甲南英文学

No. 23 秦 2008

甲南英文学会

目　次

Lillo's Innovations in *The London Merchant*

Akiko Oko

1. Popularity of the Play

The London Merchant had created a sensation in the theatrical world of England in the eighteenth century, since it was first performed in the Drury Lane Theatre on the 22nd of July, 1731. *The Weekly Resister* dated the 21st of August wrote:

> The Beginning of the first Act occasioned a Sneer in the Audience, ...but, before the End of it, the Case was quite alter'd,...as the Plot advanc'd, and new Circumstances of Guilt and Distress aggravated the Concern of the Spectators...and I believe there was hardly a Spectator there that did not witness his Approbation by his Tears.[1]

And the next year *The Universal Spectator* dated the 22nd of January wrote:

> The play... affects the Mind with the feeling Sense of the unhappy Story, and shews how a good Disposition may be corrupted; and seems happily calculated to do Good in such a City as London where Thousands of young People are pretty near in the same Condition. [2]

Theophilus Cibber (1703-58), manager of Drury Lane, appreciated this work as "almost a new species of tragedy, wrote on a very uncommon subject."[3] Indeed *The London Merchant*, as he said, brought the two new

things into the then theatrical world. One was, a new genre of tragedy written in prose, not in verses as was traditionally done; and the other was the choice of hero not in aristocratic society but in bourgeois society. These two characteristics swayed the theatre so much that the play subsequently had a great influence on Edward Moor (1712-57) in writing *The Gamester* (1753), Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-81) in writing *Miss Sara Sampson* (1755), and Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906) in writing *A Doll's House* (1879). Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762), a noted play-goer, used to declare, as her servant quoted, "... that whoever did not cry at George Barnwell must deserve to be hanged."[4] But not everyone praised the play; there were also harsh criticisms. Samuel Johnson (1709-84), for example, commented on this work that "...the writing of prose is the plea and excuse of poverty of genius."[5] Undaunted by criticism, its performances continued to have a strong hold on the public mind. Although British theatres were controlled by the Licensing Act of 1737, which literally limited the production of legitimate drama to two patent theatres, it recorded a surprising figure: 180 performances over forty six seasons at Drury Lane, at Covent Garden, and at minor theatres. Enthusiasm of the audience for the first two years was so great, that when Queen Caroline heard the reputation of the play, she longed to see it. But she was unable to do so because she was away from London at that time, so she hastened to get its manuscript sent. The performance was staged also at Fairs such as Bartholomew Fair and Southwark Fair. [6] "On 22 May 1732 yet another production appeared at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and on the 1st of June, with a performance at the New Haymarket, Lillo's tragedy completed its circuit of every theatre in London then offering plays." [7]

By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, this play was slipping away from people's mind, but the performance that David Garrick (1717-1779) presented in the Drury Lane on the 26th of September, 1765, revived its reputation again. Sarah Siddons (1755-1831) acted Millwood in Liverpool in 1776. Thus, this play repeated a cycle of disappearance and revival, and 230 performances were recorded in the whole 18th century. Generally, plays were put on the stage for several days and died, or they came back to life long after

their first performance was over. But in the case of *The London Merchant*, it had a run for twenty nights. This performance record did not merely illustrate the popularity of this play; those who were interested in moral problems provided financial aid for this play. As Cibber described, "The play was ... frequently bespoke by some eminent merchants and citizens who much approved its moral tendency" (McBurney 127). London merchants found that it depicted their lives sympathetically and that it welcomed their new power and standing in society. Those who found that its moral lesson was effective to apprentices and young people supported it strongly. It was recommended as a guidance for apprentices to London merchants, and many apprentices went to see this play because their masters told them to.

As for the text of *The London Merchant*, Lillo did not correct or alter the first edition, with the exception of punctuation marks and inconsistent stage directions. In the fifth edition which was published on 23 January 1734, he for the first time added a scene in which a final confrontation of Barnwell and Millwood below the gallows takes place, and in which Barnwell persuades Millwood in vain to be penitent. [8]

The popularity this play enjoyed and the importance this play had in the theatrical history are so outstanding that I want to look at it from its first conception and its subsequent development. First I pay attention to the ballad George Barnwell on which Lillo based his tragedy, and then deal with the way he dramatised it adding his own innovations.

