gordon's writings. Guides needed to include only those things which do not change so as to be current; therefore, they cannot contain details subject to the fluctuations of everyday life.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> morsel of meat, etc.; and only the thumb and first and second fingers are commonly used. (11)

Lane's intermittent use of the passive voice has the effect of naturalizing Egyptian practices, voiding all agency, while his persistent use of the present tense removes his objects from the flow of history by making their actions ever present. Words like "generally" and "commonly," sprinkled throughout his account, further promote the sense of timelessness. Any behavior that runs counter to the general rule, such as handing food to a neighbor, can be subsumed under the code of politeness; thus, personality is also written out of his account. Duff Gordon's description of a similar scene differs significantly:

> So I joined a party of five round a little wooden tray, tucked up my sleeve and ate—dipping the bread into the *Melocheea* which is like very sloppy spinach but much nicer. Then came the master and his servants to deal the pieces of meat out of a great basket—sodden meat—and like Benjamin my piece was the largest, so I tore off a bit and handed it to each of my companions, who said "God take these safe and happy to thy place and thy children and bring thee back to us in safety to eat the meat of the festival together once more." (230)

While Lane naturalizes Egyptian eating practices, Duff Gordon introduces agency, mostly her own, but also that of the Egyptians. While Duff Gordon inserts her own personality into her account, she also alters the pattern established by Lane, for she represents the Egyptians' reactions to her actions. Her use of the past tense situates the event in time and as a result makes room for her subjects in history. Her choice of active

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

verbs, "joined," "tucked," and "tore," demonstrate that she is in charge, but it also shows her as wholeheartedly taking part in a meal with Egyptian fellaheen.

Duff Gordon's representation, which stresses the action of doing on a regular basis, is what Michel de Certeau calls "everyday practice," or "ways of operating." She describes eating not just as a system of practices reducible to a set of rules, as does Lane, but as a system that is flexible for its users. She herself uses the system to her own end: to humanize the Egyptian peasants for her British audience. Here she is interfering with not only the Egyptian practice, but primarily her own culture's unwritten prohibitions against eating with the other—in terms of both race and class. By way of contrast, Lott establishes British propriety by always showing herself refusing to eat with a German maid who works at the harem, even though this means taking her daily meals alone. De Certeau shows the way that a daily practice, such as shopping, reading, or cooking, can become a political act by ascribing agency, or what he calls "tactics," to everyday actions. A "tactic" is "a calculus which cannot count on a 'proper' (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality" (xix). The place of a tactic, according to de Certeau, belongs to the other: "A tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance" (xix). Duff Gordon's tactic is to show herself to her British audience as eating with all Egyptians, even the poorest; thus, she presents herself (a woman) as having agency, while she represents others eating. She is using the space of the other to comment upon her own cultural practices. In the meantime, she allows us to see Egyptians' tactics, but only in the background.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lott also represents herself as having agency within the harem. She does this by presenting herself as schooling the harem in European tastes. Lott, however, unlike Duff Gordon, has no intention of presenting the Egyptians in a positive light. Her everyday practices yield another result. In Franco Moretti's understanding of the everyday, the politics of the everyday are of creeping comfort. He argues that the everyday within the novel is used to celebrate the protagonist's aesthetic choices, or what he calls the "comforts of civilization," that is making oneself comfortable in a small world. The *Bildungsroman* hero's "personality" emerges from his practice of distinguishing amongst the everyday objects that surround him. Personality, then, is not a function of heroic action, as it is in epic or romance, but of distinguishing amongst stuff on a daily basis. When Lott arrives in the harem, she applies these everyday conventions to her text, giving herself a novelistic personality, showing herself to be the heroine of the harem by presenting herself as ably distinguishing amongst the many objects that surround her. Lott quickly turns aesthetic judgment into her daily work in the harem. And her aesthetic judgments are at the center of her everyday accounting of harem life.

The novel, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, is a form that is in the process of becoming; it is the generic form best adapted to incorporate change. The romance tradition that had dominated Egyptian travel narratives was more appropriate for British views of Egypt as a static repository of the past. Many writers saw Egypt in terms of the past. Some could not conceive of Egypt otherwise: "without the past, I conceive of Egypt to be utterly uninhabitable" (Nightingale 139). The static nature of Lane's 1836 text is revealed by Jon Manchip White, writing only twenty-five years after *Modern Egyptians* was published:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Mr. Lane wrote his account of the "Modern Egyptians," when they could, for the last time be described. Twenty-five years of steam-communication with Egypt have more altered its inhabitants than had the preceding five centuries. They then retained the habits and manners of their remote ancestors: they now are yearly straying from old paths into the new ways of European civilization. Scholars will ever regard it as most fortunate that Mr. Lane seized his opportunity, and described so remarkable a people while yet they were unchanged. (xxii)

Lott and Duff Gordon, on the other hand, purposely break with the past to represent Egypt in the process of becoming. Lott portrays Egypt as "wonderfully improving," while Duff Gordon records the life of Egyptians in the act of responding to those improvements.

Mary Louise Pratt writes that women's spatial restrictions when traveling make them more likely than men to record political change within a country. According to Pratt, men travel through space while women stay in one place, making that place a home base for their ventures out. Pratt's claim sheds light on Duff Gordon's account, which was prescient in its record of Egyptian nationalist movements. While British newspapers and other accounts, including her daughter's, failed to report upon the incipient movements, Duff Gordon records them regularly. Pratt believes that the key to women's ability to see politics is their staying in place long enough to record the multiple voices of a region, or its heteroglossia. I am also suggesting that it is the adoption of another novelistic convention—the everyday—that enables Duff Gordon to record political activity. I argue that although the employment of the everyday allows Duff Gordon to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

perceive national movements, the use of this convention by both Duff Gordon and Lott is a technology that promotes domestication. Women share in the imperial mission. While this claim has been validated by scholars in recent years, the particulars in terms of women's everyday practices have been under-explored. Scholars often focus on the use of racist rhetoric by women travelers, and although this approach is necessary, I believe it is important to also understand the way that women contribute to imperialism through their everyday practices—writing, decorating, and shopping.

Harem Furniture: Emmeline Lott in the Bedroom

Lott prefaces her account by invoking the memory of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, the English traveler who distinguished herself in the eighteenth century by being the first European woman to describe the Turkish harem. Writing that Montagu's account was superficial ("The interior of those Harems were to her Ladyship a *terra incognita*, and even although she passed through those gaudy halls like a beautiful meteor, all was *coleur de rose*, and not the slightest opportunity was permitted her to study the daily life of the Odalisques" (vi)), Lott claims that Montagu failed to describe the "social manners, habits, and customs" of the harem. Thus, Lott sets as her own task the study of "daily life" therein. Lott states that her study depends upon doing what no European had done to date, "domiciling" in a harem. Lott's new job, as governess to Ismail Pasha's only son, Ibrahim, suits her purpose.

Lott sets a fast-paced tempo for her narrative: she whizzes into Alexandria on "one of the fleetest steamers," jumps upon an "express train," and is "whirled away by the iron king *en route* for the capital" (2). She represents Alexandria as "wonderfully improving," attributing that improvement to one man, the "*billionaire* Eastern merchant

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prince," the "richest man in the world," Ismail Pasha. She, like many Europeans, came to take advantage of the new order, characterized by an increase in foreign investments. In the train on the way to Cairo she meets two businessmen, one brought to Egypt by the cotton boom, and the other by the burgeoning financial industries. They discuss the current influx of foreigners to Egypt, but their conversation is interrupted when their train is stopped so that a private dispatch train, full of pretty girls, can rush past. One of the men explains that the women are "fair damsels who may chance to come on *flying* visits to Ismael Pasha" (3). Thus, trainloads of girls fly by while well-meaning businessmen are shunted off the tracks. Duff Gordon begins her tale by suggesting that not only the flow in conversation, but the circulation of goods, is at risk in modern Egypt.

When the businessmen discover that Lott will be entering Ismael Pasha's harem, they warn her about what they call his "abode of bliss": "I would have you, Madam, alive to the well-established fact, that the whole *coterie* into which you will be introduced is the very hot-bed of intrigue, jealousy, and corruption" (6). Such a description mimics commonly held western views about the harem;[6] however, the men update these views to comment upon the current economic boom by adding that Arabs "bury their gains in their Harems, instead of putting them out to interest" (11). Thus, Lott introduces her account with a theme which will be repeated throughout her text: the harem is a symbol of

[6] See Malek Alloula for an analysis of Western male depictions of the Algerian harem. Alloula argues that the lasciviousness of the harem dwellers is at the core of Western representations, asserting that portraying the harem as such enabled Westerners to justify their own desires: the colonial conquest of the harem and of Algerian society. For an analysis of Western female depictions of the harem see Jill Matus, who notes that Victorian women also approached the harem as a spectacle of sensuality. However, she argues that the harem provoked British women's own anxieties about domestic life in England (65). Thus, women represented the dullness and sloth of the harem to comment upon their own ambivalence about the separate, domestic sphere of Victorian women (75). For similar reasons they focused on polygamy and confinement within the harem.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

economic stagnation; in it capital is hoarded rather than reinvested. Lott's interest in the everyday life of the harem will be related to a desire to reorder its economy.

Lott's role as governess promises her certain privileges within the household. Like many of the *Bildungsroman* heroines with whom she shares the title of governess, Lott is privileged with a certain authority and mobility. Also like her fictional counterparts, Lott is charged with the education, not only of herself, but of those who are closest to her. Jane Eyre, as Nancy Armstrong argues, educates not only her charge but her employer, Rochester, indoctrinating him into middle-class values. But she also schools him in middle-class living: after his mansion burns down, she habituates him to his new, smaller, abode, as she leads him around it, physically accustoming him to it by touch. Similarly, Lott reorders Ismail Pasha's domestic space, schooling his household in western living practices.

Soon after her arrival to the Cairo harem, Lott claims that all of her efforts to do her job are thwarted. She complains that the Prince is impossibly cruel and greedy, and she is not permitted to establish a regular schedule. She portrays her charge as a mean boy who throws hot coals into the face of one slave, tosses another off his father's yacht into crocodile infested water for amusement, and brutally beats a third: "He immediately seized hold of her by both her arms, pinched them most violently, and like a tiger bit them until he drew blood, after which he put his fingers in that poor little creature's mouth, and tore both sides of it, until the blood streamed down her chin like water" (80). Further complicating her efforts, Ismail Pasha refuses to let her use books. She, however, is most critical of the irregularity of the daily schedule: "The irregularity which prevailed in the domestic arrangements of the Harem had totally frustrated all my endeavours to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

carry out any regular system" (102). Ultimately, Lott gives up altogether saying, "I abandoned all idea of educational training" (102). But I will suggest that she does not abandon her work as an educator, but rather, adopts a different audience and novel methods.

I. Decorating the Harem

Lott quickly turns her attention away from educating the boy and towards describing the harem, making daily pilgrimages through its rooms, inventorying their contents.[7] It is through these daily descriptions that Lott does her educational work. She uses the congested space of the harem to teach her readers the necessity of the flow of goods and services, and she uses her copious descriptions of stuff to justify an aesthetic ordering of those items. Most importantly, she uses her self-appointed position as diarist to claim aesthetic authority, putting herself in charge of making aesthetic judgments upon the daily life of the harem inhabitants, and then using her authority to teach them the art of consumption.

Lott crafts her descriptions to show the sumptuousness of the harem rooms. But she often reveals something to be missing. Here she describes the Princesses' apartments:

> [they] consisted of two large saloons, covered with magnificent Brussels carpet, but completely besprinkled, as it were, with spots of white wax, which had been suffered to fall from the candles which the slaves carry

[7] In the West, a harem is understood to be "the part of a Muslim dwelling-house appropriated to the women" or "the occupants of a harem collectively" (*OED*). Lott, however, conveniently extends the spatial definition of "harem" to include all of the palace, even those rooms designated to men. Thus, she spies upon the Ismail Pasha in the bathroom. Since in the West the harem was also understood to be a private and/or a sacred space, Lott's total penetration is significant.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> about in their fingers. Around them were placed divans covered with red satan damask; the windows and door hangings of the same materials: a very large mirror, reaching down from the ceiling, which was painted with flowers and fruits, with the crescent, and numerous war-like instruments, and music placed in each corner, to the top of a marble table supported on gilded legs, on each of which stood a silver chandelier containing eight wax candles, with red-coloured glass shades covered with painted flowers (40).

Missing in this description are the harem women, yet their traces are embedded in Lott's descriptions of the décor. Through the wax drippings on the carpet, the everyday actions of harem slaves who carry the candles "in their fingers" get narrated.

Similarly, when Lott documents the interior of the royal yacht, she elaborately details the furnishings: "The floor was covered with matting, over which was placed a rich-looking drab-ground carpet, interspersed with rose and large blue convolvuluses. The divan in which His Highness sat is covered with red and white silk and gold thread, which gives it a most gorgeous appearance" (94). She continues in the same elaborate manner for five pages, using up to four modifiers for each noun. Yet in spite of the adjectival abundance and fullness of her account, Lott complains that the viceregal spaces are bare. She realizes this bareness when she arrives to her own room:

> I gazed at the accommodation assigned to me with surprise; and yet, what could I have expected, as every apartment which I had passed through was totally destitute of everything that ought to have been placed therein? Not a footstool, no pianos, nor music-stools; not a picture adorned the walls. . .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> . In short, not any of the splendid rooms of the Enchanted Palace of the Croesus of the nineteenth century contained anything, either for ornament or use, except the bare decorations (41).

Lott's complaint about the harem furnishings is that they contain nothing "for ornament or use"; they merely decorate. In other words, they are not integrated into an economy of use or pleasure. If they do afford pleasure, then that pleasure is not circulated, but perversely hoarded. When Lott describes her own bedroom, she singles out one missing object. Tellingly, it is an object that represents what the harem furnishings are missing.

> The furniture consisted of a plain green painted iron bedstead, the bars of which had never been fastened, and pieces of wood, like the handles of brooms, and an iron bar, were placed across, to support the two thin cotton mattresses that were laid upon it. There were neither pillows, bolsters, nor any bed-linen; but as substitutes were placed three thin flat cushions; not a blanket, but two old worn-out wadded coverlets lay upon the bed. Not the sign of a dressing-table or a chair of any description, and a total absence of all the appendages necessary for a lady's bedroom—*not even a vase.* (41)

Pillows, bolsters, and blankets are missing from her room, yet it is the absence of a vase that most disturbs her. Lott's fixation on this item reveals the aesthetic nature of her concerns. Summing up her woes, Lott again mentions the missing vase: "There I was, without a chair to sit upon, or a table to write on, with barely room to dress in, and totally destitute of anything to make myself comfortable—not even the convenience of what the French term a vase" (50).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A vase, like the eight candles in the chandelier, has a function, and akin to the wax drippings on the carpet, bears the mark of an everyday action. Lott laments her missing vase because it signals that nobody is serving her, that her room is cut off from the circulation of the harem. Its presence would connote daily service, somebody arranging objects for her aesthetic pleasure. One day as she makes her harem rounds, she spots "several beautifully-painted Sèvres and Japan china vases, filled with mostly lovely nosegays!" (43) In an uncharacteristic joyful outburst, she describes the vases' contents:

> Ah! gentle reader! They were bouquets such as the hand of no European court florist could possibly have arranged; they were, in fact, mosaics of petalled gems, works of art, touches of genius, brilliant gewgaws, toy-like bouquets, which would outvie the far-famed taste of the flower-girls of lovely Florence, with all nature's fair charms at their command to construct, which only the fingers of the ladies of the Harem (for that is one of the special duties they perform) could possibly mingle together. The harmonious blending of brilliant colours, the amalgamation of the delicious fragrance of their powerful perfumes produced nosegays which, while they charmed the eye, emitted forth a fragrance that quite intoxicated the senses (44).

At first it is difficult to determine if the flowers are real, for by using the words "mosaics," "works," and "gewgaws," Lott stresses their made quality. It is not until she reveals that they emit a fragrance that we know for sure that the flowers are real. Lott's emphasis on artifice calls attention to the everyday practice of the harem dwellers, whose 'special duty' it is to arrange flowers. She enthuses about the vase because it gives her

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the opportunity to represent an object *as it should be*: integrated into an economy of use or pleasure, and it allows her to imagine the harem dwellers busily at work.

Lott often, however, depicts the residents as slothful, nicknaming their home the "Castle of Indolence." Of the harem slaves, she writes: "Their occupation during the best portion of the day consisted in lolling or rolling about the divans and mattresses which lay upon the ground, or squatting upon all fours, doubling themselves up like snips upon their boards, or clasped knives, which *pose plastique* I was for ever doomed to behold" (106). She opposes the laziness of the harem to her own busy self, yet since she cannot represent herself at work because she has abandoned her job, she must reinvent her work. She begins by rearranging her bedroom furniture, a most arduous task:

> Wishing, however, to divert my mind as much as possible, I resolved to keep a diary. But how was that to be accomplished, since I had no table in my chamber upon which I could arrange my writing materials? The top of my French chest of drawers had already been turned into a toilet-table, and even if I had removed my dressing-case and all the appendages thereon, even then I had no chair. Thinking that the slave who had arranged my chamber might, in the hurry of the moment, have forgotten both the necessary articles of furniture (as I had seen tables, and even English cane-bottom chairs in the apartments), I resolved to appropriate some to my own use; but, when attempting to do so, I was point-blank told by the eunuchs that I must not touch or take anything which had not been expressly given me. Thus I was checkmated, and powerless even to move a chair for my own accommodation. This was a kind of domestic tyranny

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> I could not endure . . . So, placing two of my largest square trunks upon one another, for a table, which I covered with my traveling-rug, and for a chair laying my traveling-cloak upon another box, and turning a larger one upright, I placed it at the back; which gave me a support for my back; and thus did I begin to jot down these incidents of my experience of Harem life in Egypt (71).

Lott reveals her genesis as a diarist to be in her skills as a decorator. Indeed, she redecorates her bedroom, checks "domestic tyranny," and becomes a writer in the same move. And she authorizes herself--spatially--to take charge of the aesthetic process, articulating the relations between space, authority, and taste.

Lott records the description of interiors in her diary so that she can assert her own taste and habits over space. By discovering objects and distinguishing them from other objects, Lott shows herself at work, as author and as tastemaker. Similarly, she demonstrates her good taste by locating hideous furniture. One day, for instance, Lott's spots a bunch of English cane-bottom chairs and cries out in despair: "But, oh! horror of horrors! . . . This was not, most assuredly, in keeping with the magnificent decorations of this palatial hall; and this constituted all the furniture. It looked bare, vacant, and miserably empty" (44).

II. The Art of Consumption

When Lott first came to the harem, she was thoroughly disliked. She explained that she was hated because she "insisted on receiving proper respect" (104). It is not hard to imagine why her haughtiness went unappreciated by the harem women: she complains incessantly about their "filthy manners," "barbarous customs," and "disgusting habits."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, immediately after Lott spots the ugly chairs, she represents a change in her reputation. On that day, the harem surrounds her:

> All of a sudden I was electrified at hearing upwards of fifty voices exclaiming simultaneously, "*Koneiis! Qui-yis! Koneiis*!" "Pretty! Pretty!" While a whole chorus shouted forth, "*Gurzel! Gurzel*!" "Beautiful! Beautiful!" Some of them took up the black straw-hat which I had taken off and laid down upon the divan at my side. This they passed from hand to hand, gazing with pleasure and delight at that specimen of English manufacture. From that they examined the whole of my costume from head to foot. (47)

Lott's aesthetic judgments give her a new role in the harem. They also give her a new role in her text; she becomes its heroine. In Moretti's terms, Lott develops a novelistic personality, which emerges out of the practice of distinguishing amongst the everyday objects. The everyday within the novel, according to Moretti, is used to celebrate the protagonist's aesthetic choices. The harem women visit her bedroom daily, seeking out her opinion about their new clothes: "It was often quite ludicrous to behold their Highnesses the Princesses, who could neither read nor write, the Ladies of the Harem, and slaves, as they came shuffling into my small room, and which was frequently crammed full of them, to ask my opinion of nearly everything they received" (131). Lott represents herself as the ultimate arbitrator of taste:

> If the Princesses had opened any boxes of new dress-pieces . . . they handed them to me, at the same time appealing to my taste to decide whether they were *quiyis*, "pretty," or *batal,* "ugly," and my verdict was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> final. The instant that any of the slaves received presents from their Highnesses, they came and showed them to me, almost stunning me with the same interrogatories. If, as frequently happened, I examined the dresses and found them damaged (for many of the boxes contained last year's fashions), some of the pieces soiled, and others deficient in quantity (for having been purchased in that condition they had been obtained at cheap rates), I condemned them, then the recipients returned them to the Princesses, who bestowed others upon them. (131)

She keeps the harem in fashion, or more importantly, in a consumptive loop, teaching the women to attune themselves to fashion's rhythms, accepting only this year's fashions, and scoffing at the rest. In this way she gains their respect and earns her keep. But it is not only their habits of dress that Lott influences with her impeccable taste; she gains sway over their living habits as well:

> In short, the whole of the inmates of the Harem soon began thouroughly to appreciate my European ways and habits in many respects. If they were taken ill they consulted me, followed my remedies, and did their best, poor ignorant, deluded, and neglected creatures, to abandon any habits which I explained to them were repugnant to delicacy, especially when I told them that such were not *a la Franca*, "European." (131)

During one of her harem strolls, Lott discovers, to her delight, a "secret chamber" full of western furniture. She and the Prince proceed to "take an inventory of the miscellaneous articles which were huddled up together in that 'Old Antique and Modern Curiosity Shop'" (141). They find a Broadwood's grand piano, spring-easy chairs, sofas,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ornaments for mantelpieces, clocks with birds that sing instead of striking the hours, and others with fish swimming around lakes. Ultimately, her inventory of the "curiosity shop" grows so long that she gives up saying that a "catalogue would take twenty pages to enumerate" (154). Lott's response to the room suggests the solution to the problem that its representation indicates:

> I then determined to ask the Viceroy . . . to allow me to have the furniture which was in it (for therein I had found everything that even a European lady of rank could desire to make her rooms comfortable) placed in the rooms above it, which would have enabled me to keep the Prince apart from the host of slaves, whose disgusting ways tended to counteract my best endeavours to bring him up in European habits and manners. (155)

The problem for Lott is that the "secret chamber" is not at all like a "curiosity shop" to which she analogizes it. Though filled with curiosities, it is nothing like a shop, where goods are bought and sold; instead the furniture is locked away and kept out of circulation. Lott's solution is to move the furniture upstairs, putting it to use and into circulation. Lott draws a connection between rearranging the furniture and educating her charge, demonstrating the relation between her taste and her work.

On another one of Lott's harem sojourns she discovers, to her horror, a room filled with life-sized mechanical animals: polar bears, tigers, and cranes. Imagining a purpose for this furniture, she writes: "It is a well-known fact that Ibrahim Pasha was of a cruel and brutal disposition, and it is most probable that he had these animals collected together and set in motion whenever he had commanded the attendance of any Turkish or Arab dignitary from whom he desired to extort money, for avarice was one of his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

predominant vices" (57). Thus she imagines the Prince's grandfather hoarding these technological toys and then using them for perverse ends—setting the toys into motion and scaring his victim into submission. Similarly, when she encounters a young eunuch crying, she explains that he had been frightened by the Prince who had ground the horns of a "snow-white mechanical lamb" into his groin. Both stories suggest that easterners may own western technology, but they lack the taste to use it properly.

One day the Prince initiates a game of banking with her by cutting up pieces of cardboard and pretending like they are bills of exchange. During the game, she demands more change, claiming that he charged her too much. When he refuses, she writes, "He looked the impersonation of a usurer; his close resemblance at the moment to the portrait of his grandfather [Ibrahim Pasha] . . . was very striking. There sat the prototype of that Viceregal usurer who so thoroughly understood the art of making money to yield its best value, a gift which has descended to his descendents" (142). She then quits in protest, and he throws a tantrum, which ushers his father into the room. Ismail Pasha takes her place, saying, "allow me to take possession of your stock-in-trade," speaking in a "tone of voice that was of a professional money lender" (141). In this scene, she creates a family tableau of usurers—three generations who disrupt the flow of capital by their hoarding habits. When Ismail Pasha leaves the room, she writes, "I had flattered myself that when he rose up from the banking department, the Viceroy would have left some packets of golden *paras* on the cushion. None, however, were deposited there; for, like his son, he was reported, and I believe the fact, to be fond of accumulating treasure as a means to happiness, and, by a common but morbid association, he continued to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

accumulate it as an end" (144). What disappoints her most about their hoarding practice is that none of the money finds its way into her pockets.

Lott extends her critique to the entire harem. One afternoon she finds the Prince's nurse hunched over a pot of money: "she opened her *sarat*, 'trunk,' and, guess my surprise, when she took out an English workbox, all the compartments of which had been removed, and I saw it was full as ever it could hold of napoleons, half-napoleons, gold five-franc pieces, Turkish, Egyptian, and English sovereigns; in short, she had the greatest difficulty in lifting it out of the trunk" (137). She then learns how the nurse acquired the hoard: she picks the Prince's pockets who "had been accustomed, as soon as he could talk and toddle about, to have his pockets filled with *paras*, "silver coins," by the Viceroy" (141). The nurse then "doled out miles of them . . . to the undernurses" (141), who created their own hoards, so that the entire household was filled with "uncirculated buried treasures." Lott inquires about what happens to the hoards after the death of the servants, and is horrified when she finds out that they are spent on extravagant funerals--proof that the harem is burying their treasures. She concludes by saying that the Prince has been schooled by the servants' hoarding practices which "had engendered in him the vice of avarice" (141).

Lott reveals an entire system of everyday practices that result in the Prince's mis-education. She had been forewarned by the two men whom she met on the train on her way to Cairo who claimed that the Arabs "bury their gains in their Harem instead of putting them out at interest" (11). Documenting their charge, she records a system of practices that stop the flow of capital: the misallocation of national resources in the Viceroy's misuse of the railway for his private pleasure, the stoppage in the circulation of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

objects and aesthetic pleasure within the harem, the practice of extortion and usury, the hoarding of coins and the mismanagement of their circulation, and most significant, the hoarding of women and their productive (and consumptive) labor. As a remedy to the problem she introduces to their daily life a system of consumption practices, organized by her own writing practice. Aesthetic in nature, her practices encourage a desire to make meaning and create pleasure out of everyday life; she introduces into the harem what Moretti calls the "comforts of civilization." Simultaneously her practices validate an economic system based on theories of flow and circulation.

Harem Furniture: Lucie Duff Gordon in the Kitchen

The *Edinburgh Review* received Lucie Duff Gordon's 1865 *Letters from Egypt* enthusiastically, stating that her account of Egypt was an improvement upon her predecessors'. Unlike them, she succeeded in depicting "the true aspect of the people" ("Lady Duff Gordon's Letters" 109). Even Lane, whose 1836 *Modern Egyptians* was considered the most authoritative source on the Egyptian people to date, had not accomplished this: "True, Mr. Lane may be said to have done all that can be done in the way of describing that people; but the 'Modern Egyptians' is not intended to give us *every-day* experience of life in Egypt—rather the results of that experience" ("Lady Duff Gordon's Letters" 109). Distinguishing between "everyday experience" and its "results," the *Edinburgh Review* points out what was markedly different about Duff Gordon's text. In her letters she is able to perceive change as it happens at the micro-level of the everyday occurrence. The *Edinburgh Review* further distinguishes Duff Gordon's work by suggesting that only she sees the "inner life" of her subjects: "Even the brilliant pages of *Eothen*, of Miss Martineau, and those of two or three other writers, afford us little

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

insight into the *inner life* of the Egyptian. Nor is the cause far to seek. A foreign people cannot be understood in a short, and generally hurried, visit; nor indeed can they be appreciated by the oldest resident, unless he will consent to waive all prejudice and *live among them as one of themselves*" (109).

It is unclear what the *Review* means by "inner life" since such a phrase could refer to anything from emotional life to intellectual life, but since the *Review* emphasizes Duff Gordon's domestic arrangements as her advantage over her predecessors, we might also consider these words literally: "inner life" meaning life in doors. In this reading, then, what distinguishes her is that she recorded Egyptians' daily domestic life. Duff Gordon's predecessors, as we have seen, cared little about the household, and she is most critical of them when they come the closest to writing about it in their accounts of Middle Eastern harems. Of Martineau, she writes, "her attack upon harems are outrageous; she implies that they are brothels" (121), and she dismisses Lott's work completely due to her account of Turkish harems which she felt was mean-spirited and unjust. As a corrective, Duff Gordon writes that the Turkish harem "is just like a tea-party at Hampton court, only handsomer, not as to the ladies, but the clothes, furniture and jewels, and not a bit like the description in Mrs. Lott's most extraordinary book" (269). By analogizing a harem to a "tea-party" Duff Gordon seeks to suggest the ordinariness of the social gathering. Throughout her text Duff Gordon demystifies the harem, making it less exotic and more mundane, redefining it for her Western audience: "harem is used here just like the German *frauenzimmer* [womenfolk], to mean a respectable woman" (55). She even points out more than once that she is considered part of her servant Omar's harem. In her letters Duff Gordon uses harem to mean both a respectable woman and womenfolk. She

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

also uses it to connote a space where women gather to socialize, and more often than not, to do their daily household work.

Duff Gordon represents the Egyptian house, distinguishing it from the landscape, in a way that had not yet been attempted. Romance conventions made houses indivisible from the landscape, and thus invisible. Kinglake, Martineau, Nightingale, and Herbert describe neither the outside nor the inside of a house, and Lott, who does describe three viceregal harems' interiors in detail, never turns her eye to a common house. But Duff Gordon visits the houses of regular Egyptians. In one telling passage, Duff Gordon tries to convince her readers that houses actually do exist:

> The villages look like slight elevations in the mud banks cut into square shapes. The best houses have neither paint, whitewash, plaster, bricks nor windows, nor any visible roofs. They don't give one the notion of human dwellings at all at first, but soon the eye gets used to the absence of all that constitutes a house in Europe, the impression of wretchedness wears off, and one sees how picturesque they are, with palm-trees and tall pigeon-houses, and here and there the dome over a saint's tomb. (56)

In order to see these houses, Duff Gordon asks her readers to erase all of their notions of what constitutes a house. Interestingly, the houses are not described, but rather differentiated by their context; their placement amongst palm trees and pigeon houses is what gives them their "houseness." Her ultimate invocation of the picturesque indicates how difficult her task is: because she can rely on no existing conventions for describing an Egyptian house, she falls back upon the domestic convention of the picturesque.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

When Duff Gordon attempts to describe the interior of a house, she again defines the house by what is missing. Like Lott, she records the lack of furniture:

> Several Turkish families were in a large square room neatly divided into little partitions with old mats hung on ropes. In each were as many bits of carpet, mat and patchwork as the poor owner could collect, and a small chest and a little brick cooking-place in one corner of the room with three earthen pipkins for I don't know how many people—that was all—they possess no sort of furniture, but all was scrupulously clean and had no bad smell whatever. (50)

Thus, Duff Gordon's idea of an Middle Eastern house is a clean, sparsely furnished room. If furniture exists at all, it is a mat, a carpet, or a chest. However, in many cases, the room is nearly bare:

> [We] turned into an Arab hut stuck against the lovely arches. I stooped low under the door, and several women crowded in. This was still poorer, for there were no mats or rags of carpet, a still worse cooking-place, a sort of dog-kennel piled up of loose stones to sleep in, which contained a small chest of the print of human forms on the stone floor. (50)

Although this house had none of the standard furniture of an Egyptian house, it did contain a cooking place. Duff Gordon, then, makes a stove the common denominator of a house, and places the kitchen at the center of her understanding of that term: "Can you imagine a house without beds, chairs, tables, cups, glasses, knives—in short, with nothing but an oven, a few pipkins and waterjars, and a couple of wooden spoons, and some mats to sleep on?" (153) Essential to her understanding of the Egyptian house is the kitchen.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Indeed, Duff Gordon places the kitchen, focusing on food purchases and market visits, at the center of the household, the harem, and her story, and in doing so she brings consumption to the center of Egyptian life. Consequently, women, who were previously conceived of in the context of production (in the bedroom), become active agents of consumption. In addition, the Egyptian family gets defined by the work it does in the kitchen. Duff Gordon's focus on kitchen consumption allows her to extend her story beyond the harem, as they do their daily shopping in local markets that are much affected by fluctuating prices. She incorporates into her story the wide array of causes for the steady rise in prices during her stay, including taxes, debt, greed, conscription, epidemics, and modernization. She shows the connection between micro and macro-economic principles, demonstrating the interrelatedness of these two spheres--a concept that was well before her time. And she goes one step further, portraying the encroachment of global systems on the economy of Egypt, showing how people there begin to question the relation between foreign occupation--by the Turks and Europeans--and their own "daily oppressions."

Duff Gordon's unique contribution to Egyptian travel literature, in her synthesis of micro and macro-economic activity, accomplishes two things. First, she creates empathy for the Egyptian people by showing how individual families suffer because of national projects that squeeze labor and financial resources out of them. She reports that one Egyptian told her that he detected a new wave of kindness towards Egyptians from American travelers and attributed this change in attitude to her book. While Duff Gordon's book favorably influenced travelers' opinions about Egyptians, it paradoxically propagated an imperial logic of consumption practices. Her emphasis on her own harem

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

economizing--pinching pennies, watching prices carefully, haggling for the best prices--puts her consumption practices at the center of her text. Her behavior stands in for the behavior of Egyptians who must do the same, on an even tighter budget; thus, she creates empathy for the everyday living practices of the Egyptians. Similarly, her economizing behavior causes her readers to feel for her, as she tries to make ends meet so far from home. Second, it shows her readers how inexpensively things can be done in another country--how cheaply a household can be run--outside of England. Ultimately she demonstrates how cheaply domestic work can be done abroad. I explore the duality of everyday living abroad. Lucie Duff Gordon is one of the few Europeans in her day who attempts to create understanding for Egyptians by describing their daily activities in a sympathetic manner. Yet, no matter how well-intentioned her liberal attitudes, her lifestyle created a justification for the habits of imperialism.

Conscription in the Kitchen

On the surface, Duff Gordon's interest in the harem does not resemble Lott's in the least.[8] While Lott plotted to fill her bedroom with European furniture, Duff Gordon had no interest in adapting Western apparatuses into the Egyptian kitchen. Modernization, for Duff Gordon, is a problem, and Ismail Pasha's rampant modernization of the country is a major object of her critique. Duff Gordon responded to his most symbolic act of modernization, the reconstruction of parts of Cairo to look like Paris, with disgust, showing how this reconstruction affected Egyptians far from the city:[9]

---

[8] See Melissa Lee Miller for a comparison of the way that Lott and Duff Gordon represent the harem.

[9] See Timothy Mitchell for an analysis of the reconstruction of Cairo. In 1867-68, he writes, Ali Mubarak, an Egyptian administrator, teacher and engineer who visited the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> My grocer [in Luxor] is half ruined by the 'improvements' made *a l'instar de Paris*—long military straight roads cut through the heart of Cairo. The owners expropriated, and there is an end of it. Only those who have half a house left are to be pitied, because they are forced to build a new front to the street on a Frankish model, which renders it uninhabitable to them and unsaleable. (329)

Duff Gordon's attention to the habitability of the improved abodes is singular in the period. While most commentators dwell on the widened streets and changed facades, Duff Gordon shifts the focus indoors, imagining how Cairo's Haussmannification will affect its inhabitants. Thus, she uniquely focuses modernity through habitation.

Duff Gordon's explicit critique of modernization has to do with its reliance upon forced labor:

> Of course half these acts [conscription] are done under the pretext of improving and civilizing, and the Europeans applaud and say, 'Oh, but nothing could be done without forced labour', and the poor fellaheen are marched off in gangs like convicts, and their families starve, and (who'd have thought it) the population keeps diminishing. No wonder the cry is, 'Let the English queen come and take us.' (85)

She criticizes the common European belief that forced labor (in the colonies) was a necessary evil, and then absents the British from the social implications of modernity by hinting at England's oppositional role. This is only to say that Duff Gordon's relation to

---

Exposition Universelle in Paris was appointed Minister of Schools and Minister of Public Works on his return home. What followed, under Mubarak's leadership, was the "greatest period of construction and demolition in the city since the growth of Mamluk Cairo in the 1300s" (65).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

modernization was complex.[10] Duff Gordon's depictions of technology are noteworthy, for while descriptions of actual ports, canals, railways, sugar refineries, irrigation systems and cotton improvements are absent from her text, these "improvements" are still represented indirectly through her portrayal of the household economy.

Her techniques for representing improvements differ from other visitors', such as those of her daughter, Janet Ross, who describes the Suez Canal construction site in 1862: "You may imagine what a hole has to be made in the sand when I tell you that the canal is to be 189 feet broad and 28 feet deep" (126). Ross begins by citing depth and width, measuring out the canal in the sand and firmly anchoring her object in its place. Ross's description never extends beyond the borders with which she began. Ross's mother, on the other hand, omits measurements from her descriptions and does not delineate borders. Instead, she represents projects as they relate to local peoples and households, as she does when she spies workers through her own window in Luxor on their way to one of the Pasha's works:

> From my window now I see men limping about among the poor camels that are waiting from the Pasha's boats to take them, and the great heaps of maize which they are forced to bring for their food. I can tell you the tears such a sight brings to one's eyes are hot and bitter. These are no sentimental grievances; hunger, and pain, and labour without hope and without reward, and the constant bitterness of impotent resentment. (202)

[10] This is in contrast to what has been said about Lucie Duff Gordon by Faiza Shereen in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* and in the account of her in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Both articles depict Duff Gordon's critique of modernization as unproblematic.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Striving to represent this scenario outside of the conventions of sentimentality, which often isolate its subjects through the use of the vignette, she seeks rather to root this scene in its home environment, showing how the conscripted men do not only take with them the fruits of their domestic production but also the food that would be consumed by their family. She says, "I grieve still more over the daily anguish of the poor fellaheen, who are forced to take the bread from the mouths of their starving families and to eat it while toiling for the private profit of one man" (201). And of her "donkey-boys," she writes: "The father of one, and the two brothers of the other, were gone to work on the railway for sixty days' forced labour, taking their own bread, and the poor little fellows were left alone to take care of the hareem" (240). Modernization, seen through the harem window, is uniquely depicted as it relates to domestic production and household consumption, as fields lie fallow and families are left to starve.

Duff Gordon represents the workers who harvested the cotton, and built the railways, canals, and ports, as bodies in transit. Whether she sees them "limping" about the village awaiting orders to leave, floating up the Nile on a barge, or being herded along the banks of the river, Duff Gordon shows the conscripts moving through space, traversing Egypt. Conversely, Ross keeps them penned within the boundaries which she so nicely drew, representing them confined within the borders of the object which they make. In her account, they are walled in by the banks of the canal: "I pitied the poor fellaheen their treadmill labour. Up and down the sliding sand-banks from sunrise to sunset, and a lick over the back when they did not go fast enough" (57). Further, Ross depicts them as a mass, never differentiating the workers from each other, and when she does, it is only to racialize their labor: "Eight thousand of the men came from the upper

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nile between Philae and Khartum, a far finer race than the lower Egyptians and better and faster workers. There was more animation in their section, much talking and some laughter, while the Behere looked dispirited and melancholy" (57). Duff Gordon's strategy is different; she breaks up the stereotypical clumping of bodies, individuating them, as she does in this passage where she shifts her focus from a mass of laborers to one individual:

> The other day four huge barges passed us towed by a steamer and crammed with hundreds of the poor souls torn from their homes to work at the Isthmus of Suez, or some place of the Pasha's, for a nominal piaster a day, and find their own bread and water and cloak. One of my crew, Andrasool, a black savage whose function is always to jump overboard whenever a rope gets entangled or anything is wanted, recognized some relations of his from a village close to Aswan. There was much shouting and poor Andrasool looked very mournful all day. It may be his turn next. (57)

"Hundreds" of conscripts are focused through "one" crew member, whom she individuates by assigning assets of character, a name and a "function." Most tellingly, she depicts this future conscript as a member of her household, living on a boat with her for four months.