2. Writing a Dramatic Piece out of a Ballad

As George Lillo himself said in his prologue, *The London Merchant* was dramatised from a ballad entitled "George Barnwell," which gained popularity when it was published in the middle of the seventeenth century. Ballads were one of the common sources to which dramatists resorted for writing new plays. But of course there was a great difference between the ballad and the play based upon it. Lillo has transformed a criminal story into a great literary work

which would at once entertain and instruct a great number of audiences.

In writing a five-act play out of the ballad, Lillo introduces three things that are not existent in the ballad: characterisations, a clear moral concept, and the criminals's attitude when facing death. First, the London merchant, who in the ballad was referred to as the master of Barnwell, is named Thorowgood, engaged in commerce on a large scale in the drama. He possesses gentle manners and high social standing, holding a firm philosophy of a merchant. He plays an exceedingly important role in the drama. Thorowgood teaches his apprentice Trueman "the method of merchandise" (III, iii, 1), which he says "will be well worth [his] pains to study as a science" (III, i, 3-4). It is not only a means to make oneself rich, but also utilizes technology and industry in order to promote wealth and peace among the nations "by mutual benefits diffusing mutual love from pole to pole" (III, i, 8-9). He preaches that the morality of merchants is high and that they should work hard at merchandising with pride and confidence.

On the day following the night when Barnwell stays at Millwood's house without his permission, Thorowgood looks Barnwell in the face, and says "I will not hear a syllable more upon this subject....Whatever is your fault, of this I'm certain; 'twas harder for you to offend than me to pardon" (III, vii, 35-41). Thorowgood suspects from Barnwell's expression that he has committed a heinous crime, but he does not want him to suffer by confessing it. He believes that Barnwell will correct his error by himself, and so he passes a lenient judgment on him and goes off. When Barnwell hears it, he is profoundly moved. He curses himself as "Villain, villain! Basely to wrong so excellent a man!" (II, v, 1) and immediately declares, "I renounce her. I give her up!" (II, v, 5)

Secondly, the characterization of Barnwell is very convincingly done. In the ballad, Barnwell voluntarily suggests killing his uncle for money, his only relative. When he is about to be seized by the police because of accusation on the part of Millwood, he escapes abroad, where he charges Millwood with a crime of murder and sends her to the gallows. He further commits a murder in Poland. As against Barnwell who lacks humanity in the ballad, Barnwell in

the play is an exceedingly good-natured person. He makes efforts to recover his former self, at an early stage of stumbling. Nevertheless, he is tempted into the path of evil, and consequently is tormented by a guilty conscience. He is described as a person who is ridden with guilt.

Thirdly, Barnwell's total penitence and Millwood's self-defense are put in marked contrast. In contrast to Barnwell who remains an honest man, Millwood does not change much. She seduces Barnwell into bed, cajoles him into stealing money from his master, drives him to kill his uncle, and when money is used up, indicts Barnwell. But soon she is arrested, and hanged. Lillo portrays an attractive and cunning woman who can devise a series of tricks to exploit an innocent young man.

In the play, Lucy and Blunt take sides with Millwood at first, but when they know that Millwood is going to make him kill his uncle, they feel the pricks of conscience and change their mind. As for Millwood, she is described as a villainess who exploits Barnwell for money.

Therefore, in developing a plot for his play out of the ballad, Lillo emphasizes the contrast between Barnwell and Millwood, the former attaining salvation by repentance and the latter condemned for refusing to repent. Maria tries to hide Barnwell's embezzlement from her father, and troubles herself to save Barnwell, thus leaving him in the dilemma of fate and love, and heightening the sentimentality of the tragedy. Lillo emphasizes the anguish of Barnwell who has strayed from the path of Christian morality and repents what he has done. It enhances the importance of the lesson of the play, and its instructive purpose for the audience.

3. Lillo's Innovations

Lillo's innovations are traced by comparing his tragedy with those in Restoration drama.