The strict borders that Ross draws around the Suez Canal serve to disconnect this project and its workers, who are contained within its machinery, from the surrounding landscape; Ross, then, is invoking a sense of "technology"--as an object divorced from the social system that organized it--that did not emerge until the twentieth century,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

according to Leo Marx. Duff Gordon's techniques of depicting improvements by stressing transit have just the opposite effect: they connect the object to its social making, and unveil "technology" as a means of social organization brought about by a reorganization of production and consumption at the level of the household. Further, she nationalizes the process by scattering her citings of transported bodies throughout Egypt, "200 from Luxor, 400 from Karnac, 310 from Zenia, 320 from Byadyeh, and 380 from Salamieh—a good deal more than half the adult men to go for sixty days leaving their fields uncultivated and their hareem and children hungry—for they have to take all the food for themselves" (230). Duff Gordon shows the way that the modernization projects draw from and draw out the entire nation.

In order to further drive home the reality of conscription to her family and wider audience, Duff Gordon translates the issue into a domestic problem:

> To you all this must sound remote and almost fabulous. But try to imagine Farmer Smith's team driven off by the police and himself beaten till he delivered his hay, his oats and his farm-servant for the use of the Lord Lieutenant, and his two sons dragged in chains to work at railway embankments. (202)

Thus, she translates the "remote" and "fabulous" scene to a local and real one, invoking the domestic genre of the picturesque, only to destroy its complacency.

Conscription, however, was not a domestic problem. England had outlawed slavery in the colonies thirty years earlier. Forced labor belonged to France or Turkey: "Everyone is cursing the French here. Forty thousand men always at work at the Suez Canal at starvation-point, does not endear them to the Arabs" (66). The Suez Canal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enabled the British to believe that they themselves had nothing to do with forced labor, for they could loudly protest the use of forced labor in its construction, without implicating themselves. Yet British railways throughout Egypt were being built by conscripted labor, and the many British companies that came to Egypt in the sixties invested in improvement projects that profited from conscription. Duff Gordon's own daughter was in Egypt because her husband directed such a company.[11] In a very rare indulgence in gossip, Duff Gordon tells a story of de Lesseps that acts as an allegory for modernization: "a Frenchman told me he was on board a Pashas's steamer under M. de Lesseps' command, and they passed a flooded village where two hundred or so people stood on their roofs crying for help. Could you believe it: they passed on and left them to drown? None but an eye-witness could have made me believe such villainy" (93). Poised on their roof tops, clinging to the last of their domestic security, Egyptian villagers are swept away in a flood of change, while Ferdinand de Lesseps, the symbol of that change, callously stands by. The Suez Canal was one of the few modernization projects in Egypt at that time that used no British monies. By attacking it on the grounds of the use of forced labor, the British could be sure that they were attacking something in which they had little investment. British investments lay elsewhere.

I. Investing in Saving

---

[11] Henry Ross was a director of the Sudan Company, later known as the Egyptian Commercial and Trading Company, established in 1863 to trade with Upper Egypt, the Sudan, and the Red Sea. Janet Ross wrote in a letter to *The Times* on April 7, 1863 that the company had "brilliant prospects" and stood to gain an average profit of 200 per cent per annum in its trade in elephant's teeth, ostrich feathers, bees-wax, ox-hides, and gold dust. Duff Gordon wrote that Ross "stands to win pots of money" (84), but later she wrote that Ross did not understand the situation in Egypt well enough to direct such a company.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

When it came to conscripted labor, the British could feel pride in their laws that banned the slave trade in 1807 and slavery in the colonies in 1834. In Egypt, where slavery was all but outlawed by Said Pasha in 1855, they could also smugly point their fingers at the French who had tens of thousands of Egyptians conscripted to build the Suez Canal. Yet Duff Gordon, who was adamantly opposed to conscription and who spent pages of her letters denouncing it, kept house slaves. During her seven years of living in Egypt she acquired seven slaves, buying and selling them without expressing any compunction. Nor did she express any explicit justification of her actions in her writings. If we want to know how a woman who was clearly conscious of the domestic ills of slavery justified keeping slaves at home, we should look closer. Duff Gordon's justification is written into the practices of her everyday life. Reading her domestic habits will not only help us understand how a liberal woman like herself could so easily keep slaves, but it will also aid us in seeing how a liberal nation, that had little interest in imperialism in mid century, grew proud of its acquisitions by the last quarter of the century.

Duff Gordon lived cheaply. And she turned her living habits into the subject of many of her letters. Even so, her letters do not detail what it is that she lived without in order to meet her budgetary constraints; instead they detail what she purchased for that very purpose. That is to say, she invested her energies in consuming, and she consumed in order to save money. Such behavior is usually associated with the British a decade later, in the 1870s, when consumer goods from the colonies first flooded the domestic market, but Duff Gordon's fixation on consumption a decade earlier reveals the connection between consumption practices and colonial living. Even so, she seems to be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an odd choice to study in order to understand the change in consumption practices in the last quarter of the century because she consumed so little. Moreover, she took great pride in how little she consumed, frequently describing her Luxor apartment as being equipped with only the bare necessities. Her letters to her husband gloat about how little she spends, often listing her purchases alongside of how much she paid in comparison to how much she could have paid or how much her neighbor paid. Her prolonged stay in Egypt due to her illness, and the necessity of keeping two separate households—one in England and one in Egypt--was the stated cause for her thriftiness. Yet her attention to her spending is so constant that it emerges as the most persistent theme of her letters, and it becomes clear that she is doing much more than justifying her spending to her husband. She is exposing a way of living that calls upon a set of skills that encourage her to use consumption as a way to save, and it is those skills that justify her continued stay.

Duff Gordon's description of her arrival to Egypt is singular. While her contemporaries describe the architecture or landscapes, she dotes on the prices. Egypt is simply too expensive. Her immediate response to the high costs of living is to get a servant; this may seem odd, until we see that her logic is to spend a little in order to save a lot. He will help her get things for less: "I am frightened of the dearness of everything here. I found it quite impossible to get on without a servant able to speak English. The janissary of Mr. Thayer, the American Consul-General, recommended to me a youth called Omar . . . , whom I have taken. . . . He will do all I ask for £3 a month and a greatcoat" (41). When Omar at first mistook his duties, thinking that Duff Gordon, like most Europeans, wanted to live extravagantly, she made it clear that he was hired to aid her in living cheaply: "as soon as I told him that my master was a bey who got £100 a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

month and no backsheesh [tips] he was careful as if for himself" (81). Duff Gordon lets her husband know that Omar is the key to her economical living, often incorporating praise for Omar into the review of her budget, "Thanks very much to Omar's good management I have spent little more than £250." With Omar's help, she eats well and pays less than other Europeans:

> Omar performs wonders of marketing and cookery. I have not spent above ten shillings a day for the four of us and have excellent dinners—soup, fish, a petit plat or two and a roast every day. But butter and meat and milk are horribly dear. I never saw so good a servant as Omar and such a nice creature, so pleasant and good. When I hear and see what other people spend here in traveling and in living and what bother they have, I say, "May God favour Omar and his descendents." (98)

Omar's skill at making domestic arrangements is a factor of his success, "At Cairo . . . Omar will get a lodging and borrow a few mattresses and a table and chair, and as he says, 'keep the money in our pockets instead of giving it to the hotel'" (68).

Yet Omar's value lies not so much in that he saves her money, but in *how* he saves it. She uses Omar to demonstrate the art of consuming. Helping her to set up her household, Omar accompanies her to purchase everything from kitchenware to a houseboat, and Duff Gordon describes these shopping trips in detail. Early on, she and Omar buy a boat, and she describes the transaction, accentuating the teamwork and skill involved in getting a bargain:

> The owner of the boat, Sid Ahmad el-Berberi, asked £30, whereupon I touched my breast, mouth and eyes, and stated through Omar that I was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> not, like other Ingeleez, made of money, but would give £20. He then showed another boat at £20, very much worse, and I departed (with fresh civilities) and looked at others, and saw two more for £20; but neither was clean, and neither had a little boat for landing. Meanwhile Sid Ahmad came after me and explained that, if I was not like other Ingeleez in money, I likewise differed in politeness, and had refrained from abuse, etc., etc., and I should have the boat for £25 (45).

During an earlier purchase, that of pots and pans, she relies on Omar to complete the hour-long transaction, but here, she and Omar cooperate; he provides the voice and she the pantomime. It is ultimately her politeness, learned from Omar, that seals the deal. Although the purchase was collaborative, she attributed it entirely to Omar: "My servant Omar turns out a jewel. He has discovered an excellent boat for the Nile voyage, and I am to be mistress of a captain, mate, eight men and a cabin boy for £25 a month. Similar boats cost people with dragomans £50 to £65. But, then, 'I shall lick the fellows,' etc., is what I hear all round. The dragoman, I conclude, pockets the difference" (45). If the dragoman [guide] pockets the difference, she makes it clear that Omar pockets none.

A year and a half later, Duff Gordon, now a seasoned veteran, buys a carpet without the help of Omar. She records the purchase at length:

> You would have laughed to hear me buying a carpet. I saw an old broker with one on his shoulder in the bazaar, and asked the price, 'eight napoleons'; then it was unfolded and spread in the street, to the great inconvenience of the passers-by, just in front of a coffee-shop. I look at it superciliously, and say, 'Three hundred piastres, O uncle'; the poor old

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> broker cries out in despair to the men sitting outside the coffee-shop: 'O Muslims, hear that and look at this excellent carpet. Three hundred piastres! By the faith, it is worth two thousand!' But the men take my part and one mildly says: "I wonder that an old man as thou art should tell us that this lady, who is a traveler and a person of experience, values it at three hundred—thinkest thou we will give thee more?" (103)

Duff Gordon credits her own style--her "supercilious" look, her cultural fluency, punctuating her request with "oh uncle," and her language skills, answering "napoleons" with "piastres"--with her bargain. Yet what is most important about this passage is that Duff Gordon shows in detail the practice of consuming to save.

Not only does Omar teach her to bargain hunt, he at £3 a month *is* a bargain, which she proclaims to her husband more than once: "It is becoming quite a calamity about servants here. Arthur tells me that men, not fit to light Omar's pipe, ask him £10 a month in Cairo and would not take less, and he gives his Copt £4. I really feel as if I were cheating Omar to let him stay on for £3; but if I say anything he kisses my hand tells me 'not to be cross'" (162). One wonders why Omar works for so little, and one day while he rubs her feet, we get the answer. When she tells him that foot care is below his dignity, he sings in response: "the slave of the Turk may be set free by money, but how shall one be ransomed who has been paid for by kind actions and sweet words" (164). Just as Duff Gordon's kindness procured her a cheap boat, it also lets her keep a servant underpaid by all accounts.

If Omar works for so little because he is paid in kindness, he also does so because he is part of the family. Repeatedly, she represents Omar as such: "You would be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

amused to see Omar bring me a letter and sit down on the floor till I tell him the family news, and then *Alhamdulillah*, we are so pleased, and he goes off to his pots and pans again" (127). Omar, she suggests, delighted to be one of family, skips off to perform his domestic labor. Incorporating Omar's laboring body into the family circle, Duff Gordon writes, "This morning I went into the kitchen and found Omar cooking with a little baby in his arms, and giving it sugar" (169). And again she draws Omar's labor into the family: "I am now writing in the kitchen, which is the coolest place where there is any light at all. Omar is diligently spelling words of six letters, with the wooden spoon in his hand and a cigarette in his mouth, and Sally [her British servant] is lying on her back on the floor" (175). Here, Omar's economy is being commented upon as he is portrayed as part of the family: Omar's dual usage of his wooden spoon, preparing dinner as he teaches Arabic, shows that he works both as cook and teacher. And he is paid adequately for neither.

When Duff Gordon's British servant, Sally, gets pregnant with Omar's baby, Duff Gordon quickly breaks up the family which she had so sentimentally portrayed, sending Sally back to England on the first steamer and the baby out to an Egyptian woman to nurse. She has Omar cover all expenses; thus she transfers the costs of her British servant onto her Egyptian one. She then swears off English maids: "I think I will not take an English maid, but bring only Omar to Europe and get a Syrian or a black woman when I return. I find that these disasters are wonderfully common here—is it the climate or the costume I wonder that makes the English maids ravish the Arab men so continually?" (187). A year later, when Maria, her German maid, becomes "bored," "dissatisfied," and "ill" in Luxor, Duff Gordon gets rid of her too saying:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> I do so much better without a maid that I shall remain so. The difference in expense is enormous, and the peace and quiet a still greater gain; no more grumbling and "exigencies" and worry; Omar irons very fairly, and the sailor washes well enough, and I don't want toilette—anyhow, I would rather wear a sack than try the experiment again. An educated, course-minded European is too disturbing an element in the family life of Easterns; the sort of filial relation, at once familiar and reverential of servants to a master they like, is odious to English and still more to French servants. (265)

The real reason that Duff Gordon dismisses Maria has to do with her unruliness: "the European style of abusing me and making faces behind my back, and trying to set my household against me—in short, the vulgar servant view of the master as a natural enemy—struck absolute dismay among my hangers-on, paid and unpaid" (254). As Duff Gordon gradually rids herself of European labor, she lays out an argument for the use of Egyptian labor: they are cheaper; they will play the family part; and they are easier to control.

Duff Gordon reveals the family to be a domestic work unit, itemizing the cost of each member. Omar, himself, costs 1/6 to 1/8 the price of a European in food: "Omar does everything well and with pride and pleasure, and is delighted at the saving of expense in wine, beer, meat, etc. etc. One feeds six or eight Arabs well with the money for one European" (265). And he has no desire to be aided in his work: "Omar of course is hardworked—what with going to the market, cooking, cleaning, ironing, and generally

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

keeping everything in nice order but he won't hear of a maid of any sort. No wonder!" (269).

II. Saving on Household Slaves

Scholars who seek to prove that Duff Gordon is an imperialist indicate that she owned slaves. Melissa Lee Miller points to Duff Gordon's dismissal of her eight-year-old slave girl, Zeynab, because of her refusal to eat pork as evidence of Duff Gordon's cultural imperialism. This is indeed the case; however, I have been arguing for an understanding of imperialism that includes a broader range of practices. In my reading her ownership of slaves is a symptom of her everyday practices of saving and consuming. Her purchase of Zeynab, then, can be seen in relation to her dismissal of Sally and Maria. Interpreted in this way, imperialism itself can be understood as a system not only based on racial distinctions but on economic ones as well.

Duff Gordon uses her need to save money to justify paying Omar so poorly. As she records the rise in prices all over Egypt, she never increases Omar's pay even though her expenses decrease because of the dismissal of her costly European maids. Duff Gordon replaces these Europeans with workers for whom she paid little—slaves from Egypt and other parts of Africa. During her stay in Egypt, she kept seven slaves; she acquired the majority of them only after Sally and Maria left. Slaves for her were a good investment; they worked for free and Duff Gordon never paid much for them, although how much she pays is unclear. Only once does she mention the transaction. This was when she said that she considered her purchase price to be the wage. Usually, Duff Gordon was reticent about discussing financial transactions when it came to slaves. She

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

announced the acquisition of her first slave, Zeynab, by simply writing, "I have a black slave—a real one" (73).

The language that she employs to discuss how she gets her slaves is familial rather than commercial. She often speaks of "adopting" or "inheriting," as when she gets a slave from her son-in-law's business: "I am to inherit another little blackie from Ross's agency at Kenneh: the funniest little chap" (313). Or she acquires slaves as a good deed, saving them from others' brutality, as she does when a friend shows her his new slave: "he fetched me to look at her, and when I saw the terror-stricken creature being coarsely pulled about by his cook and groom, I said I would take her for the present" (74). Similarly, she gained two more slaves when a Belgian died and "his two slaves . . . got my little valet, Darfur, to coax me to take them under my protection, which I have done, as there appeared a strong probability that they would be 'annexed' by a rascally Copt who is a Consular agent at Keneh" (350).

Just as the English saw themselves as protecting the Egyptian fellaheen from the French and Turks who forced them to toil on their projects, Duff Gordon imagined herself saving Egyptian and African slaves from mean masters. She offered a safe haven for them in the bosom of her family, where they would work tirelessly without pay. If she portrayed Omar as the father, son, or wife in that family, they were the children: "What would an English respectable cook say to seeing 'two dishes and a sweet' cooked over a little old wood stove on a few bricks, by a baby in a blue shirt? And very well cooked too, and followed by incomparable coffee" (276). Duff Gordon incorporates their playful, childish bodies, into her family scene, "I go on very well with my two boys. Mabrook washes very well and acts a *marmiton*. Darfur is a housemaid and waiter in his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

very thin way. He is only troublesome as being given to dirty his clothes in an incredibly short time" (329). Weaving together a child's role, getting dirty, and his work, waiting, Duff Gordon creates an image of productive children, and a family always at work. Omar, whom they call "uncle," is portrayed as an older sibling or father, who supervises their work, while busily performing his own. If Duff Gordon portrays Omar as a father figure, she portrays herself as a mother.

Sensitive to the problem that this portrayal may cause for her biological children, Maurice and Urania, she tells them that her slaves pay homage to them: "She [Zeynab] sings a wild song of joy to Maurice's picture and about the little Sitt [Urania]" (74). Duff Gordon's children's feelings, however, may not be her only concern; she may herself fear that she is replacing her family. If this is true, then her Egyptian family is a much more convenient version. They, after all, work to make her comfortable: "in this large dusty house, and with errands to run, and comers and goers to look after, pipes and coffee and the like, it takes two boys to be comfortable" (303). But more to the point, everybody in her Egyptian family works. Her English family is never portrayed as laboring; to the contrary, she complains about the laziness of Maurice, her youngest son: "I wish he would work; it is a great heaviness of heart to me to know that he is so idle and unsatisfactory" (334). The only time that she entertains a family visit is when, frustrated with Maurice's indolence, she asks him to come to Egypt to learn Arabic from Omar, so that in the future he may get a job in the colonies. And when Maurice does come, Omar works wonders. He teaches him Arabic, reforms his work habits and his spending habits: "I never beheld such a change for the better in any human being. Really Omar has done good service in keeping him out of mischief and teaching him to be more

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

careful with money" (350). Duff Gordon reverses the colonial trope of the lazy native and projects it back home. Seemingly, Duff Gordon replaces her biological family with a more productive one. She out-sources the family, making its productivity visible, by showing it at work.

Her slaves only fully enter into the narrative when Omar is away. It is not until Omar spends time away from home fixing her boat that she incorporates her "boys" into her text: "I am better again now and go on very comfortably with my two little boys. Omar is from dawn till night at work at my boat, so I have only Mabrook and Ahmad, and you would wonder to see how well I am served. Ahmad cooks a very good dinner, serves it and orders Mabrook about" (276). That she fills Omar's absence with accounts of her slaves is telling. She replaces his domestic labor with theirs, "It is surprising how fast the boys learn, and how well they do their work. Ahmad, who is quite little, would be a perfectly sufficient servant for a man alone; he can cook, wash, clean the rooms, make the beds, and do all the table service, knife and plate cleaning, all fairly well, and I believe now he would get along even without Omar's orders" (303). She is only one word short of omitting Omar altogether.

Work defines her Egyptian family. While she can live without her European maids, she can't live without Omar—until she discovers how well young slaves work in his absence. The step from domestic work to household slavery is short. Duff Gordon need only redefine "wage" as "purchase price" or rewrite "family" as those who work in the household to justify the use of slaves. It should be noted that in the process, Duff Gordon excludes female labor: she gets rid of Zeynab because she refuses to eat pork when she discovers religion; she expels Sally because she gets pregnant; and she

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dismisses Maria because she wants entertainment, but more importantly, she attempts to stir up the household against her. It appears as though Duff Gordon wants to eliminate the threat to her role as mother and to her place at the head of a matriarchal household. If Duff Gordon has discovered an ideal labor force, who don't get paid, don't need to gratify their own cultural desires, and don't stir up dissent, she has also found a gentler way to rule—an imperialism based on an economy of kindness, where people work for little—or nothing—because they are getting paid in other ways, as does her slave, Mabrook: "You would delight in Mabrook; a man asked him the other day after his flogging, if he would not run away, to see what he would say, as he alleged; I suspect he meant to steal and sell him. 'I run away, to eat lentils like you? When *my* effendi gives me meat and bread every day, and *I eat such a lot*.' Is not that a delicious practical view of liberty" (282).

Duff Gordon is a conundrum. On the one hand, she treats Egyptians better than any of her peers; she enters their houses and lives like them. On the other hand, she lives cheaply off of them. Viewed through the window of everyday life, Duff Gordon appears less complicated. Duff Gordon's daily, habitual, ways of thinking about saving and consuming made her own misdeeds invisible to her. While she ably described large-scale injustices, such as conscription to build the Suez Canal, she could not see beyond her own domestic behavior. Similar traits in other British travelers, though, were only too apparent to her. For example, she relates a story of an Englishman to whom she recommended a dragoman. When the Englishman promised him employment and then cheated the dragoman out of £120, Duff Gordon became so incensed that she considered writing a letter to the *Times*. She was especially outraged at the reason for the behavior:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"It seems that they found one or two parties who had done it cheaper, but that is no reason for breaking their word" (355). She then sums up her story as one could easily sum up her account of her stay in Egypt: "The English have taken to doing very odd things about paying" (355).

Genre and Politics

The result of Duff Gordon's everyday accounting of her seven-year stay in Egypt is a narrative that makes visible political movements at the same time that it motivates them. Gordon depicts various uprisings against Turks, tax collectors, and other foreigners. Her account of one such uprising, the Gau rebellion, is notable for she does not only depict the 1865 revolt of three villages, Gau, Rayanaeh, and Bedeh, against Turkish oppression that took form as an attack upon a boatload of Greek traders in which one person was killed, but she depicts the daily occurrences that led up to that rebellion. Further, Duff Gordon shows the way that a local revolt, headed by Ahmad et-Tayib and originally supported by almost nobody outside of the three tiny villages in which it originated, grew into a national cause supported by all: "every Arab sympathizes with him" (226). She shows the way that the government's brutal reaction to the villagers, which included the extermination of four villages and the beheading of 1,600 people, garnered national support for the cause. More importantly, she demonstrates the way that the revolt against the Turks contained sentiments against Europeans as well because "everyone believes that the Europeans aid and abet" the government in its savage suppression of it (212).

Duff Gordon was one of the only British writers in Egypt in 1865 who recorded the Gau rebellion and the massacre that followed. She herself was surprised when her

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

daughter did not mention it in a letter to her. And unlike so many other accounts of colonial rebellions, for instance that of the Sepoy rebellion in India in 1857, Duff Gordon motivates the actions of the participants in a way that makes their behavior understandable, sympathetic, and inevitable. Her account of Egypt from within--the house, the harem, the kitchen--encourages her to show what she calls the "daily oppressions" of the Egyptian people, accumulating until the point at which politics penetrate the household and "everyone is exasperated--the very harem talk of the government" (244). Thus she demonstrates the effects of conscription, price fluctuations, and tax increases on the household, uniquely focusing modernization through habitation.

Duff Gordon's narrative gives us a fuller understanding of national movements that remained unobserved in western accounts until it became politically convenient to tell these stories. It wasn't until the next century that a popular account of a large-scale national movement in the Middle East was articulated. T.E. Lawrence's 1926 account, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, of the British exploitation of the Arab national movement in order to defeat the Turks and gain sway in the Middle East could only be recounted after the British and French were firmly entrenched in the Middle East and the Arab movement was pacified.

Unwittingly, Duff Gordon reveals her own part in motivating Egyptian rebellion. In unveiling her everyday habits, she shows that even the most liberal and well-intentioned visitors to Egypt were implicated in the colonial project. I have argued that Duff Gordon's domestic habits, adopted to cut costs, have imperial implications.

Lott's world is more circumscribed than Duff Gordon's. She provides no windows in her harem walls through which we can perceive the outside world. Instead,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

she provides us with a painstakingly detailed depiction of the world from within. The harem, indeed, is her world, and Lott's role in her textual representation of that small world, similar to the role of the protagonist in a novel, according to Moretti, is to make herself comfortable there. While Moretti argues that the politics of the conventions of the everyday are of "creeping comfort" because the everyday promotes bourgeois detachment from the larger world in favor of making oneself at home in a small world, I point out how the application of the conventions of the everyday in a colonial setting reveals the imperial violence implicit in these conventions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter IV

World-Girdling Technologies:
Around the World Travel Narratives of the 1870s

In the 1870s Europeans traveled around the world with new vigor, causing a surge in the publication of accounts of circumnavigations. Indeed the increase in round-the-world travel introduced a new word and character type into the English language, the "globe-trotter," that sure-footed, yet un-ambitious traveler who goes "round" rather than straight "to."[1] The *Oxford English Dictionary* traces the word to the early 1880s, but "globe-trotter" seems to have entered the language a decade earlier in the wake of the new round-the-world travelers.[2] Travel narratives about global travel represent nothing new, but the circumnavigations of the 1870s were radically different than the ones that came before.

The reemergence of this travel trend in the 1870s followed on the heels of the completion of three of the largest and most innovative technological enterprises of the

[1] Globe-trotters can be thought of in the context of the rise of organized tourism usually dated to the1840s in England, the period in which guidebooks were published and tours were organized by a developing industry. Although undeniably a part of this new phenomenon, the round-the-world narratives differ from other tourist tomes in their teleology. Their journey is defined by their destination, which is always the shortest way back home.

[2]The *OED* records this first usage in 1883: "Nothing nowadays is easier and safer than to 'globe-trot' round the world." But it was commonly used self-referentially by round the world travelers a decade earlier. The American traveler, E.K. Laird, uses it in his 1875 account, "These are the sentiments of a 'globe trotter', whose business it is to see sights" (Laird 223). And the British traveler, William Simpson, also uses it in his 1877 account when discussing Europeans in China in 1872, "there are only those belonging to the Legations and the Missionary institutions, except an occasional 'globe-trotter' like myself" (219).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

nineteenth century.[3] The Suez Canal, the Great Indian Peninsular Railway, and the Pacific Railway all were completed and opened for traffic by 1870. The Suez Canal and the Pacific Railway were finished in 1869, while the Peninsular Railway was opened in 1870.[4] With the completion of these three projects, a new route around the world was born, drastically altering the way that the world would be experienced. Travelers could now cut through Egypt en route to India, instead of taking the much longer, more tedious way around the Cape of Good Hope.[5] They could steam from Bombay to Calcutta without worrying about procuring a palanquin or an unwieldy coach, or from San Francisco to New York without the discomfort of meeting "Indians or wild animals."[6] By the 1870s travelers could more easily circle the globe, traveling with speed, agility, and relative comfort. And the Suez Canal, the Great Peninsular and Pacific Railways ushered in a new way of writing the world and engendered a new body of writings to capture that experience.

---

[3]A fourth technological enterprise that facilitated global travel was the Mont Cenis Tunnel, opened in September of 1871. It was the first tunnel to cut through the Alps, facilitating travel between France and Italy by reducing the time it took to cross over the Alps to a period of less than ten minutes.

[4] The Great Indian Peninsular Railway company was founded in 1845, it built the first railway in India from Bombay to Thana in 1853. The cross-continental line from Bombay to Calcutta was completed on March 7, 1870.

[5] Simpson writes that in 1859 it took him ninety days to travel from England to Calcutta around the Cape of Good Hope, and that that was considered a quick voyage. The cutting of the Suez Canal reduced the time it took to travel from England to India to less than a month.

[6] These are the advantages of the new cross-continental railway according to Phileas Fogg, Jules Verne's *Round the World in Eighty Days* protagonist.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It is important to consider this subgenre of travel writing because it records bourgeois global re-visioning on the cusp of what is called by many the New Imperialism. When the bourgeoisie circle the globe, they meet face to face with their newest imperial technologies: their recently exported steel roads and their newly reconstituted steamboat industry. In writing about their global shortcuts, they write about technologies that facilitate a new relation to the colonies and the world, and they develop writing styles and narrative techniques that represent that relationship. The technology that they survey, and intimately get to know, is what enables their class to take hold of the globe more firmly. The genre they rewrite encodes that knowledge and vision in its texture. I explore this new genre of travel narrative, both in its real-world form, and then in its most famous fictional representation. Since my argument is that the genre remapped the spatial and temporal way of viewing the globe, I first look at the spatial re-mapping of the world performed by the British writer William Simpson's 1877 account of a circumnavigation that he embarked upon in 1872. I show how the genre represents a new global aesthetic, one that involves a smoothing of geographical and political boundaries. And then I suggest how the narrative's world-flattening technology aids in real-world technology transfer across national boundaries and across the globe. I suggest that the narratives represent technology only to reproduce it and scatter it about the globe. Further, the narratives articulate a logic of world ownership in ascendance in Europe and America in the last quarter of the century, a logic that relies on systems of technology to assert its claims on the world. What I am calling the "techno-logic" of these narratives is not just a British phenomenon, but transnational and Western. It relies upon the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

establishment of a "Western" subject position that can be mobilized to a variety of inter/nationalist projects.

The re-spatialization of the globe performed by this genre was accomplished by a remapping of the temporal order. In the second part of this chapter I turn to the French popular writer Jules Verne to show the way that temporal restructuring of the globe was achieved through narrative. It is Verne and his fast-paced protagonist who popularized and internationalized the temporal logic of the genre. *Around the World in 80 Days*, published in 1872, the same year that Simpson embarked on his journey, and translated into English in 1873, is the only narrative of this genre that is still widely read today, and I argue that this is because of Verne's astute ability to give story to the temporal re-imagination of the globe.[7] Just as the re-spatialization of the globe mounted in excitement, curiosity and anxieties about the proximity of the world, the re-temporalization of the globe provoked enthusiasm, but more often fear, about a new temporality. I show how Verne resolves anxieties about the new fast-paced world caused by that restructuring. By looking at Simpson's spatial mapping and Verne's temporal interpretation, I hope to uncover a chronotopic logic of the new round-the-world journeys.[8]

Facilitating the Globe

---

[7] Geo. M. Towle and N. d'Anvers came out with the English translation in 1873, but biographers claim that British and American newspapers published excerpts from Verne's serial publication of the novel that began on December 22, 1872 even earlier.

[8] M. M. Bakhtin uses "chronotope" to mean "time-space." It explains the connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are expressed in literature, and it defines genre and generic distinctions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Accounts of round-the-world voyages have been a staple of European travel writing since the 1520s when the Magellan circumnavigation was recorded. Throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries Europeans purposefully ventured out to discover territories and commercial routes, map coastlines and plant coastal colonies. However, as knowledge about territories and coastlines neared completion in the nineteenth century, these purposeful round-the-world voyages waned. Instead of venturing around, people increasingly headed inwards to explore continental interiors.[9] Mary Louise Pratt sees the rise of natural history and internationally sponsored scientific expeditions in the eighteenth century as the reasons for the new interior travel, and she associates the move to the interior with a new way that the European elite understood themselves and the world and created meaning on a global scale. Pratt argues that journeys to the interior produced and were the production of new ways of knowing beginning in 1735 when Carl Linne published the *Systema Naturae*, and Europe launched its first major international scientific expedition. By the mid-nineteenth century, the scientific urgency of the circumnavigation was no longer felt. Circumnavigations were replaced by more purposeful inward journeys, documented, described and theorized most notably by Pratt. But beginning in the 1870s, travelers again took to circling the globe. Unlike their predecessors they carried no measuring instruments and drew no maps; instead, they brought games, books, and fancy dresses. They recorded their

---

[9] This is not to say that journeys around the world altogether stopped. Henry Kratz in his introduction to Adelbert von Chamisso's journey around the world (1815 to 1818) suggests that circumnavigations increased in the mid-eighteenth century, citing various round-the-world expeditions including that of Samuel Wallis and Louis Antoine de Bougainville, who led the first French expedition to travel around the world in 1766-1769; Captain James Cook, who led three British expeditions in the second half of the century, and Adam Johann Von Krusenstern, who led the first Russian expedition around the world in 1803 to 1806 (Chamisso xii).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

circumnavigation, but what they produced was a body of literature that is lighter, swifter, and less serious than what had come before. They took little interest in discovering and documenting; instead, these outpourings speak sporadically and unsystematically about the landscapes, peoples, flora and fauna that they encountered. They share a lack of studied interest in the conventional preoccupations of circumnavigations of old: history, geography and science. As they trot from country to country, they skip from subject to subject; and in recording it all and shaping it into a narrative pattern, many of these narratives create a uniquely unengaged tone, lacking in a "serious" and scientific purpose.

It is most likely due to their largely unserious tone that the latter-day circumnavigations are overlooked by scholars.[10] The works of the celebrity explorers such as John Speke, Richard Burton, James Grant, Samuel Baker, David Livingstone and Henry Morton Stanley, who went into Africa to search for the Zembezi, Nile and Congo rivers in the 1850s and 1860s and 1870s, attract more critical attention. Their serious projects, including the abolition of slavery and the Christianization of Africans, mark them off for critical study, and implicate them in the imperial project. By contrast the buoyancy and light-heartedness of many of the around-the-world voyages suggest an unimportant and even un-imperial content. Many titles of the genre, such as H.J. Burlingame's *Around the World with a Magician and a Juggler* (1891) or Thomas Woodbine Hinchliff's *Over the Sea and Far Away* (1876) make light of round-the-world

---

[10] I am not suggesting that all of the circumnavigators and circumnavigations lack seriousness. Some of them are indeed serious about their mission, as is the American C.C. Coffin, who travels around the world in 1869 and William Simpson, who travels in 1872. However, more often than not, authors downplay the seriousness of their travels as they play up the joyfulness and ease of a journey around the world. Even Coffin and Simpson, who are serious about their work, lack a rigor of study that is found in earlier circumnavigations. That is to say that Coffin and Simpson's work resembles journalistic prose much more than it resembles scientific writing.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

travel. Others, such as Ellen Walworth's *An Old World, as Seen through Young Eyes* (1877) and Emmet Carr's *All the Way Round; or What a Boy Saw and Heard on His Way Round the World* (1876) purport to be written by children. Egregious errors in these child-authored texts would cause one to think that the narratives were edited by children as well: the ten-year-old Emmit Carr's narrative brims with historical and geographical inaccuracies, the most blatant one being the placement of Cape Horn in Africa instead of South America. The project then is not, as in the circumnavigations that came before, one of geographical accuracy, but the impression of an idea: traveling around the world is now so simple, that even a child can do it.

Even adult authors take pains to exhibit the simplicity of world travel. They often do this by showing just how easy it is to begin, offering impetuous motives for travel, and making light of their journey. The German traveler Baron de Huebner lacks a serious motive and begins his 1874 account by writing: "on my road, I mean to amuse myself; that is, to see all I can which is curious and, to me, new: and every evening I shall note down in my journal what I have seen, and what has been told me during the day" (vi). Other adults demonstrate the simplicity of circumnavigation by taking pains to show just how little they know or care to know about the world. The English traveler, Egerton K. Laird, describes in his 1875 account why he and an American travel companion that he met en route travel so well together: "H—and I hit it off pretty well, as neither of us . . . know, I'm afraid, anything of, or take any interest in, botany, geology, entomology, or any other *ology*, and he is generally lively and in good spirits" (Laird 245).[11]

---

[11] Compare this to the much more serious motives of Aldebert von Chamisso who traveled around the world in 1815-1818: "My chief occupation now, using time and the good nature of scholars industriously, was to inquire what gaps in our scientific

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

These happy-go-lucky travelers presented themselves as a conundrum to indigenous peoples, who had little context for understanding this new lot of visitors. Annie Brassey, a British woman who circled the globe in her yacht "Sunbeam" in 1878, told of this encounter with some perplexed natives in the South Seas, "'No sell brandy?' – 'No.' 'No stealy men? – 'No.' 'No do what then?' Their knowledge of English was too limited to enable us to make them understand that we were *only* making a voyage of circumnavigation in a yacht" (Brassey 205). Imagining the sort of gestures that Brassey might have produced in her efforts to "make them understand" exposes just how unintuitive the round-the-world journeys were. She projects the purposelessness of her own project onto the South Sea Island natives, who could not understand such a venture. It is their "knowledge of English" that stands in the way, and it is also the "knowledge of English" of her home reading public that enables understanding. By summoning up a knowledgeable public, she naturalizes her project and subsumes it in a realm of innocence, "we were *only* making." Yet the project of this genre, circling the world, and the naturalization of that project, was far from innocent, as we shall see.

The characteristic emphasis on ease was echoed by Thomas Cook, the English travel entrepreneur who organized the very first tour group to circle the globe in September of 1872. Cook reflected that "this going around the world business is a very easy and almost imperceptible business" (Brendon 144). Just as Cook eased the way around the world for his clients by organizing their journey, providing tents, food, guides

---

knowledge a voyage such as the one in prospect might hope to fill" (14). Or James Holman who traveled around the world in 1834: "I have been conscious from my earliest youth of the existence of the desire to explore distant regions, to trace the varieties exhibited by mankind under different influences of different climates, customs, and laws, and to investigate with unwearied solicitude the moral and physical distinctions that separate and diversify the various nations on the earth" (2).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and coordinating the transfers from trains to steamboats, the round-the-world travel narratives projected a new sense of ease with the world to the reading public at home. Circumventing the globe was represented as being as easy and as familiar as opening a book; no prior scientific knowledge or even curiosity about natural history or geography was necessary, either to read the narrative or to embark on one's own journey. Often it is Cook who is given credit for innovating the new round-the-world journey; and he is sometimes even accredited with inspiring Jules Verne's fictional account.[12] Indeed, in 1872 he led the first guided tour around the world when he took eight people on a 222-day journey around the globe. Further, his company led more people around the world than any other travel company in the nineteenth century, and by 1892 1,000 people had circumnavigated the globe with Cook & Son (Brendon 151). But it is inaccurate to think of Cook as the innovator of the global excursion; indeed he just capitalized on the new travel possibilities. It is more useful to think of Cook as one of the early articulators of the new global communications network. More importantly, Cook popularized that network through advertising and articles in his journal *Cook's Excursionist.* Cook opened the globe to the participation of a newly mobile public through the accessibility and immediacy of advertising. Likewise, the globe-trotters wrote accessible prose, not bogged down with botany, entomology, biology, or any other of what Laird called the

---

[12] James Buzard and Piers Brendon both hypothesize that Jules Verne may have gotten the idea for his novel from Cook's 1872 expedition. And Cook's biographers Allotte de la Fuye and Bernard Frank also suggest that Cook's advertisement of his journey inspired Verne's book. But Verne had contemplated round the world navigation long before he sent Phileas Fogg racing around the world. Verne wrote *Captain Grant's Children: A Voyage Round the World* in 1865. And in his 1864 novel, *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* he sends Captain Nemo and his crew circumnavigating the globe in a submarine. Verne's idea was much more likely to have come from a variety of sources than to just have one origin.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ology's, with the same results. The accessibility of their writings, often published first as letters home to newspapers, opened up the world to a broadening reading public at home.

Entitling a Genre

The titles in this genre are important to consider because they indicate its new vision. Earlier round-the-world narratives often relied on titles that advertised a mission, destination, or name of a ship, and they often used the word "voyage" in their title. Darwin, for example, called his 1837 circumnavigation, *The Voyage of the Beagle.*[13] In the 1870s travelers dropped the word "voyage" from their titles. Without a mission or destination the circumnavigations of the 1870s flatly spoke their purposelessness, and were frequently called some variation of "Around the World." Put another way, the titles of these narratives baldly state a new purpose of circumnavigation, simply to get around the world, to draw a circle around it and enclose it within. Going around the world then becomes an end in itself, as Simpson suggests when he concludes his circumnavigation by writing: "When I put my foot on a certain door-step, the girdle had been put round about the earth, and there was an inward sense of satisfaction in feeling that a long journey was ended, and a task had been accomplished" (Simpson 413). Thus Simpson turns the round-the-world journey into an accomplishable "task." At the same time he articulates the globe from the threshold of his own home, a common move of the globe-trotters, as seen in Ellen Walworth's account of her arrival home, "Thus, June 1874, finds us where June, 1873, left us—Uncle absorbed in the duties of his parish, I intent on my studies, and more strongly convinced than ever of these three things: that the world is

---

[13] See also Adelbert von Chamisso's narrative: *A Voyage Around the World with the Romanzov Exploring Expedition in the Years 1815-1818 in the Brig Rurik.* Captain Fisher A. Newell's too demonstrates this trend: *Two Brothers Narrative of a Voyage Around the World in the Bark 'Sea Breeze'* (1850).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

round, that the finest country in the world is the United States, and that the brightest spot in the United States is Home!" (Walworth 316) One purpose of these narratives is to articulate the world as a globe, and to make that globe knowable from the familiar space of home.