(1) Transition of the idea of hero in tragedy

There was a tacit understanding that heroes and heroines in tragedies of

the Restoration Drama are those of high social standing such as lords, the characters of myths and legends, and military officers. For example, Cato, who is the hero of *Cato* (1713) by Joseph Addison (1672-1719) is a general of Rome; Calista, who is the heroine of *The Fair Penitent* (1703) by Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718) is a daughter of nobility. In both *Venice Preserved* (1682) by Thomas Otway (1652-85) and *The Fatal Marriage* (1694) by Thomas Southerne (1660-1746), the hero or heroine is either an officer, or an aristocrat. It is rare that commoners play a leading part in tragedy, although they frequently go in and out in comedy. Peachum, the hero of *The Beggar's Opera* (1728) by John Gay (1685-1732), is a dealer in stolen goods; and in such comedies as *The Country Wife* (1675) by William Wycherley (1640?-1716), *Confederacy* (1705) by John Vanbrugh (1664-1726), and *Every Man is His Humour* (1598) by Ben Jonson (1572-1637), the heroes are ordinary people in their everyday life.

In a time when the idea of the hero was fixed within the ruling classes, it was bold and unprecedented to make an apprentice to a merchant play the principal part of a tragedy. Lillo's experiment was quite novel. However, partly as a result of the Puritan Revolution (1642-49) and the Glorious Revolution (1688), the centre of power in British society gradually moved away from the aristocracy and the bourgeois class including merchants who had gained economic strength started to seize real power in society. In this movement, it was inevitable that the bourgeois became the hero of a new age.

Lillo expressed at the beginning of his dedication of his tragedy to John Eyles, who was baronet and Member of Parliament:

> If Tragic Poetry be, as Mr. *Dryden* has some where said, the most excellent and most useful Kind of Writing, the more extensively useful the Moral of any Tragedy is, the more excellent that Piece must be of its Kind. (Steffensen 151)

Subsequently, Lillo aimed at "the exciting of the Passions in order to the correcting such of them as are criminal, either in their Nature, or through their Excess" (*ibid.*) and he clearly stated that he would "enlarge the Province of the graver Kind of Poetry" (*ibid.* 152). Here Lillo announced his didactic

aims and declared that he would revise the existing tragic theory to make his drama accomplish its moral and instrumental goals.

> ...Tragedy is so far from losing its Dignity, by being accommodated to the Circumstances of the Generality of Mankind, that it is more truly august in Proportion to the Extent of its Influence, and the Numbers that are properly affected by it. (*ibid.* 151)

Thus, he emphasized that "Plays founded on moral Tales in private Life, may be of admirable Use" (*ibid.* 152), and said: "...nothing can be more reasonable than to proportion the Remedy to the Disease" (*ibid.* 152). Here the "disease" meant the problem with traditional tragedy which needed to be rendered more democratic; and the "remedy" meant a shift of characters from the royal or aristocratic to the bourgeois, and a shift of situations from public and political to private and domestic. In classical tragedies, the hero was necessarily of the royalty or the nobility, and the disaster that happened to him was related with the fate of his country or of his social position. A sympathetic identification with the tragic hero, upon which the morally reformative purpose of tragedy depended, could be achieved when the dramatist succeeded in "the exciting of the Passions in order to the correcting such of them as are criminal, either in their Nature or through their Excess." Only on the basis of their sympathetic identification with the hero could the audience share the hero's moral enlightenment.

In writing a tragedy based on the ballad, Lillo paid attention to its having a close relation to the daily life of the audience, and necessarily transformed the idea of tragedy, conferring esthetic legitimacy on popular culture. What distinguished *The London Merchant* from traditional tragedies was that it appealed to the audience's sense of morality and to the identity of the bourgeois class they belonged to. Although ordinary people occasionally appeared in former drama, including such plays as *A Women Killed with Kindness* (1607) by Thomas Heywood (1574?-1641) and the anonymous *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *Arden of Feversham*, but these could not be called "bourgeois" dramas, because they dealt with the rural poor. Lillo opened a new

page in tragedy in terms of bringing it down to the level of everyday life of people, and he was the first dramatist who analysed the moral outlook and social awareness of the bourgeois merchant.

(2) Merchant as hero

The London Merchant is different from other domestic tragedies in that a merchant occupies quite an important place in the play, as we understand from the double-title "The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell." Here the London merchant and his apprentice are juxtaposed. At the very beginning of this play, Thorowgood talks of beliefs and capabilities of the merchants, who, in a time of national crisis, contribute to bringing peace in the whole country as well as in the world.