In titling his 1887 work *A Girdle Round the Earth: Home Letters from Foreign Lands*, D. N. Richardson emphasizes the words "home" and "girdle" to map familiarity onto the project. *Girdle*, a recurring word in these works, simultaneously accomplishes a sense of familiarity and a sense of constriction, a spatial shrinkage of the globe that approaches a smug at-homeness in the world. The girdle familiarizes the globe, putting it in the same spatial framework as the body, the usual object of girdling, and calls to mind the constrictive nature of this body wrap. "Girdling" was not a new way to describe round-the-world travel; Shakespeare has Puck "girdle round about the globe in forty minutes" (quoted in Simpson 5). Yet, girdling the globe, in the restrictive sense, is a newly found reality, made possible by rail and steam technology. In the 1870s the word *girdle* was increasingly used to conjure up the world railway system, and usage such as R.H. Brown's, "50,000 miles of track in operation in 1870, enough to *girdle* the earth twice" was common (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*). Thus girdling the globe in the seventies signifies not just an innocent act of circling the world, but a technological feat that depended on the "cooperation" of global powers, England, France and America, and the submission of countries and zones, Egypt and the Red Sea, India and the Arabian Sea, and China and the Pacific. Richardson's title points out the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

strictures that this act imposes, a monopolistic tightening of control of the globe that Vladimir Ilich Lenin associates with the New Imperialism of the 1890s.[14]

The most prolific contributors to the genre of round-the-world literature were Americans, and the American C.C. Coffin was one of the first to girdle the globe in the new fashion.[15] In *Our New Way Round the World* he explains the motivation for his 1869 journey: "The last rail has been laid between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the locomotive runs from ocean to ocean. A few months hence the waters of the Mediterranean and Red Seas will mingle together through the Suez Canal, and a new way for trade and travel will thus be completed round the world" (Preface). Here he explains the *new* of his title, but one has yet to understand what he means by *our*. The use of this pronoun is puzzling because it modifies "new way" which he defines by two pieces of

---

[14] Lenin uses the exportation of railways around the globe as a symbol of his thesis about the New Imperialism. Capitalism, he argues, inevitably leads to monopolies and imperialism. The girdling of the globe with railways in the 1890s was a sign of monopoly capitalism and the New Imperialism. He writes: "Thus, about 80 per cent of the total existing railways are concentrated in the hands of the five Great Powers (U.S., British Empire, Russia, Germany, France). But concentration of the ownership of these railways, of finance capital, is much greater still: French and English millionaires, for example, own an enormous amount of stocks and bonds in American, Russian, and other railways" (98).

[15] American accounts of round the world travel were numerous. The Union Pacific Railway company came out with *Around the World by Steam, via Pacific Railway* in 1871 enabling many to easily take the journey. William P. Fogg went around the globe in 1869-71 and described his tour in a series of letters to the *Cleveland Leader* and published *Round the World: Letters from Japan, China, India, and Egypt* in 1872. The American railway builder, George Francis Train, went around the world four times, once in 80 days in 1870. An American boy, Emmit Carr went around the world in 1874 with his grandfather and mother and published *All the Way Round* (1876). The sixteen-year old Ellen Walworth went around the world with her uncle and published *An Old World, as Seen through Young Eyes* in 1877. American circumnavigations increased throughout the century and had their most famous incarnations with Ulysses S. Grant's *General Grant's Tour Around the World: With a Sketch of his Life* (1879) and Nellie Bly's record-breaking narrative, *Around the World in 72 Days* (1890).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

technology, one "American" and the other "internationally" held on Egyptian territory controlled by the decaying Ottoman Empire. American investment in the Canal project was negligible, and Americans had little to do with the international company.[16] Yet Coffin is claiming both roads as American. Coffin's claim on the global highway introduces a generic claim. The circumnavigations of the 1870s make national and Western claims to the globe-girdling technologies and all that fall in their tracks. As Coffin uses the possessive pronoun to take hold of the new global highway, the authors of round-the-world travel narratives invoke "Western" technology to claim *all* technological enterprises and imaginings as their *own*. They establish a "Western" subject position suggested by Coffin's "*our*" that could be mobilized to a variety of inter/nationalized projects.

Mapping the Route: William Simpson's *Meeting the Sun: A Journey All Round The World, through Egypt, China, Japan and California* (1877)

In 1872 the British journalist William Simpson was dispatched by the *Daily News* to Peking (Beijing) to report on the marriage of the emperor of China. The internal policies and events of China were of increasing interest to England for a variety of reasons. First, China was the world's most sizeable empire, and England's move towards expanding her own empire made China a natural object of study and curiosity. Second, China represented a large potential market for goods and source of raw materials, not only to England, but to France, Russia and America; thus, the coming of age of its emperor offered a new hope for a change in China's isolationist policies, which had hitherto kept European traders confined only to a few treaty ports on the coast.

---

[16] Lesseps reserved five percent of the canal shares for investors from the United States. But American investment in the canal was actually much less (Farnie 51).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Simpson's travel account is extraordinary because he saw an opportunity to penetrate the most intimate spaces of China by writing about its age-old custom of marriage, and he turned the story of imperial nuptials into a circumnavigation, incorporating a local event into a global context. Thus he girdles the globe by incorporating its most recalcitrant locality. And he does it with a nonchalance typical of the genre: "as I should be so nearly halfway round the globe, it might be as well to return home by the New World, and thus put a girdle round about the whole" (7). Simpson's ability to girdle the globe by incorporating its largest resistor makes his round-the-world narrative stand out; nevertheless, Simpson's work remains unstudied by scholars. His narrative is worthy of study because he articulates an important function of the narratives: the completion of the globe by the incorporation of countries outside of its fold, in this case China. Chinese leaders were adamantly opposed to building telegraphs and railways on their territory. China stood outside of the global communications and transportation network; thus China was the largest impediment to the smooth transfer of Western technology and goods across the surface of the globe. But the round-the-world travel narratives incorporate China into the technological imagination of the globe, and Simpson provides a roadmap for that incorporation. Simpson's work reveals the technologies of incorporation that round-the-world narratives adopt.

Simpson devotes his eight-page introduction to mapping out and justifying his route. Like many other globe-trotters, he claims to go "all" the way around the world, entitling his narrative *Meeting the Sun: A Journey All Round the World.* Yet, such a claim can only be a construction since it would be impossible to encompass "all" of the world. His route then is valuable for study because it reveals the constructed nature of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the geography of the circumnavigation. Simpson defines the skeletal route of the genre; beginning his travels in Europe, Simpson goes on to Egypt, Aden, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Singapore, China, Japan, America, and then back to Europe.[17] "All" then does not mean all countries, cities, or bodies of water. Instead, "all" means the shortest and the fastest route that still encompasses; it means the most "direct route": "what I will call the *Direct Route* will be generally chosen, *via* Egypt. Any one wishing to reach Egypt by the quickest means will go by the Mont Cenis Tunnel. Speed was my object, and so I propose to take my readers by this last route" (6). Almost all round-the-world travelers pass through America, Europe (England, France, Italy), Egypt, Aden, Ceylon, Singapore, China and Japan. Many see India. Some see Australia, New Zealand, and Honolulu. Travelers almost never visit Russia, Africa (excluding Egypt), or South America.[18] Simpson provides a justification for these exclusions saying that the Siberian Overland Route from St. Petersburg to Peking is a "long and a very serious undertaking" (3). Of South America and Africa he offers,

> The modern traveler who skims round the earth's surface is not an Explorer; as a rule he belongs to the genus Tourist. He has no wish to risk his neck in attempting to go over impassable peaks, or to die of hunger and thirst in the burning deserts; painted savages with heavy clubs and

---

[17]Notice how closely this skeletal route coincides with what R. Calwer called the "main economic areas" at the turn of the century: Central Europe, Great Britain, Russia, East Asia, America (*An Introduction to World Economics*). Calwer's map gives us insight into an economic understanding of the structuring of this particular route.

[18] Hinchliff decides to go to South America precisely because it is not on the circuit. He writes that he wanted "to avoid following the example of the great majority of modern travelers, who, for some unknown reasons, appear almost unanimously to exclude South America from their programme" (viii).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> poisoned arrows, or Indians with scalping-knives, are a class of society he has no desire to mix with. Jungles with tigers or venomous snakes he marks as places to be avoided. (5)

The "modern traveler" avoids extreme landscapes, "impassable peaks," "burning deserts" and "jungles." Yet in the round-the-world travel genre, he does not just eschew, as Simpson suggests, deserts, jungles and mountains, but he stays clear of the semi-arid, the wooded, and undulating areas as well. Globetrotters, it seems, are averse to landscapes altogether. Round-the-world travelers, in this respect, are not like other road-based travelers, who exult in landscape reporting. William Burchell's 1822 text of travel in Africa is typical of the road-based tradition: "The path soon became more steep and laborious, and the sun from behind the distant mountains of Hottentot Holland, rose upon us before we had climbed much more than half the height" (40). Packed tight into one sentence are evidence of the incline of the hill, the weather, the landscape, and the subject positioning vis-a-vis the landscape. Although hills, weather, and landscape reporting can be found in the round-the-world travel accounts, such density of landscape reporting is conspicuously absent. Again and again Simpson produces potentially dense landscape descriptions as not textured. Passing through a jungle in Penang, he writes: "There is a dense jungle all round, but a good road has been cut through to the foot of the waterfall, and the Hindoos have built a small temple close to the rocks" (88). Absent in this description is a corporal knowledge of the landscape, which in Burchell is conveyed by a report of the incline of the hill and an account of the weather. In Simpson's account the "good road" that cuts through the jungle seems to flatten out the landscape itself.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Travelers often feel the road beneath them, as John Campbell, traveling in South Africa clearly does, "The roots of the grass, which was growing in separate tufts, were so hard, that they jolted the wagons like so many stones" (134). Road-based literature always had a way of incorporating the road, bumping around and jolting its passengers as it goes. Yet in the round-the-world travels, the road is rail smooth. At sea too one meets neither tempests nor pirates; steamships smoothly ply from shore to shore with surprisingly few storms, deck fires, or battles to check their movement. Making a twenty-six day journey across the Pacific in a new American steamer, Simpson typically writes: "We found the Pacific not untrue to its name. There were one or two days which we might say were not quite smooth; but a storm, or a gale, or even a rough sea, we did not encounter the whole way" (340). One gets the feeling that the sea itself has been pacified by the new American steamers, whose powers and size he describes in ample detail.

During Simpson's trip he rarely indicates that he has risen above sea level. He infrequently records heat and rain, despite time spent in the tropics.[19] Instead, he records a geographically smooth world. Related to the lack of geographic borders is the lack of cultural and political ones. Language, dress, or customs rarely hinder his movement, and he encounters no passport controls, customhouse hassles, or money problems.[20]

---

[19] This is not to say that he never mentions the weather. He does, as when he passes through the inferno of the Red Sea. However, weather intrusions are relatively rare, especially when compared to other types of travel narratives, where weather and weather patterns make a daily appearance.

[20] Compare this to the typical hassles of the English traveler described in Murray's 1836 guidebook: "Of all the penalties, at the expense of which the pleasure of traveling abroad is purchased, the most disagreeable and most repugnant to English feelings is that of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Guidebooks from the period suggest that even the most pampered tourist would have no such luck; typically, tourists complained of everything from fleas and bugs to collapsing tents and grounded steamers. And tourists' logs were filled with strange encounters that suggest a very bordered world. Visiting four continents, seven countries and thirteen cities, one would expect that Simpson might experience a few more inconveniences. Yet states hinder his movement in no way; he enters all ports and stations without interruption. Nor does Simpson encounter the mundane problems that happen when one must rely on trains and ships for conveyance. His trains are never late, and he is always prompt. A common complaint featured in the "Travel through Egypt" column of the *The Times* throughout the 1860s was of "stranded" travelers, who missed steamboat connections and were thus "stuck" for weeks at Suez. But for Simpson there are only smooth transfers from steamboat to train and train to steamboat. Nothing, it seems, gets in the way of the new technology. Technology smooths out geographical, cultural and political borders. People and goods flow freely over the surface of the globe, and a common problematic of modernity, traffic, is elided. Indeed, these are traffic utopias.

Traffic utopias should be unreadable. Their frictionless accounting provides no bumps or snags to give a story grip. Borders are the stuff of narrative; it would be hard to imagine a story without them.[21] Even the most fundamental narrative theories take them into account, such as Vladimir Propp's *Morphology of a Folktale.* Round-the-world

---

submitting to the strict regulations of the continental police, and especially to the annoyance of bearing a passport" (*A Handbook for Travellers on the Continent* xv).

[21] One way that a story can go wrong, Franco Moretti suggests, is to fail to incorporate borders and border-crossings (what he calls complexity). This is where the English novel gravely erred. England's production of a genre that lacks border-crossing, is what Moretti argues, has made England into an Island (*Atlas of the European Novel*).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

travel narratives practice imagining a world without borders, and they are invested in producing a narrative of a borderless world. Such bourgeois imaginative practices overlapped with the nineteenth-century revival of the imperialist dream of the seamless joining of the hemispheres. Round-the-world travel narratives are globalizing technologies. They project onto the world a homogenizing smoothness that comes out of and makes apparent an imperial dream of hemispheric union. The round-the-world narratives are particularly interested in the joining together of the Eastern and Western hemispheres, made evident by the route that they most often reproduce—a route that moves from East to West or West to East, smoothly and without snares. They provide a narrative version of the nineteenth-century imperialist vision of uniting the hemispheres.

Round-the-world narratives, technologies themselves, are born out of the global transport technologies that they seek to reproduce. Global technologies provide them with the structures that they need to articulate the imperial project of global union. Thus, the concern with technology and the description of technologies takes a prominent place in the round-the-world travel narratives. Technologies give materiality to abstracted imperialist claims of global union. Prominently placed in these works are representations of the Mont Cenis Tunnel, the Suez Canal, the Great Peninsular Railway, the Pacific Railway, and various newly built ports. The texts focus on technologies that are placed between worlds. The most instrumental of these technologies is the Suez Canal, for it most symbolically represents that seamless joining of the hemispheres in its dramatic linkage of two oceans--the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, of two nations--England and India, and of two worlds—West and East.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although the Suez Canal is the symbolic center of his work, Simpson launches his narrative much closer to home, at the mouth of the Mont Cenis Tunnel on the border between France and Italy. He begins his narrative with a long description of the technology used to make the tunnel, concentrating on the newest technologies and processes employed. Like the Suez Canal and the Pacific and the Peninsular railways, it was most significant in that it provided the means of communication between nations. It symbolized the reduction of what was once a three-day long crossing of the Alps to a matter of minutes. Most interesting about Simpson's accounting of the tunnel is the way that he incorporates his detailed description of technology into the literary. Standing at the French end of the recently completed tunnel he thinks back to the previous century, when no tunnel existed, and the mountain was a formidable block to movement between France and Italy. Pondering the tunnel-less mountain, he says that it is here that Laurence Sterne ends his travel novel *Sentimental Journey*, as if to suggest that England's most innovative novelist was himself immobilized in front of the mountain. Sterne therefore strands his beloved character, Yorick, in front of the formidable landscape, leaving Yorick's journey and Sterne's novel uneasily incomplete. Simpson's ruminations suggest that where technology ends, literature too must find its conclusion. Continuing his linkage between technology and literature, Simpson writes, "The mails [which would have included newspapers, journals, and even books] which leave London on Friday evening, reach Brindisi early on Monday morning. The whole of this distance, via Mont Cenis is 1477 miles" (33).

The Mont Cenis Tunnel, then, opens up the world to English letters. And Simpson's circumnavigation maps out the road that they will follow. From England to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Brindisi via the Mont Cenis Tunnel, from Brindisi to India via the Suez Canal, from India to China via the Peninsula Railway, Simpson projects English letters around the world. This is the primary work of the circumnavigations: they project across national borders self, commodity, culture, and technology. Thus, they rely upon a smooth world vision so as to encourage the flow. Further, they streamline movement, gathering all roads into one, forging practical and logical connections between technologies and technological spaces around the globe. The Mont Cenis Tunnel merely connects France to Italy, an idea that is politically fraught but nothing new. The Suez Canal is different. It connects two truly abstract notions, the West and the East.

As the home of the Suez Canal, Egypt is the most symbolically active space in this narrative. It is the site of the joining of East and West. Since the opening of the canal, Egypt occupied a new space in the European geographical imaginary: "Egypt of old was the gate of the east, and now she has again got back her lost privilege" (Simpson 16). Egypt was now the space in which East and West meet and mingle: "Port Said would in a short time be the Liverpool of Egypt; all the commerce of east and west would meet there" (Simpson 16, 36). What enables Egypt to become a geographical space of encounter between East and West is the technology that it harbors. The Suez Canal is the active agent of East/West union: "As Vasco de Gama's discovery of the Cape of Good Hope divorced the connection with the East, so the Suez Canal is to restore it, and the Adriatic and the Indian Ocean will be more closely wedded again than ever" (17). In round-the-world travel narratives, Egypt is synonymous with the Suez Canal, and Egypt and the Canal function symbolically as the site of East/West union.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The round-the-world narratives claim "Western" ownership to this unique space of union. The new international transport technology, then, gains credence as Western. The narratives assure that what might be considered an Egyptian project (for Egypt was the biggest contributor, giving labor, lives, land, technical expertise, and ultimately the most money) is collectively available for "Western" ownership. Simpson westernizes the canal by claiming belief in it at the same time that he distances eastern claims to its technology by portraying the Alexandrians as disbelievers in the canal project. Thus he exports England's notorious lack of belief in the "practicability" of the project onto the "East," telling an elaborate tale of Alexandrian disavowal of it. Simpson's arrival in Egypt is colored by a description of Egyptians' inability to imagine the canal as a completed object:

> When we arrived, in November, 1869, at Alexandria for the ceremonies at the opening of the Suez Canal, the first news received was that an impenetrable mass of rock had turned up on the canal at the Serapeum; that it would be quite impossible to cut through it in time; that the canal itself, generally speaking, was a complete failure; that Lesseps knew this all along, and that the rock at the Serapeum would put the inauguration out of the question. There were people from all parts of the world, including an Empress, and an Emperor, Princes, and great folks of all ranks; and so Lesseps, unable to carry on the imposture any longer, had that morning blown out his brains with a revolver. Such was the intelligence that first came on board our ship when we got into Alexandria. Of course it was of Alexandrian manufacture. (36)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He projects this story of disbelief, so familiar to British readers, onto the Alexandrians. British readers knew, however, that it was they who doubted, but by exporting English doubt to Egypt, Simpson helps to shape the notion that it is England and the West which believe in technology, and it is Egypt and the East that disbelieve in it. Simpson continues to dislodge the ownership of the canal from the East by writing about the changes that the canal project produced on the environment. Noting the vast transformation of desert land into a sea, he writes:

> The transformation seemed like enchantment, as if the wizards and genii of the east had been at work,--but, on consideration, it might appear doubtful whether individuals of that kind could have wrought such transformations. Engineers and contractors are our modern wizards and genii, and not only the bitter lakes, but the whole Suez Canal, is evidence that they are far ahead of their ancient rivals. (40)

Thus the "geniis" and "wizards" of the east are incapable of orchestrating technological transformations, while the engineers and contractors of the west own that ability. Simpson represents the canal as materially and imaginatively western. In so doing, he represents the symbolic power of the canal to "unite" east and west as a Western power. Thus the magical union between East and West is facilitated by the invention of technology as Western.

Round-the-world travel narratives are narratives of inevitability. They rely on the production of repeatable (and knowable) spaces to make meaning of the vast world. As their project, the drawing of the world into a narrative, is nearly impossible, they rely on the production of repeatable (thus knowable) spaces to create continuity. The spaces that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

get repeated are spaces of technology, newly Westernized spaces that define the East/West union narrative. Technological spaces are repetitions of the ones that came before; thus the Suez Canal is a repetition of the Mont Cenis Tunnel; the Peninsular railway is a repetition of the Suez Canal. As each technological space repeats one that comes before, each new space of technology anticipates one that will come after. Spaces of technology are proleptic; they predict a future that is knowable in the present. Prolepsis then predicts a world in which all roads will be paved, and "Western" technology will inhabit every corner of the globe. The story of the Mount Cenis Tunnel announces the Suez Canal; the Suez Canal announces the Peninsular railway; and the Peninsular Railway announces a Chinese railway. But herein lies the problem. There was no Chinese railway, and any "foreign" encroachment into China to build railways was strictly forbidden. China was opposed to Western ideas and technologies, and the creation of Western spaces on that territory, outside of the handful of treaty ports, was impossible. It was important, then, that a body of narratives arise which would smuggle Western technology into China. The force of the prolepsis suggests that what has happened to Egypt will happen in China. Thus the form of the narrative itself works hand in hand with Simpson's most prophetic claim about China: "If machines do not come in today, they will find admission tomorrow" (292).

The Suez Canal, symbolically resonant in its (uniquely Western) ability to unite the East and the West, is imagined in China. Simpson reports, for example, that European missionaries published and circulated pamphlets with descriptions and pictures of the Suez Canal and the Mont Cenis Tunnel, to prove to the Chinese that the Westerners were indeed a civilized people since they had such difficulty believing it.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Like the pamphlets, Simpson's text reproduces Western technology in China. Simpson, however, unlike the missionaries, has no interest in persuading the Chinese of the West's state of civilization. Instead, he imbues Westerners with a sense of themselves and a belief in their own technological inevitability. In the face of an obstinate Chinese government, who had "set their faces against railways and telegraphs" (Simpson 210), Simpson offers his readers a sense of the inevitability of western technology in China and around the globe.

As Simpson approaches China, steaming through the Chinese Seas, his narrative changes. The smooth journey that has hitherto been presented is ruffled by the contemplation of China. The rebellious seas frighten his crew, and the fear of monsoons make them worry that they "might be all thrown upon one of those desolate rocks before to-morrow morning" (106). Bloodthirsty pirates clog the sea and doom European passage: "Their plan with a European ship is to kill the crew, as dead dogs tell no tales; then, after taking whatever they want from the vessel, they set her on fire or scuttle her" (108). Once he is on shore, rebellious natives threaten them. Simpson arrives to China two years after the "Tsiensing massacre," a rebellion in which hundreds of French missionaries and Chinese converts were killed by Chinese rumored to be angered by the kidnapping of their children by missionaries. Simpson visits the sites of the massacre, various Roman Catholic churches, and documents the atrocities. He speaks of children who took refuge in the basement of a church being suffocated, of native converts being "savagely butchered," and of innumerable dead bodies floating down the river for days afterwards (222). The Tsiensing massacre colors his entire visit. Tsiensing is the first place that he visits, and he spends his entire time there visiting sights of the massacre;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

then when he travels to Peking and the Great Wall, he continually refers back to the massacre. Everywhere, he cites Europeans, whom he says are in a constant state of military preparedness, flying their flags in their ports, and ready for an attack. His readers cannot help but be made aware of the constant threat that a Chinese rebellion, what he calls "another Tsiensing," posed. What is most interesting about the massacre is the way that it calls into account a "European" object of attack (rather than French.)

Simpson's writing on China differs from his writing on the rest of the world. China represents a potential snag in his smooth journey around the world. Monsoons, pirates and especially massacres throw up borders and threaten to disrupt the ease in which he circles the globe. Indeed, he perceives the entire Chinese landscape as uniquely bordered. Burial mounds cover the landscape and "are so thick and close that the whole country has the appearance of being one vast burial ground" (116). He writes: "In sailing up the Pei-Ho, I was struck with the infinite number of grave-mounds which were visible in every direction, and I found that this is the case in all the northern part of China" (190). The importance of the mounds to the round-the-world travelers is most bluntly announced by E.K. Laird, "the whole country is disfigured by unshapely mounds; and, worst of all, no railway can be built" (243). Coffin too makes this point,

> The empire is a graveyard. Railroads are remorseless; they cut through the cities of the living and the dead alike. A railroad running ten miles in China would disturb the whole spirit-realm. Unlike strokes from spades might sever skulls from vertebrae in some ancestral burial ground, and then there would be headless ghosts wandering through the land of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> darkness, and sickness, pestilence, calamity, and untold horrors would settle upon China. (343)

Yet Coffin continues by proposing that a railway is the only solution. Round-the-world travelers portray these mounds (and the massacres) in order to suggest the inevitability of their leveling (and squelching). They imagine the landscape flattened and ready for the production of western technology upon it. Simpson sees the landscape with one purpose: "The country here is perfectly flat, and a railway could be constructed with the greatest ease" (Simpson 125).

Globetrotters understood the resistance to "Western" technology as cultural.[22] By portraying the landscape as filled with mounds, they could materialize a cultural practice, so as to more easily imagine it expunged. Western technologies, they imagined, could plough through China, ridding it of its uncomfortable contours. The narratives employ technologies that make the inevitability of China's flattening apparent. They proleptically suggest that what had happened elsewhere would happen too in China. The railway had rid India of its cultural symbols: "Ten years ago five thousand images of the idol Doorga were sold at the annual festival held on the banks of the Ganges in honor of that god; but since the opening of the railroads the sale has almost wholly ceased" (Coffin 107). In India, Coffin continues, "The locomotive, like a ploughshare turning the sword of the prairies, is cutting up a faith whose roots run deep into bygone ages" (Coffin 108). And China would follow suit:

---

[22] Most round-the-world travelers cite three cultural reasons for the resistance to Western technology in China: the burial mounds, the practice of audience rituals such as kowtowing, and the belief in Fung Shuey.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> When that screeching innovator, the locomotive, begins to move across the plains of this flowery land, ploughing up old bones, breaking the chains which bind the living and the dead, there will be hope for China. . . . It will yet do for China what it is doing for India. It is a powerful missionary. Idols, caste, prejudices, sacred bulls, Brahmans, customs, religions, laws, governments, dynasties, pashas, mandarins, and kens are borne down by that great leveler. (Coffin 343)

The round-the-world narratives offer up a way to thread together the world, to connect the spaces of the globe through a particular spatio-temporal logic, characterized by the inevitability of the reproduction of space in time. What will happen here, they suggest, will happen there. It is only a matter of time.

Timetable Anxieties: Jules Verne's *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1872)

Thus far I have been describing the way that space is homogenized, reproduced, and scattered around the globe by the round-the-world traveler. I have suggested that the technology of the round-the-world narrative is the flattening out of cultural difference and the spatial reining in of the world. In *Around the World in Eighty Days* Jules Verne invents a character to whom the spaces of the globe are no matter. Phileas Fogg whisks his way around a world which is all the same to him. Aloof to the scenery that he steams by, he is the embodiment of indifference: "He made little effort to observe this Red Sea. . . . He did not come and observe the fascinating towns crowded along its banks, whose picturesque silhouettes sometimes appeared on the horizon" (39). A chapter heading can sum up his whole attitude: "Chapter 14: In which Phileas Fogg Travels the Whole Length of the Wonderful Ganges Valley without even Considering Seeing It" (68).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Given a chance to learn about India from a fellow traveler, Fogg prefers not to: "He was an educated man, who would willingly have provided information about the customs, history, and political system of India if Phileas Fogg had been the sort of man to ask for it. But this gentlemen requested nothing. He wasn't traveling, he was describing a circumference" (48). Fogg is not interested in the particularities of the spaces of the globe; his task is quite literally to describe a circumference. Phileas Fogg travels around the world in eighty days and sees nothing.[23] *Around the World in Eighty Days* is almost a parody of the round-the-world genre in which a commodity-like self is projected around the globe and meets no friction along the way. But instead of thinking of it as a parody, one would do better to consider it as an improvement on the genre. As I have argued, the work of the genre is the projection across national borders of self, commodity, culture, and technology, and the streamlining of movement around the world. Verne improves upon that projection and creates a character who forges an even better route around the world. Phileas Fogg is an entrepreneur of global travel, and Verne offers the round-the-world genre the benefice of entrepreneurship.

Verne's contribution to the round-the-world tradition is based in the second part of his masterful title, "in eighty days." No previous narrative made such a titular promise. Although the American George Francis Train traveled around the world in eighty days two years prior to Verne's protagonist, it was considered ill-advised to make

---

[23] In this way, he is not a typical globetrotter, whose "business it is to see sights" (Laird 223). But he is typical of the railway sojourner, who according to Wolfgang Schivelbusch detached himself from the outside world, preferring a good book to a distant view. Phileas Fogg, then, is the cliché of the railway passenger in the nineteenth century, who often was referred to as a "human parcel" who dispatched him/herself to his/her destination by means of the railway and steamboat. Indeed Verne intermittently refers to Fogg as a commodity and merchandise.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the journey in anything less than a year. One of the first Americans to go around the world in the new fashion, Charles Coffin, explains that it would be possible to circumnavigate the globe in ninety days, but that it would not be advisable: "he who makes it in that time will have weariness of body and a confused brain" (509). Further:

> Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos, and Arabs will be so completely mixed, --there will be such indistinct recollections of joss-houses, pagodas, mosques, temples, --of junks, sampans, proas, and other queer craft, --such a snarl of streets, lanes, and alleys, filled with myriads of people, carrying baskets, bundles, chests of tea, and dressed in blue blouses, baggy trousers, flowing robes, long gowns, turbans, broad-brimmed or steeple-shaped hats, --or wearing nothing at all, except a narrow strip of cloth about the loins, --with pigtails, cures, or gaven crowns, plucked brows, painted faces, tattooed skins, --riding in sedans, palankeens, or on donkeys, elephants, and camels, --that the brain, instead of retaining distinct pictures, will be in the condition of a sportsman whose horse turns a somersault in a steeple-chase, and the unfortunate rider beholds only a whirling landscape of fields, trees, hounds, hedges, and blinking stars! (509)

A too-quick journey around the world caused anxieties about fatigue, "weariness of body," and a fear that things would not stay in their place. Peoples, "Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos," and places, "pagodas, mosques, temples," would lose their distinction, jumbling together in a meaningless heap. Indeed, one of the biggest casualties of the quickened pace is the unit of meaning itself. The integrity of the sentence is threatened

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

as it swells to twelve lines and is barely held together by threads of punctuation. Coffin offers a sea of words in danger of losing coherence. But Verne's narrative seeks to restore the syntax that Coffin fears will be lost in a too-swift journey around the world. He will re-establish a temporal coherence to a globe threatened by an ever-quickening pace. While Simpson worked to narrate the world as a spatial unity, Verne will succeed in authoring it as a temporal one.

Verne's proposal, an eighty-day journey around the world, was realistic enough. The advancement of international routes and technologies around the globe made necessary a newly internationalized standardization of time so that commodities could flow freely around the world. What Lenin had written about the spatial monopolization of the globe by railways and their owners was now becoming true of time.[24] Temporality had to rush to meet the needs of capital flows. Time could no longer run at its local pace. Beginning in the 1860s the international community's grip on time began to tighten. The timetable and timekeeping were at the forefront of this constrictive movement. In 1871 the first regularly-held conference to establish an agreed upon timetable for passenger services was established (Wedgwood 6, 20). And in 1884 a world standard for timekeeping was adopted when the Greenwich Meridian was established as the Prime Meridian by twenty-five countries.

---

[24] Lenin wrote that beginning in the 1870s capitalism veered from its roots in "free trade" and became increasingly monopolistic. Lenin used the railways as an example of the expansion of monopolies around the world. For him, both the component parts of the railway—coal and steel—and the railways themselves that by the 1890s were found in nearly every space of the globe were evidence of the monopolistic developments of capital.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

One *could* get around the world in eighty days, and proof of that appeared to Verne *in Bradshaw's Continental Railway, Steam Transit and General Guide*,[25] which he uses to structure his narrative. One afternoon at the Reform club, Fogg picks up the *Morning Chronicle* and finds this *Bradshaw*-style timetable:

London to Suez via the Mont Cenis Tunnel and Brindisi, by rail and steamboats	7 days
Suez to Bombay, by steamship	13 days
Bombay to Calcutta, by railway	3 days
Calcutta to Hong Kong, by steamship	13 days
Honk Kong to Yokohama, by steamship	6 days
Yokahama to San Francisco, by steamship	22 days
San Francisco to New York, by railroad	7 days
New York to London, by steamship and railway	9 days
Total	80 days (Verne 19)

Fogg therefore confidently claims that he can go around the world in eighty days. His friends at the club are incredulous. They worry about what the timetable has left out; it is "not allowing for unfavourable weather, headwinds, shipwrecks, derailments, etc." (19). The circle of disbelief widens when the Royal Geographical Society publishes its thoughts on the matter: "And what about breakdowns, derailments, collisions, bad weather, and snowdrifts—wasn't everything against Phileas Fogg? On the steamships would he not be at the mercy of the winter squalls and fogs?" (26) All of London is worried about headwinds and shipwrecks and snowdrifts and fogs. However, to Fogg, those unpredictable elements—promoting the confusions and miscalculations so productive of narrative—have disappeared into the confident lines of the timetable. The stops and the slowdowns that create spaces from which stories emerged are erased by

---

[25] George Bradshaw began to publish the Series of Railway Timetables in 1839. By 1847, he expanded them to include the continent, and his timetables became indispensable for railway and steamboat travel (Buzard 78).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fogg's ever-forward dash. A colleague argues, "Twenty thousand pounds that you could lose through an unforeseen mishap!" To which Fogg answers, "The unforeseen does not exist" (20). In Fogg's world there is only the timely predictions of the timetable. And Fogg's timetable leaves no space for unforeseen delay and narrative flourish: it leaves out story altogether.

Verne plays with a very real nineteenth-century fear of loss of specificity, similar to but different from what Coffin had recognized and produced in his dizzying narrative. While Coffin envisions the loss of definition in the jumbling together of places and peoples caused by unprecedented haste, Verne's Londoners fear the loss of space altogether in the face of the effort to eliminate it into the precision of the international timetable. Wolfgang Schivelbusch argues that in the nineteenth century people thought that railway travel, which in its early phase was three times the speed of the usual means of conveyance, would obliterate space and time. Temporal shrinkage was projected onto space: "the temporal diminution is expressed mostly in terms of a shrinking of space" (34). People feared that those interstitial spaces between destinations would lose all distinction as they disappeared into the blur of speed. The loss of space in terms of the shrinkage of time in *Around the World* appears as such: "The Earth has shrunk because it can be covered ten times as quickly now as a hundred years ago" (18). Time has gobbled up space. *Around the World* plays with the anxiety that all space will be squeezed out by that grand organizer and symbolic of compressed time, the timetable. The Londoners fear that Fogg's time-tablic journey, leaping precisely from rail to steam and steam to rail with no time in-between, leaves no room for story. One can hear echoes in Walter Benjamin: "Every morning brings us the news of the globe, and yet we are poor in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

noteworthy stories" (Benjamin 88). While Benjamin argues that it is the immediacy of information that curtails the time-bound experience of story, Verne's Londoners fear that the speedy and unhampered flow of goods and peoples will erase all trace of familiar experiences and the stories that they provoke.

But the accomplishment of *Around the World* is that Fogg circumnavigates the globe in record time and finds time for story. He does this by incorporating adventure into the seams of the timetable. Verne's novel is remarkable for the number of adventures that it includes, considering that its protagonist prefers staying comfortably on board playing whist to venturing out. Fogg, who is on the strictest of schedules, should not have time to get embroiled in adventures if he is to make all of his connections. But *Around the World* is replete with adventures, including twenty-one of them in its two hundred pages.[26] Mikhail Bakhtin makes visible the connection between adventure and time in his formulation of Greek adventure-time in the ancient novel. He calls adventure-time, "a time of exceptional and unusual events, events determined by chance, which, moreover manifest themselves in fortuitous encounters (temporal junctures) and fortuitous nonencounters (temporal disjunctures)" (116). Verne incorporates adventure into a timetable, reinventing the globe as a temporal unity. He mixes Greek adventure-time with the newly synchronized transport time, and ultimately incorporates all temporal

---

[26]These are the adventures that are met along the way: Passepartout's pagoda melee, an elephant ride through an Indian jungle, a suttee rescue from fanatics, apprehension and trial for the pagoda incident, storm at sea, Passepartout drugged and passed out in an opium den, missing the *Carnatic*, a typhoon, Passepartout's bout as a Japanese acrobat, an election day brawl, train leap across a broken bridge, a duel on a speeding train, a Sioux attack, a Sioux rescue, missing the train, a sledge ride, missing the *China*, a boat hijack involving locking up the captain and taking over his crew, dismantling and burning a boat for fuel, taking a mail boat, an arrest and imprisonment!

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

junctures and disjunctures (adventures) into the timetable, revising it for the better, improving its productivity and grip upon story.

Improving *Bradshaw's* by Leaps and Bounds

The novel begins with a wager. In England Phileas Fogg, the hero so famous for his precision and punctuality that he is called a chronometer, challenges the men of the Reform club, of which he is a whist-playing member, to a wager. He bets twenty thousand pounds that he can go around the world in eighty days. He gathers up his servant and leaves London less than a half-hour later. Taking Simpson's "Direct Route," Europe, Egypt, Aden, Ceylon, Singapore, China, Japan, America, Europe, with a few modifications—he substitutes India for Ceylon, taking the Great Peninsular Railway from Bombay to Calcutta, and he spends less time in China, indeed he only visits Hong Kong—he and his servant travel around the world. Although they have adventures along the way, exactly eighty days from their departure, they arrive in Liverpool with nine hours to spare, the trip to London only taking six. However, upon his arrival on British territory, he is thrown in jail because he is believed to have stolen £55,000 from the Bank of England before his departure, and the wager is lost. But he has one final adventure (fortuitous temporal dis/juncture): he discovers when he tries to plan his marriage for the following day, a Sunday, that the following day is a Saturday. He arrived a day early. He had insistently kept his watch to London time, and on account of his traveling east, he had gained a day, so he really circled the globe in seventy-nine days. He weds.

This is the plot that gets remembered in summaries and films. But I would like to wind back the clock, and look at two moments that occur before what seems to be the initiating action of the text, the wager. Two actions, a hiring and a crime, predicate

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fogg's famous bet that sends him hurtling around the globe, and it is important to consider these two actions because they set up the circumnavigation as a global project within a social context, disavowing the idea that Fogg represents merely an eccentric individual set in motion by a bet. These two initial actions allow us to see the social apparatus and control surrounding Fogg's seemingly idiosyncratic journey. *Around the World* begins with a hiring. The ever exacting Phileas Fogg engages a new servant because his old one "had made the mistake of bringing in his shaving-water at a temperature of 84 F, rather than the statutory 86" (10). He employs the Frenchman, Passepartout. The title of the first chapter, under which this hiring is subsumed, is, "In Which Phileas Fogg and Passepartout Accept Each Other, the One as Master, the Other as Servant." Here symbolically what is "accepted" is England's new global domination and France's diminution in global importance following the Franco-Prussian defeat in 1871. Thus, the initiatory action of the novel sets in motion an international partnership, however hierarchical, suggesting that global circumnavigation will be a joint endeavor. Verne makes explicit what other round-the-world narratives state implicitly: the project of global circumnavigation will rely on international relationships and agreements if it is to succeed. Globalization, or the propelling of goods, technologies and peoples around the globe unfettered by states or cultures, cannot be conceived of as a national project; the coordination of networks and routes rely upon international cooperation. The chapter ends with a synchronization of watches, in which an Englishman tells a Frenchman that his watch is four minutes slow. "You're four minutes slow. It is of no consequence. What matters is to note the difference" (11). The project of circumnavigation becomes

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

one of international synchronization, in which one power creates the standards and everybody else "notes the difference."

The second event that precedes the "wager" is a bank robbery. The Bank of England is robbed of £55,000--not by a common criminal, but by a "gentleman." This robbery provides the catalyst for Fogg's circumnavigation, making it the first round-the-world journey motivated by a crime. It happens this way: the robbery becomes the subject of discussion at the Reform Club, and it is generally believed that the robber will try to escape the country, so that "detectives chosen from among the best policemen were sent to the main ports of Liverpool, Glasgow, Le Havre, Suez, Brindisi, New York" (17). In an ensuing discussion the men at Fogg's club argue about the likelihood of a getaway:

> "And where do you think he might go, then?" "I can't say," replied Stuart. "But after all, the world is big enough." "It used to be," Fogg said quietly. . . . "What d'you mean, 'used to be'? Has the Earth suddenly got smaller by some chance?" "Unquestionably it has," responded Ralph. "I share Mr. Fogg's view. The Earth has shrunk because it can be covered ten times as quickly now as a hundred years ago. And in the case we are discussing, this will make the search faster" "You must admit, Ralph, that you have a funny way of saying the Earth has shrunk! Because you can now go round it in three months" "Eighty days," interjected Fogg." (18)

Thus begins the wager. Fogg becomes Scotland Yard's primary suspect for the robbery because he fits the description "gentleman" and he appears to be escaping. The detective, Fix, sets off on his trail. This plot is not only an around-the-world narrative, it is also a prototypical-spy novel, in which two international players, of unequal power,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

travel the globe hand-in-hand, chased by a bumbling detective, named ironically Fix. In this sense the round-the-world narrative becomes a projection of the British state not just to India and Hong Kong, where it already has a presence, but around the globe. Projecting an explicit system of control around the world is an innovation of Verne to the round-the-world narrative. He uses the detective plot to bind together his novel, giving coherence to the project of narrating the world.