> The Bank of Genoa had agreed, at excessive interest and on good security, to advance the King of Spain a sum of money sufficient to equip his vast Armado. Of which, our peerless Elizabeth (more than in name the mother of her people) being well informed, sent Walsingham, her wise and faithful secretary, to consult the merchants of this loyal city, who all agreed to direct their several agents to influence, if possible, the Genoese to break their contract with the Spanish Court. 'Tis done. The state and bank of Genoa, having maturely weighed and rightly judged of their true interest, prefer the friendship of the merchants of London to that of a monarch who proudly styles himself King of both Indies. (I, i, 31-43)

From his words, it is clear that the play is set at the time when the invincible Spanish Armada is going to attack England. He tells how merchants soften the antagonism between England and Spain and contribute to the security of the nation. He feels proud of his profession and says, "As the name of merchant never degrades the gentleman, so by no means does it exclude him" (I, i, 26-27). Thorowgood is a trader of great wealth, with penetrating insight and admirable personality. His premises are visited frequently by courtiers and noblemen and he treats them respectfully. He wants his daughter Maria happily married to one of them, and says to Maria that if she is not at home when they visit, they will be disappointed and regret

having visited Thorowgood the merchant. But Maria answers:

> He that shall think his time or honor lost in visiting you can set no real value on your daughter's company, whose only merit is that she is yours. The man of quality, who chooses to converse with a gentleman and merchant of your worth and character, may confer honor by so doing, but he loses none. (I, ii, 20-25)

Maria represents her father as "a gentleman and merchant of [his] worth and character". As the word "gentleman" indicates a nobleman, it signifies that Thorowgood as merchant is as good as a nobleman—at least in mentality, if not in actuality. From the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century, England has attained remarkable economic growth, to which merchants' contribution is so great that they have raised their social position to be in one with respectability. Therefore a merchant can be equal or sometimes superior to a general, like the hero of Addison's play or Thomson's. Trueman rightly says that "few men recover reputation lost; a merchant, never" (III, iii, 37-38). This shows the great difference between the merchants and the generals. Generals may lose a war, but if they win the next war bigger than the first, they can recover their reputation. But if merchants lose trust among people, they will never recover it. Accordingly, when merchants give a judgment, it is always expected to be sound and prudent. He goes as far as to suggest that merchants may surpass generals, because generals rule the world by force but merchants achieve the same aim without spilling blood. They achieve it by mutual understanding and by peaceful solution. To sum up, Lillo considers that merchants stand as worthy of the role of hero in tragedy as generals, and that they may be superior to them in promoting "arts, industry, peace and plenty" and in diffusing love from pole to pole.

(3) Repentance and New Life

Barnwell is sentenced to death by hanging in the same way as Millwood. He remains calm even when he hears the pronouncement of the death penalty. He devotes himself to reading the Bible, sitting peacefully in the condemned cell, when Thorowgood enters. Barnwell is confident that he will soon go to the

Kingdom of God. Thorowgood points his finger at Barnwell, and speaks to the audience: "See there the bitter fruits of passion's detested reign and sensual appetites indulged—severe reflections, penitence, and tears" (V, ii, 1-3). This scene clearly warns the audience of the danger of giving free rein to one's desire through the example of Barnwell. Meanwhile Barnwell is ready to accept the punishment which he has brought upon himself. As Barnwell and Thorowgood part, Thorowgood persuades him to "bear a little longer the pains that attend this transitory life, and cease from pain forever" (V, ii, 62-63). The following are the words he speaks, when he is left alone:

> I find a power within that bears my soul above the fears of death and, spite of conscious shame and guilt, gives me a taste of pleasure more than mortal. (V, iii, 1-3)

For Barnwell, death is no longer to be afraid of. He overcomes the terror of death and even finds pleasure in it. By repentance, he feels himself purified and his sense of guilt and shame overcome. This pleasure of regeneration is far loftier than the carnal desire for Millwood. Barnwell's discovery of pleasure beyond this world belongs to the life after death in Christianity, and Lillo emphasizes how purified the hero's soul is before death. It would be absolutely impossible for Millwood to understand this ascetic pleasure. Barnwell proceeds to the scaffold, offering the following lesson to the audience.