Reading *Around the World* as a prototypical-spy novel opens up the apparently simple plot and its idiosyncratic hero.[27] Indeed there are no indicators that Fogg is *not* a criminal. In addition to the coincidence of his departure, just one day after the robbery, there is the source of his fortune of £20,000, which is never accounted for. He did not seem to earn it as he "was not engaged in industry, business, commerce, or agriculture" (7). And if the money were inherited, it was not public knowledge, "Was Phileas Fogg well off? Without any doubt. But how he made his fortune, even the best informed could not say" (8). His pockets are shockingly deep, as Fix notes: "He's spending money like a thief" (80). Indeed, he spends £2,000 to buy an elephant, £2,000 on bail, $8,000 for passage across the Atlantic, and $60,000 to purchase a sloop. In total he spends £55,000 on his journey, but he takes home nothing that he purchased. He gives away the elephant, and burns the sloop for fuel. Of course his timely circumnavigation justifies all expenditures.

But Verne casts suspicion upon the round-the-world traveler. If we take Verne's claims seriously, that Fogg is a "commodity," a piece of "merchandise," and a

---

[27] It also opens up the spy novel, that other globetrotting genre, which represents a network of spies and suspicion propelled into the world at the moment that England was firming up its hold upon the globe.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"machine," then we must see Fogg as simultaneously passenger, commodity, and technology. He embodies every sort of thing that could and did go around the world. Fogg then represents the entire round-the-world apparatus. By linking telegraph, rail, steam, information, commodity, merchandise, passenger with Fogg--Verne succeeds in casting suspicion upon the whole global project.

Around the World holds us in a state of suspense—will he make it? did he steal it? will he get caught?--until our hero reaches home. Then, we discover, all is well. The suspicion of Fogg, that "enigmatic figure" and "mysterious gentleman," is dispelled along with suspicions about the project of circling the globe at lightening speed and all that it entails. The real robber is apprehended; Fogg wins his bet; he marries his Indian bride, and he beats the record for global circumnavigation. Order has been re-established, but it is a more orderly order than ever before. Before Fogg embarks on his mission, one nonbeliever tells him, "But in order to do it, you'll have to mathematically jump from trains into steamships and from steamships on to trains!" And Fogg replies, "I'll jump mathematically" (20). Herein lies Verne's chronotopic formula. He subjects Greek adventure-time to the newly emerging international precision. In doing so, he advances the girdling—the constriction of—the world. *Bradshaw's* promised an eighty-day journey around the world. But Fogg increasingly supplements his *Bradshaw's* with other means of travel. He travels in every means of conveyance: steamer, railway, elephant, yacht, trading vessel, flying train, sledge, carriage, mail boat, sloop-on-fire. These unlikely adventures are undoubtedly the attraction of the novel for its readers.[28]

---

[28] Adventures are also important to the film versions of Verne's novel. Indeed, in these the plot becomes reduced to a stream of adventures, and adventures that never even take place in the novel are introduced

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

On the micro level each adventure slows him down. But on the macro level, misconnections and adventures actually speed up the journey. For example, in the mid-way point between San Francisco and New York, Fogg and his fellow travelers fall behind schedule by twenty hours after a series of adventures. If Fogg were to follow his *Bradshaw's*, he would only need to reach New York and there make a connection to a steamboat heading for Liverpool. Instead, Fogg forges an alternative route and has five adventures along the way: a sledge ride hounded by wolves, missing the *China*, hijacking a boat, burning a boat, catching a mail boat. In spite of (or because of) these adventures, Fogg arrives in Liverpool with six hours to spare. Adventures enable him to move faster, not slower; they put him back on schedule, rather than taking him off it. Ultimately, they put him so far ahead of schedule that they create a new standard by which to move. Verne subsumes adventure to the timetable, and suggests that eighty days is not the limit, but a new frontier.[29] Thus, it comes as no surprise to Fogg at the end of his seventy-nine day journey around the world, that he could have done it in less time. Passepartout discovers "That we could have done the trip around the world in only 78 days" (202). Fogg answers, "undoubtedly."

Verne has discovered a formula for improving upon *Bradshaw's* timetables: to jump mathematically. Adventure comes to service the needs of capital, quickening the pace of global circulation, and making it fun to boot. Verne unglues adventure from its lexical history—removing it from that slow-moving, road-bound mercantile "venturer," to whom adventure may result in total loss. In its place, he gives us a sure-footed, un-

[29] Verne's body of work is geared towards pushing this temporal limit of circumnavigation. In *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* (1869), he sends captain Nemo's submarine though a secret passageway under the Suez Canal, and they speed from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean in twenty minutes only.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ambitious, yet willing to risk it all *entrepreneur*. Fogg can jump mathematically. He can take risks with the precision of one who knows the gain of risk. Thus when Fogg risks his life to save an Indian woman from suttee, he words it as if it were an investment: "Saving this woman, Mr. Fogg?" exclaimed the Brigadier General. "I'm still twelve hours ahead. I can use them that way" (62). Fogg banks hours and invests them in adventures. This one turns out to be a particularly good investment, for he gains a wife who will make him the "happiest of men."

Fogg's famous imperturbability comes from his confidence in his ability to use all resources to his gain. When caught in a storm in the Chinese Seas, "this nerveless man felt neither impatience nor annoyance. It really seemed as though the storm formed part of his schedule: that it was forseen" (92). When Fogg misses the only steamer that will get him back to Liverpool on time, he is again unperturbed. Immediately he sets out to look for a better way to cross the Atlantic. Eventually he finds a merchant "with a steamer with an iron hull, but with upper works made entirely of wood" on his way to Bordeaux (178). He coaxes Captain Speedy, despite the fact that Speedy refuses to veer from his course to Bordeaux and never carries passengers, to carry him and his three friends to Bordeaux, offering to pay him $2,000 per person causing Speedy to remark, "passengers at $2,000 apiece are no longer passengers, but precious merchandise" (180). It is next reported that "At midday on the following day, 13 December, a man went up on a bridge to take the bearings. It will certainly be assumed that this man was Captain Speedy—but it wasn't. It was Phileas Fogg" (181). Effortlessly Fogg took over Speedy's captainship, crew and vessel, and steered a new course to Liverpool. Fogg overthrows the single-minded merchant capitalist, unwilling to alter his route to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bordeaux, and replaces him with a much more flexible capitalist, who not only alters his route, but changes the rules of the game; the narrator compliments Fogg's ability to "maneuver." When Fogg discovers that there is not enough coal to make it to Liverpool, he decides to burn the boat for fuel. Thus he makes use of every last resource, converting the upper parts of the ship to fuel and returning its steel hull to Speedy. Fogg returns home to England at the helm of a ship, fully in control of all of the resources within his reach.

Global Text, Local Dissent

Verne offers up a formula for global conquest. Exploration and its accompanying brute force were nearing the end of their utility. With the help of a large fortune, an international partnership, the state, and an entrepreneurial persona, Fogg facilitates global circulation, and shows its way forward. *Around the World* is a global text with world-wide appeal. The two countries to first see translations of Verne's work, England and America, were the ones that had the most to gain from it. England, soon to be in the throes of global conquest, would by the end of the century begin to be eclipsed by America, a country more accepting of Verne's lessons.[30] As Americans were the largest contributors to the round-the-world genre, it is not surprising that *Around the World* was immensely popular there. If round-the-world narratives offered their bourgeois readers a glimpse of *"our"* new road, *Around the World* offered them a formula for its improvement.

---

[30] Neil Smith argues that American Imperialism began to differ from the British variety in this period when America turned to economic means of conquest rather than military ones. Verne suggests that Fogg may well be an American hero when he has Captain Speedy compliment Fogg by saying: "Well, Captain Fogg, you have Yankee blood in you" (186).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But that improvement was not always without complications. Those complications came from the cultures that resisted improvement. Verne's Londoners demonstrated their existence: "Even if the Indians and Red Indians tear up the rails? . . . Even if they stop the trains, plunder the carriages, and scalp the passengers?" (19) What if *these* stories get told? What if stories about peoples who tear up technology, or who flat-out refuse it, as in the case of China, get put into circulation? *Around the World* offers a particular technology to make sure that *if* circulated *these* stories will do no harm. It makes sure that these stories are interchangeable and therefore not particularly powerful. Adventure is prone to interchangeability, as Bakhtin points out, "The adventure chronotope is thus characterized by a *technical, abstract connection between space and time*, by the *reversibility* of moments in a temporal sequence, and by their *interchangeability* in space" (Bakhtin 100). Within *Around the World* the interchangeability of adventures is made evident when Fogg and Passepartout are brought to trial in Calcutta. Neither of them know why they are being prosecuted. Passepartout believes that they are being brought to trial for their first adventure, the pagoda melee, but it turns out that they are being held on account of their second adventure, the suttee rescue.

Verne offers his readers an onslaught of adventures, and none of the adventures seem to follow a particular order or readily adhere to their surroundings. They seem to be departicularized to the point of operating within the space of romance. Their romance quality assures their interchangeability. But if we look closer, we begin to see that adventure has a spatial component, disguised by its seeming interchangeability. In Fogg's most "benign" adventure, he saves a woman who is being sacrificed to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

practice of suttee. On his way to Calcutta from Bombay, Fogg is stopped in Allahabad because fifty miles of track from Kholby to Allahabad have not been completed. He is forced to disembark from the train and travel to Allahabad by elephant. On his way he fights fanatics, halts a suttee, and steals away the bride. These adventures have the air of romance. The space, quickly moving from "great forests" to "vast arid plains" is departicularized in a way that is typical of romance. Morality too is easily bifurcated, as is typical of that genre, with the forces of good, Fogg and Passepartout, fighting the forces of evil, the fanatics with their barbaric customs.

Yet this space, flattened out and departicularized through romance, and made interchangeable through adventure, has a history. Allahabad stops Fogg in his tracks. Why? Murray's 1892 *Handbook for Travelers in India & Ceylon* suggests one possibility: "The history of the outbreak at Allahabad is one of the saddest chapters of the long list of misfortunes which marked the commencement of the great Mutiny in 1857. Fifteen officers were murdered by the Sepoys . . . anarchy reigned in the city—the jail was broken open, and the prisoners, with the irons still rattling on their limbs, murdered every Christian they met" (37). Verne echoes this sentiment but places this scene on the road to Allahabad, instead of in Allahabad itself: "The whole northern flank of the Vindhya range is the scene of incessant murder and pillaging" (61). Allahabad has an almost timeless hold on the British imagination. Thirty-five years after the rebellion, Murray's guidebook still cites the "mutiny" as Allahabad's major point of attraction. In his novel Verne stages his own version of this long-standing identification and hence tells a story of British strength and reprisal. In Verne's version, Fogg squelches the mutinous "fanatics" and takes away booty, which becomes his bride when he reaches England. So

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

not only has Fogg restaged the mutiny, he has fought it and won—this time with the help of a French cohort.

The day after he returns to London, Fogg marries the woman that he saved. She is the only object that Fogg brings home, and the only thing that he gained from his journey, since he spent the equivalent of his prize money during the journey, a point with which Verne ends his novel. And he finishes his text with this cheeky observation: "In truth, wouldn't anyone go around the world for less" (202). He begs the question. Would anyone? It seems unlikely that a Victorian would go around the world for an Indian bride. However, the accomplishment of such a union is another story. With this marriage, Verne elegantly achieves a restaging of the mutiny, and a final symbolic smoothing out of India's rough terrain.

Verne introduces India to us by saying that it was not fully conquered: "British India in the strict sense only covers an area of 700,000 square miles (out of 1,400,000) and a population of 100-110 million (out of 180 million). In other words, a considerable part of the territory still escapes the Queen's authority; and, indeed, amongst certain fierce and dreaded rajahs of the interior, Indian independence continues absolute" (43). Fogg's unscheduled journey takes us through an unconquered territory, one ruled by a "dreaded rajah": "This whole region of the Upper Bundelkhand, where travelers rarely go, is inhabited by a fanatical population inured in the most repugnant practices of Hinduism. British domination has not been able to take proper hold over a territory still under the rajahs' influence, difficult to reach in their inaccessible fastnesses of the Vindhya Range" (57). Interestingly, Fogg does not follow the tracks of the interrupted line; instead, he goes out of his way to take the route where the English railway company

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dare not go. Verne willfully leads us through independent India, ruled by the "dreaded" rajahs. Railway projects were often thwarted by England's incomplete dominance over Indian territory; often rajahs would not grant permission to build on their land; sometimes they wanted to start their own railway companies on their lands, an act which England soon made illegal. Aouda's husband, it should be remembered, was "one of the independent rajahs of Bundelkhand" (61). Thus, when Fogg carries her away, he symbolically steals away a piece of Indian independence.

We can now reconsider Verne's cheeky conclusion:

> But what was the point? What had he gained from all this commotion? What had he got out of his journey? Nothing, comes the reply? Nothing, agreed were it not for a lovely wife—who however unlikely it may seem--made him the happiest of men! In truth wouldn't anyone have gone around the world for less? (202).

Clearly not. Fogg circled the globe with the British state in tow, and in the process stole away just a bit of Indian independence. Moreover, he shows the way. He not only maps out the journey but a way of journeying that incorporates improving energies in every step. Thus, for example, the "eighty days" of the title is revised to the "seventy nine" days in which they really make it, and the "seventy eight" days in which Passepartout discovers they could have made it. These reserve improvements are indeed what Martin Heidegger calls the essence of modern technology. In his analysis, technology is a way of thinking that always calls out the reserve energy of every object, even, most detrimentally, that of human beings (human resources).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Not only does the text improve upon itself, it invites people to follow in its footsteps, and many real-life adventuresome souls, inspired by Fogg's journey, took up the challenge. Most notable is the American, Nellie Bly, who made it around the world in 72 days in 1890. A few years later a circumnavigation club was formed in England for this purpose, and in the twentieth century, journeys proliferated as the route got better. Indeed, by mid-century the land route could be done in 32 days.[31] And advances in aviation technology made around-the-world flights possible to a wider public. In 1936 Herbert Roslyn Ekins, demonstrating the true spirit of the around-the-world narratives, wrote a how-to book of global aviation titled *Around the World in Eighteen Days and How to Do It*.[32] These globe-trotters and travel writers imitated the entrepreneurial spirit of Fogg and Verne, girdling the globe, telling their tale, and inspiring many to follow.

Most importantly, Verne's neatly concluded tale quells anxieties about this process—the kind of anxieties that were expressed in the nineteenth century by travelers like Coffin who perceived that a too-quick journey around the globe threatened meaning itself; and in the twentieth century by philosophers such as Heidegger, who shows how technology in all of its modern manifestations menaces meaning.[33] But Verne's narrative assuages these fears by creating satisfying closure—supplying the journey with telos. The final pages of Verne's novel simultaneously wrap up a journey, a bet and a chase; solve a mystery; set a world record, and produce a marriage. As a result Verne's lasting

---

[31] See Yvette H. Ward's *Around the World in 32 Days* (1958).

[32] Five years earlier Wiley Post records the eight-day flight of Winnie Mae in *Around the World in Eight Days; The Flight of Winnie Mae* (1931).

[33] See, for example, Heidegger's essay "The Question Concerning Technology."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

accomplishment in *Around the World in Eighty Days* is inspiring confidence in the technological fitting of the globe.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

EPILOGUE

I have told a story of how the British came to embrace the Suez Canal—a story that reveals the alterations in the way that they perceived character, investments, and technology throughout the century. Narrative itself played a role in the process. From the incorporation of the entrepreneur to the mapping out of a global via, nineteenth-century narratives plot a culture increasingly accepting of global technologies. By intentionally blurring the lines between narrative and what we have come to think of in the twentieth century as technology, I have asserted that we register the interconnectedness of the two, for they are both cultural productions dependent upon each other for their mutual articulation. The most poignant example of their interdependence came in my final chapter, where I argued that circumnavigation narratives commonly represented global technologies at the same time that European missionaries in China depended upon western technology—namely the Suez Canal and the Mount Cenis Tunnel—to articulate conversion narratives to the Chinese. While in the former case, narratives represent technology, in the latter, technology enables narrative.

Throughout "Imperial Ways" I have argued for an expansion of the ways that we think about narrative and technology. It is not an accident that my work relies heavily upon novels, the dominant genre of the century, or that travel narratives play a large secondary role. The novel developed the ability to proliferate characters--to propose and dispose of them at will—at precisely the moment when the market itself was demanding an acceptance of diverse character types, such as the entrepreneur. In addition, the novel and travel narrative were the forms that best incorporated everyday life. While the everyday had been a convention of the novel since its beginnings, we have seen the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

coincidence of the introduction of everyday life into the travel narrative form at the time when Egypt was becoming a colony. It was through the incorporation of the everyday, I argued in chapters two and three, that novels and travel narratives asserted their own spatial practices abroad—imaginatively colonizing foreign spaces so as to make them more familiar. The *Bildungsroman*, with its emphasis on the incorporation of the individual into society and its institutions, thus looks suspicious when enacted abroad. If Tancred were to develop in the Middle East, he would need to bring British institutions with him, which he does in the ultimate pages of *Tancred.* In my final chapter, I argue that in the process of narrating the world, round-the-world travel accounts developed an ability to incorporate and disseminate the new ideology of speed in a way that ameliorated fears about the loss of space and story. This is seen nowhere more clearly than in Jules Verne's 1872 novel, *Around the world in Eighty Days.*

The ability of the novel to incorporate the world, I would suggest, was furthered by innovations of the modernist novel. Stream of consciousness, for example, is a narrative technique which permits characters to break with the strictures imposed upon them by conventions of time and space in order to roam the world, if only in their minds. Of course, stream of consciousness developed out of earlier nineteenth-century narrative techniques; authors had always found ways to crisscross time and space, as Charles Dickens adeptly demonstrates in his novel *Tale of Two Cities,* where he moves between nineteenth-century England and eighteenth-century France with ease. While stream of consciousness made it even easier to cross temporal and spatial borders, by enabling individual characters to do so at will, I would argue that the novel still remained more comfortable in the terrain of the relatively slow time and localized space of the national

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

railway. Temporal and spatial leaps and bounds in narrative, instead, took place in film. I would like to conclude "Imperial Ways" by reflecting on how two film versions of Verne's *Around the World in Eighty Days*, the first, made in 1956 and the second in 2003, furthered the development of the narrative technologies discussed thus far.

I began "Imperial Ways" by referencing David Lean's incorporation of the Suez Canal into his 1962 movie *Lawrence of Arabia*, suggesting that the canal here dramatically symbolized a world in transition following Gamal A. Nasser's nationalization of it in 1956. I conclude my work by turning to another Hollywood movie that touches upon the subject, this one made in the same year as the "canal crisis," Michael Todd's 1956 *Around the World in 80 Days*. A movie that seems to need no introduction was given two discrete ones when it was re-released in 1982. The 1982 film begins with a lengthy introduction by the American, Robert Osborne. Todd himself built a "prologue" into his film when he had Edward R. Murrow introduce it in 1956. Thus Todd cleverly gave himself the ability to comment on the film by putting his own words into the mouth of one of the most authoritative reporters at the time, made so by his World War II reporting. Sitting behind a desk, surrounded by neatly filled bookshelves and a globe, Murrow uses his best news voice to ponder Verne's technological foresight, and to consider the connections between "fiction" and "fact." Verne, after all, he says, predicted the invention of the submarine, the airplane, and the rocket. Indeed, Murrow is preoccupied with the third, and shows the earliest film of Verne's work, the 1902 short, "A Trip to the Moon," made from Verne's novel *From the Earth to the Moon* by the French filmmaker George Méliès.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I would argue that Todd uses Méliès's famous film to introduce his own for two reasons: first, to call attention to the quickly modernizing world, and second to implicate Verne's novel (and fiction in general) in that process. First, Todd made *Around the World in 80 Days* during the beginnings of the race for space: only a year after his film was released, the Soviets launched Sputnik. The United States swiftly countered by opening NASA. Todd ends his prologue with images of a real rocket launch, the type of footage that would only become familiar to American viewing audiences in the following decade. In Todd's movie, the image must have been truly awesome, especially as it was proceeded by Méliès's crude fictional representation of a rocket launch a half a century earlier. If the juxtaposition of the footage purposefully shows just how far man has come, it also demonstrates the progressive relation of fiction to technological fact. In addition, Murrow's pronouncements provide a moral spin to Verne's imaginings, as he admonishes "speed is good only when wisdom leads the way," adding "There is in this power of destruction also the promise of hope. Man has discovered a method of destroying most of humanity or of lifting it up to high plateaus of prosperity and progress never dreamed of by the boldest dreamer."