> If any youth, like you, in future times
> Shall mourn my fate, though he abhors my crimes;
> Or tender maid, like you, my tale shall hear,
> And to my sorrows give a pitying tear:
> To each such melting eye and throbbing heart,
> Would gracious Heaven this benefit impart
> Never to know my guilt, nor feel my pain.
> Then must you own you ought not to complain;
> Since you nor weep, nor shall I die in vain. (V, x, 23-31)

Barnwell firmly believes that his office in this world is to save people from

their future destruction by his example.

(4) Millwood's logic

In the first half of the eighteenth century, it was customary to present women as those easily tempted and ruined by men, if they can not protect their chastity. In *Pamela* (1740-1) by Samuel Richardson (1689-1761), the heroine, Pamela, is a girl of 16 years old, beautiful and innocent. She is a daughter of a farming family, poor but pious. She goes into service as a maid to a fine house of Mr. B who is a landlord. But the young master is a notorious profligate, and tries in various ways to violate her, but she firmly protects her innocence to the end, and finally, she becomes the young master's legal wife on account of her constancy, beauty and affection.

Millwood, on the other hand, is a prostitute, who from the beginning approaches Barnwell with the intention of deceiving him. She succeeds in seducing him, and then drives him to ruin. Millwood is an intricate, novel character in those days. She is malicious, it is true, but she definitely has her principles to which she remains loyal throughout. Barnwell kills his uncle in the country and, stunned by the atrocity of crime, forgets to steal money. When the blood-spattered Barnwell comes back to Millwood without money, she is enraged at him and blames him as a murderer and hypocrite. She heaps curses on him:

> Whining, preposterous, canting villain! To murder your uncle, rob him of life—nature's first, last dear prerogative, after which there's no injury—then fear to take what he no longer wanted, and bring to me your penury and guilt! Do you think I'll hazard my reputation—nay, my life—to entertain you? (IV, x, 39-44)

Postulating the hideousness of his guilt, she says it is not enough to give him up to the police. She persuades him that there is no point in regretting at this late time what he has done. When her accusation is over, she charges him for a greater crime—the crime of threatening her property, reputation and life. Barnwell is convinced that Millwood is a heartless and cruel woman who takes no heed of his life.

In *The London Merchant*, the confrontation of Thorowgood and Millwood highlights its dramatic interest. When all her wicked deeds are exposed, Millwood does not give herself up to justice, but attributes all her doings to the evil tradition of the male sex, and the male-centred society. They have driven her to behave as they do. Even "the judge who condemns the poor man for being a thief had been a thief himself, had he been poor" (IV, xviii, 64-66). Millwood asserts that good and evil is like two sides of the same coin: whether to incline to good or bad, depends on the situation one is in. She remarks that whatever classes and occupations they are in, men's wickedness is bottomless, and women are pitilessly sacrificed by them. She bitterly curses them from her experiences: "I hate you all! I know you, and expect no mercy, I ask for none" (IV, xviii, 40-41). Millwood rejects mercy of men as she believes that there is no moral distinction between her inclinations and those of men. Why should she be punished for pursuing her desires, whereas they are rewarded for following their own. Men, guided by their desires, invade and conquer foreign countries or, indeed, other people, and ruin them and win their reward. Where is the distinction between right and wrong, she questions. She challenges what men believe is right, by attacking their "pretended piety" and their barbarous cruelty.

> I am not fool enough to be an atheist, though I have known enough of men's hypocrisy to make a thousand simple women so. Whatever religion is in itself, as practiced by mankind it has caused the evils you say it was designed to cure. War, plague, and famine have not destroyed so many of the human race as this pretended piety has done, and with such barbarous cruelty as if the only way to honor Heaven were to turn the present world into Hell. (IV, xviii, 49-56)

She does not embrace religion as it does not redeem people from sorrow and destruction. Rather she denounces it as it brings down evil upon people in reality. Piety and morality are loudly talked about, and never practiced in deed.

Thorowgood regrets the irreligious feeling in her philosophy of life, but admits that "Truth is truth, though from an enemy and spoke in malice" (IV,

xviii, 57). He is far from confuting her argument; he even gives her toleration and makes some concessions to her. Though high-principled, he cannot control her in this dispute, and even seems a little disturbed.

Millwood, on the other hand, is capable of turning charges back against her accuser. She refuses to accept the Christian morality which Thorowgood and Barnwell firmly sustain. Yet she carefully distinguishes her materialism from outright irreligion. Here David Mazella draws our attention to the dialogue between Thorowgood and Millwood, as in it the argument over religious problems of those days is aptly reflected.

> Lillo's discourse of moral inclusion, which is displayed in this little dialogue between Millwood and Thorowgood on the dangers of "pretended Piety" to true religion, consciously detaches itself from the fixities of existing religious and political systems and recognizes historically conflicting positions into a larger, more abstract and comprehensive moral system. (Mazella 813)

According to Mazella, there is in the eighteenth century, a conflict between Catholics and Protestants, throughout Europe. By making Thorowgood and Millwood argue about religious problems from an unrestricted standpoint, Lillo tries to define a third position neither Catholic nor Protestant. Millwood argues that law and religion must be separated, and that state authority must be diverted from "pretended piety." Only in that case an autonomous ethics is established—one whose frame of reference is either the social order or the conscience. Millwood attacks law, saying that those on the side of punishing people themselves have faults:

> What are your laws, of which you make your boast, but the fool's wisdom and the coward's valor, the instrument and screen of all your villainies by which you punish in others what you act yourselves or would have acted, had you been in their circumstances? The judge who condemns the poor man for being a thief had been a thief himself, had he been poor. Thus, you go on deceiving and being deceived, harassing, plaguing, and destroying one another, but women are your universal prey. (IV, xviii, 60-68)

Millwood analyses law from the point of view of the exploited, who are punished severely for their infractions and gain no protection. "Women" are "universal prey" for men, and they are habitually exploited. "A thousand ways our ruin you pursue, / Yet blame in us those arts first taught by you" (IV, xviii, 71-72). Millwood deplores that women are not given a fair deal, and blames society for its unfairness to women. Meanwhile, Thorowgood cannot sufficiently refute her argument. Lillo presents Thorowgood as one who cultivates Protestant virtues as well as those of merchants who contribute to the safety of their country by means of their mercantile gains. Consequently Thorowgood suffers from moral ambiguity. He cannot fully deny what "a female Machiavelle," as McBurney terms, represents.[10]

> Oh, may, from hence, each violated maid,
> By flatt'ring, faithless, barb'rous man betray'd,
> When robb'd of innocence and virgin fame,
> From your destruction raise a nobler name:
> To right their sex's wrongs devote their mind,
> And future Millwoods prove, to plague mankind! (IV, xviii, 73-78)

Millwood maintains that the administration of justice is wrong and that therefore women do not obey it but behave as they like. Millwood's last threat that "future Millwoods" will appear and revenge their kind on men imprints itself upon the audience's mind and makes them examine their sin and resolve to avoid future offences. Millwood's thorough refusal of mercy and repentance—rendering her destruction unavoidable—carries with it a significant dramatic irony. Millwood's argument plays a substantial role in arousing in the audience's mind a sense of "what sin is". Hence, Millwood is depicted as a woman who wishes to exercise "autonomy" and to make self-assertion a means of gaining power over men. She denies God, but at the same time, God also denies her. Lillo offers Barnwell as a model of "the saved" and Millwood as a model of "the damned," to the audience in order to gauge the social morality and reassert its soundness. But one cannot help thinking that like Milton, he has an unconscious sympathy towards his "devil."

4. Autonomy versus Traditional Values

Because of its clear moral purpose, *The London Merchant* may not create a sensation today. But the audience of the eighteenth century ardently sought out performances.

> By the middle of the century it had become the traditional offering for Christmas and Easter holidays, since it was "judged a proper entertainment for the apprentices, & c." as being a more instructive, moral, and cautionary drama, than many pieces that had usually been exhibited on those days with little but farce and ribaldry to recommend them." It was also usually given on Lord Mayor's Day in November, presumably for the same season. Ernest Bernbaum may be correct in speculating that "the frequent performance of George Barnwell was encouraged by influential citizens, not because they themselves enjoyed it, but because they thought young people should." [11]

The play gained popular favour well into the nineteenth century, and many merchants financed the performance of this play and put their apprentices under an obligation to see it. In *Great Expectations* (1861) by Charles Dickens (1812-70), when Pip is going to be an apprentice to Joe, Mr. Wopsle reads *The London Merchant* to him and says, "Take warning, boy, take warning!"[12] Dickens's references to *The London Merchant* suggest a lively familiarity with the play among his readers and a devotion to it among actors who roamed the countryside, while the tragedy has long been considered as a guide for apprentices.