That Todd was a bold dreamer himself is the message of Robert Osborne's 1982 introduction in which he ponders the innovations that were the products of Todd's dreaming. Most importantly, Todd pioneered the Todd-AO process, a wide gage panoramic presentation method, a technology that better enabled him to incorporate landscapes into his travelogue. He also invented the cameo role, which permitted him to procure a star-studded cast without overspending. Osborne's interest in Todd's innovations stems from his desire to shift the focus away from the film and to its making,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

away from Verne's vision to Todd's. This shift is noted in his introduction: "The story of the making of the film is as wild, implausible, and entertaining as the film itself." According to Osborne, nobody believed that Todd, who had never made a movie before, could pull off such an ambitious one: "by all odds everybody expected this movie to be a disaster." Critics said that he would never raise the money, he wouldn't get the stars, and he wouldn't be able to pull off the world-circumnavigating plot. Yet he "begged, borrowed, and cajoled" to raise the money to get his movie made. Moreover, he managed to land the "wealthiest and the most independent" actor in the world, the Mexican comedian "Cantinflas," to play the role of Passepartout, a coup, Osborne explains, because Cantinflas had hitherto turned down all requests to play roles in English. Despite all setbacks, the story goes, Todd triumphed. He won the Oskar for best picture, and Osborne adds his final punctuation to his story by concluding with these words: "he wooed and won Elizabeth Tailor as his wife."

The story is by now familiar. It not only echoes the life of his subject Phileas Fogg but of all of the fictional and real-life entrepreneurs that made Fogg possible such as Doyce/Clennam and Lesseps. And it shows just how far that figure has come--from its humble beginnings in the much-maligned figures of George Hudson and Mr. Merdle to the culturally coveted position of producer/director. In addition, Osborne reveals the entrepreneur to be the engine that motors modern technology. And he brushes away all remaining moralism surrounding that figure, clarifying that it does not matter how one organizes the productive factors. Whether one "cons" or "charms," as does Todd, the entrepreneur is the hero of the modern age.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

If Osborne propagates the myth of the entrepreneur who does it all in spite of the difficulties, the film itself reveals a different, if not more accurate, story. Fogg is wholly dependent upon his valet, Passepartout, to circle the globe, for it is Passepartout's propensity to embroil himself in adventures that speeds up the circumnavigation process, as I have argued in chapter four. It takes two to circle the globe in record time. Imperialism is indeed a joint venture. Throughout "Imperial Ways" I have showed the ways in which various partnerships informed imperialism; amongst them I discussed how the coupling of French theory and British practice informed the making of the entrepreneur. I pointed out the manner in which British market moralism and market greed became paired in the coupling of Tancred and Fakredeen in order to ensure the cleansing of the investor figure. I demonstrated how the Lucy Duff Gordon and Omar pairing used familial relations to obscure unfair labor practices and promote the consumption of cheap products abroad. And finally, I intimated the ways in which Fogg and Passepartout combined English capital and French ingenuity to conquer the globe.

Disney's 2003 remake of *Around the World in 80 Days* adds a new twist to global partnership, one that reflects a more modern world in which an ascending global power joins forces with a descending one. In it Jackie Chan plays a Chinese Passepartout, while Steve Coogan plays Fogg--no longer the English gentleman, but an American-style antiestablishment inventor/entrepreneur. While on the surface this movie is as different from Todd's film as it is from Verne's novel, that difference, I suggest, is superficial. The movie brings the technological innovations that marked the genre of global circumnavigation from the beginning to their logical conclusion.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Not surprisingly, then, the film is nearly impossible to watch, for it packs adventures into every scene, crowding out any attempt at plot development. The plot is simple enough to be summarized in a few lines: Chan must return a jade Buddha to his village in China before a pack of Chinese thugs headed by an evil Chinese warlord stops him. Thus he races around the globe en route to China, using an unsuspecting Fogg, who is just innocently circling the globe, as his cover. As can be surmised by the plot summary, this movie shifts the focus from Fogg to Chan, who was clearly chosen for his fame as an actor in action films. Thus, Chan propels this movie from one adventure to the next allowing nothing, not even plot, to get in the way. Landscapes that had been so stunningly filmed in Todd's movie have no place here, as the world becomes reduced to a smattering of interchangeable adventures in which place loses all distinction. While Todd dallied in the countries that Fogg visited, especially India, to film breathtaking scenes from the window of the train as it rolled through the countryside, taking advantage of his new Todd AO method to capture the broadest of vistas, Disney too makes the most of the technology that it pioneered. In Disney's movie, Landscapes are replaced by animations of landscapes. The animations, in turn, enable Fogg and Chan to speed up the tempo, to zip across India without entering a train—to move from Calcutta to Hong Kong, without crossing the water.

Disney has literally corporatized the landscape, turning every locality into a corporate production of space. Yet, we are not so far from where we started. The round-the-world travel narratives, made possible by the new global routes, reproduced western technology wherever they went, as we have seen. But the difference is that while their writers circled the globe in record time and found room for story, Disney's did not. The

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most recent retelling of Verne's 1872 classic was a box-office flop. This, perhaps, could be explained in the way that various reviewers have suggested: poor marketing, a relatively unknown actor playing Fogg's role, the overuse of slapstick, or Chan's recent lack of appeal. As right as these assessments may be, I have been arguing that the movie's poor reception stems from another place—that the movie itself is exemplary of a genre that has perfected its techniques to the point of playing itself out, a genre that has been overwhelmed by its own technology. But I would like to conclude by speculating that this film registers a failure of another kind entirely—a failure of corporate imagining. Corporate culture cannot imagine what Verne's Londoner's predicted would surely delay Fogg's swift journey around the world—those Indians who would "stop the trains," "plunder the carriages," and "tear up the rails" (19). In other words, corporate America cannot picture those unpredictable events caused by the people and cultures that they are so riotously globalizing.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

WORKS CITED

Adams, D.D. *A Voyage Around the World.* Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1871.

Alborn, Timothy L. *Conceiving Companies: Joint-stock Politics in Victorian England.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Alder, Judith. "Origins of Sightseeing." *Annals of Tourism Research* 16 (1989): 7-29.

Alloula, Malek. *The Colonial Harem.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1983.

Arago, Jacques. *Voyage Autour du Monde.* Paris: Berquet et Pétion, 1842.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Bailey, Brian J. *George Hudson: The Rise and Fall of the Railway King.* Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton Publishers, 1995.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1981.

Ballou, Maturin Murray. *Due West, or, Round the World in Ten Months.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Storyteller." *Illuminations.* New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Berg, Maxine. *The Machinery Question and the Making of Political Economy 1815-1848.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Blakesley, J. W. Rev. "M. de Lesseps and the Suez Canal." *Macmillan's Magazine* March 1860: 407-416.

Blessington, Marguerite. *Hughenden Papers* 22 March 1848, 36.

Bly, Nellie. *Nellie Bly's Book: Around the World in Seventy-Two Days.* New York: The Pictorial Weeklies Company, 1890.

Brainbridge, Lucy Seaman. *Round the World Letters.* Boston: D. Lothrop & Co., 1882.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Disraeli and Orientalism." *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818–1851.* Ed. Charles Richmond and Paul Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 91-105.

---. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Brassie, Annie. *Around the World in the Yacht Sunbeam.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1878.

Brendon, Piers. *Thomas Cook: 150 Years of Popular Tourism.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1991.

Brett, Michael. "Continuity and Change: Egypt and North Africa in the Nineteenth-Century." *Journal of African History* 27 (1986): 149-162.

Burchell, Williams. *Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822.

Burlingame, H.J. *Around the World with a Magician and a Juggler.* Chicago: Clyde Pub., 1891.

Burton., Sir Richard F. *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah.* New York: Dover Publications, 1964.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Buzard, James. *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways of Culture, 1800-1918.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Cain, P.J. and A.G. Hopkins. *British Imperialism, 1688-2000.* New York: Longman, 2002.

Campbell, John. *Travels in South Africa.* London: Francis Westley, 1822.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Captains of Industry." *Past and Present.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. 267-273.

---. "Hudson's Statue." *Latter-Day Pamphlets.* Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1972. 220-248.

Carr, Addis Emmit. *All the Way Round: or What a Boy Saw and Heard on His Way Round the World.* London: Sampson Low, Marson, Searle, & Rivington, 1876.

Chamisso, Adelbert Von. *A Voyage Around the World with the Romanzov Exploring Expedition in the Years 1815-1818 in the Brig Rurik, Captain Otto Von Kotzebue.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.

Childers, Joseph W. *Novel Possibilities: Fiction and the Formation of Early Victorian Culture.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Coffin, C.C. *Our New Way Round the World.* Boston: Fields, 1869.

"A Contrast." *The Times* 23 March 1846: 4e.

Cook, Thomas. *Letters from the Sea and from Foreign Lands, Descriptive of a Tour Round the World.* London: Routledge/Thoemmes, 1998.

Danziger, Christopher. "The First Suez Crisis." *History Today* September 1982: 3-7.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dickens, Charles. *Little Dorrit.* London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Tancred; or The New Crusade.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934.

Disraeli. Dir. Alfred E. Green. With Florence Arliss and George Arliss. Warner Brothers, 1929.

Dixon, Hepworth W. "The False Move on Egypt." *Gentleman's Magazine* January-June 1876: 38-44.

Duff Gordon, Lady. *Letters From Egypt, 1862-1869.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

Ekins, Herbert Roslyn. *Around the World in Eighteen Days and How to Do It.* New York: Green & Co., 1936.

Eldridge, C.C. *Disraeli and the Rise of the New Imperialism.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1996.

Farnie, D.A. *East and West of Suez, The Suez Canal in History.* Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1969.

Fitzgerald, Percy Hetherington. *The Great Canal at Suez: its Political, Engineering, and Financial History. With an Account of the Struggles of its Projector, Ferdinand de Lesseps.* London: Tinsley Bros., 1876.

Francis, G.H. "Outlines in Parliament. The Railway Potentates—Mr. Hudson, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Rusell, Mr. Strutt." *Fraser's Town and Country Magazine* August 1847: 213-227.

Freedgood, Elaine. *Victorian Writing about Risk: Imagining a Safe England in a Dangerous World.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Frith, Francis. *Egypt and Palestine, Photographed and Described.* London: J.S. Virtue, 1858.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Fogg, William Perry. *Round the World: Letters from Japan, China, India and Egypt.* 1872.

Gallagher, John and Ronald Robinson. "The Imperialism of Free Trade." *Economic History Review* 1.1 (1953): 1-15.

Grant, Ulysses S. *General Grant's Tour Around the World: With a Sketch of his Life.* Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1879.

Greimas, A.J. *Semantique Structurale.* Paris: Larousse, 1966.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of a Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Hamley, William. "Egypt and the Story of the Suez Canal." *Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine* 106 December 1896: 730-745.

Harcourt, Freda. "Thomas Waghorn (1800-1850)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [accessed 29 Oct. 2004: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28397]

Harper, Lila Marz. "Gordon, Lucie Duff, Lady Duff Gordon (1821-1869)" *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [accessed 27 Sept. 2004: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8175]

Heidegger, Martin. "The Question Concerning Technology." *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Herbert, Christopher. "Filthy Lucre: Victorian Ideas of Money." *Victorian Studies* 44.2 (2002): 185-212.

Herbert, Mary Elizabeth. *Cradle Lands*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1869.

Hinchliff, T.W. *Over the Sea and Far Away being a Narrative of Wanderings Round the World.* London: Longmans, 1876.

Hobson, J.A. *Imperialism.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1972.

Hoffman, William. *The Monitor; or, Jottings of a New York Merchant During a Trip Round the Globe.* New York: Carleton, 1862.

Holman, James. *A Voyage Round the World, Including Travels in Africa, Asia, Australasia, America.* London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1834.

Horn, Edward. *Around the World; a Narrative of a Tour of the Earth.* Cincinatti: Press of Jennings and Pye, 1904.

Hoselitz, Bert F. "The Early History of Entrepreneurial Theory." *Essays in Economic Thought: Aristotle to Marshall.* Ed. Joseph J. Spengler. New York: Rand McNalley & Co., 1960. 234-254.

"Hudson Takes a Step Forward." *Punch* 1850: 70.

Huebner, Baron de. Trans. by Mary Elizabeth Herbert, *A Ramble Round the World.* London: Macmillan & Co., 1874.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

---. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kennedy, Paul. "Continuity and Discontinuity in British Imperialism 1815-1914." *British Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. Ed. C.C. Eldridge. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

Kinglake, Alexander William. *Eothen, Or, Traces of Travel Brought Home from the East*. London: J.M. Dent, 1844.

Koolman, G. "Say's Conception of the Role of the Entrepreneur." *Economica* 151 (1971): 169-286.

"Lady Duff Gordon's Letters from Egypt." *Edinburgh Review* July 1865. 108-119.

Laird, Egerton K. *The Rambles of a Globe Trotter*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1875.

Lambert, Richard S. *The Railway King, 1800-1871: A Study of George Hudson and the Business Morals of his Time*. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1834.

Landes, David S. *Bankers and Pashas: International Finance and Economic Imperialism in Egypt*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Lane, Edward Williams. *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*. London: Dent, 1954.

Lawrence, T.E. *Seven Pillars of Wisdom; a Triumph*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1938.

Lawrence of Arabia. Dir. David Lean. With Peter O'Toole, Alec Guiness, Anthony Quinn, Omar Sharif. Horizon Pictures, 1962.

Lenin, Vladimir Ilich. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers, 1939.

Lott, Emmeline. *The English Governess in Egypt: Harem Life in Egypt and Constantinople*. London: Bentley, 1867.

Martineau, Harriet. *Eastern Life, Present and Past*. London: E. Moxon, 1848.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Matus, Jill. "The 'Eastern-Woman Question': Martineau and Nightingale Visit the Harem." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 21 (1999): 63-87.

Marx, Leo. ""Technology": The Advent of a Hazardous Concept." *Negotiations of America's National Identity.* Ed. Roland Hagenbüchle and Josef Raab. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2000. 464-470.

McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Melman, Billie. *Women's Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718-1918: Sexuality, Religion, and Work.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Miller, Melissa Lee. "The Imperial Feminine: Victorian Women Travellers in Egypt." *White Women in Racialized Spaces: Imaginative Transformation and Ethical Action in Literature.* Ed. Samina Najmi and Rajini Srikanth. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Milnes, Monckton R. "Mr. D'Israeli's Tancred—The Emancipation of the Jews." *The Edinburgh Review* 86 (1847): 138-155.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Colonising Egypt.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Moir, Edith. *The Discovery of Britain; The English Tourist. 1540-1840.* London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1964.

Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley. *Embassy to Constantinople: The Travels of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.* New York: Amsterdam, 1988.

Moretti, Franco. *Atlas of the European Novel, 1800-1900.* London: Verso, 1998.

---. *The Way of the World: The Bildungsroman in European Culture.* London: Verso, 1987.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Murray, John. *A Handbook for Travellers on the Continent.* London: John Murray and Son, 1836.

---. *A Handbook to India & Ceylon.* London: John Murray, 1892.

---. *A Handbook for Travellers in Egypt: Including Descriptions of the Course of the Nile Through Egypt and Nubia, Alexandria, Cairo, The Pyrmadis and Thebes, The Suez Canal.* London: John Murray 1875.

Newell, Captain George. *Two Brothers Narrative of a Voyage Around the World in the Bark "Sea Breeze."* Norwalk: Whale House Press, 1961.

Nightingale, Florence. *Letters from Egypt, 1849-1850.* New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.

Waller, J.F. "Novels and Novelists of the Day." *Dublin University Magazine* 30 September (1847): 253-267.

Parsons, Timothy. *The British Imperial Century.* Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.

Poovey, Mary. "Writing about Finance in Victorian England: Disclosure and Secrecy in the Culture of Investment." *Victorian Studies* 45.1 (2002): 17-41.

Post, Wiley. *Around the World in Eight Days; the Flight of the Winnie May.* New York: Rand, McNally & Company, 1931.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.

Pudney, John. *Suez: De Lesseps' Canal.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reed, Michael. "George Hudson [the Railway King] (1800-1871)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. [accessed 29 Oct 2004: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14029]

Reeve, H. "The Suez Canal." *Edinburgh Review.* January 1856: 120-136.

Richardson, D.N. *A Girdle Round the Earth: Home Letters from Foreign Lands.* Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Company, 1887.

Richardson, James. *The Mysteries of Hudson's Railway Frauds Exposed*. London: C. Mitchell, 1850.

Richmond, Charles and Paul Smith's, eds. *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818-1851.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Ross, Janet. *The Fourth Generation: Reminiscences*. London: Constable, 1912.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

---. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Schwarz, Daniel R. "Disraeli's Romanticism: Self-Fashioning in the Novels." *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818–1851.* Ed. Charles Richmond and Paul Smith Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 43-65.

Shereen, Faiza. "Lucie Duff Gordon." *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. 166 Detroit: Bruccoli, 1996. 157-164.

Simpson, William. *Meeting the Sun: A Journey All Round the World, through Egypt, China, Japan, and California.* London: Longmans, 1874.

Smiles, Samuel. *Lives of the Engineers*. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1862.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

---. *Self Help*. London: Sphere Books Ltd., 1968.

---. *Round the World: Including a Residence in Victoria and a Journey by Rail across North America/by a Boy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1872.

Stephen, Leslie. "Mr. Disraeli's Novels." *Fortnightly Review* 22 October 1847: 351-353. Reprinted in *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*.

Taylor, W.C. "The Hebrew, The Saracen, and the Christian." *Bentley's Miscellany* 21 April 1847: 385-389.

"Testimonial to George Hudson." *The Times* 6 October 1845: 3e.

The Times 19 November 1845: 3c.

The Times 2 April 1847: 5b.

The Times 15 August 1863: 6b.

Thompson, E.P. *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture*. New York: New Press, 1993.

Troup, George. "The Hudsonian Eclipse." *Tait's Edinburgh* 20 May 1849: 319-324.

Union Pacific Railroad Company. *Around the World by Steam, via Pacific Railway,* 1871.

Verne, Jules. *Around the world in Eighty Days.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

---. *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea.* London: J.M. Dent, 1908.

Wall, Samuel W. *Round the World with Train. A Typhoon. Being the Confessions of a Private Secretary Concerning a Tour of the World in Sixty-Seven Days.* Boston: Round the World Co., 1891.

Walworth, Ellen H. *An Old World, as Seen through Young Eyes; or, Travels Around the World.* New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1877.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ward, Yvette. H. *Around the World in 32 Days*. Hudson: Star-Observer Print, 1958.

Wedgwood, Sir Ralph L. *International Rail Transport.* London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weir, William and W.H. Wills. "Shortcuts across the Globe i." *Household Words* 13 April 1850: 65-68.

---. "Shortcuts across the Globe ii." *Household Words* 11 May 1850: 167-168.

White, Rev. James. "A Testimonial in Praise of Testimonials." *Household Words* 7 February 1857: 121-124.

Wilt, Judith. "The Imperial Mouth: Imperialism, the Gothic and Science Fiction," *Journal of Popular Culture* 14 (1981): 618-628.

Wojcik, Michael. "Emmeline Lott." *Dictionary of Literary Biography* 166. Detroit: Bruccoli, 1996. 235-239.

Xu, Wenying. "The Opium Trade and Little Dorrit: A Case of Reading Silences." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 25:1 (1997): 53-66.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.