For the audience of the eighteenth century, the story of a gullible apprentice and a scheming prostitute may have seemed more likely to be the material of comedy than of tragedy. But there is in *The London Merchant* a concern to impress the audience that what has too often been the staple of comedy is indeed no laughing matter, that the viciousness the audience who are used to laughing at is more properly the subject of tragedy. Of course *The*

London Merchant is not the single innovator of domestic tragedy. Lillo, at any rate, has conceived this tragedy more as an extension of than a departure from the previous practice of tragedy, by placing the apprentice as a hero in his tragedy. Indeed it possesses many qualities of heroic plays such as Addison's *Cato* and Thomson's *Sophonisba.*[13] What makes *The London Merchant* different from other domestic tragedies in the first half of the eighteenth century is that Lillo uses this play to teach a moral lesson. He presents in this play the solid merchant morality, which is amply illustrated in Thorowgood's virtuous character, and by so doing, enhances the position of the merchant.

In *The London Merchant,* Lillo manipulates various characters to speak their views on society thereby to relativise values and make them share a more elastic view of society. Barnwell and Millwood are offered as models of "the saved" and "the damned," with the former embodying the traditional piety of Christianity, and the latter anthropocentric autonomy, discarding "pretended piety" away. The idea to consider Millwood as an autonomous character has its origins in the twentieth century. For the audience of the eighteenth century, Millwood is simply a prostitute who has a glib tongue. In fact, Lillo renders his hero even more acceptable and his villain yet more detestable to the orthodox audience. Millwood is innovative in those days for her self-justification. But this story is the story of the London merchant. As is clear in the verbal exchange of Thorowgood and Millwood, the desire on the part of Lillo to create a new category of religious belief, is connected with a more autonomous definition of human beings. Therefore, Lillo's model of the autonomous being seems to be the obedient Barnwell, not the infinitely more challenging figure of Millwood. That is, in making Christian morality stand out clearly, Lillo has placed Millwood and Thorowgood at both extremes in the Protestant ethic, and Barnwell in between, so that the audience will sympathise with Barnwell who, in a state of indecision, has to consider what morality is.

Lillo has confronted the problems of fatality and private responsibility in writing Barnwell's destruction and salvation. But to the audience, as probably

to the playwright himself, the logic of tragedy or of argument is less important than the moral example and the evocation of awaking sympathy in them.

Notes

1 "Some Remarks on the Play of George Barnwell," *The Weekly Resister*, 21 August 1731. As quoted in John Loftice, *Essays on the Theatre from Eighteen Century Periodicals* (New York, 1969), pp.33-4.

2 *The Universal Spectator*, 22 January 1732, reprinted in Lincoln B. Faller, *The Popularity of Addison's Cato and Lillo's The London Merchant, 1700-1776*, (New York, 1988), pp.98-99; and in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1732).

3 Theophilius Cibber, *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. v (London, 1753), p.339.

4 Lord Wharncliffe, *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, vol. I (New York, 1970), p.111.

5 Johnson's remark is quoted from David Erskine Baker, *Biographia Dramatica*, vol. II (London, 1812), pp. 377-8.

6 Sybil Rosenfeld, *The Theatre of The London Fairs in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1960), p. 36, 91.

7 Quoted from "introduction" to *The London Merchant* in James L. Steffensen ed., *The Dramatic Works of George Lillo* (Oxford, 1993), p.124.

8 Steffensen, *loc. cit.*, p.138. The present thesis is written based on the text of the first edition.

9 See the "introduction" to *The London Merchant*, ed. William H. McBurney, xv-xvi.

10 McBurney, p. xxiv.

11 McBurney, pp. xii-xiii.

12 Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations*, ed. Tim Seward (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 117-118.

13 Faller, p.106.

Text

Lillo, George. *The London Merchant*. Ed. McBurney, William H. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Lillo, George. *The London Merchant* in *The Dramatic Works of George Lillo.* Ed. Steffensen, James L. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Works Cited

Carson, Herbert L. "The play that would not die: Lillo's *The London Merchant*". Quarterly Journal of Speech 49 (1963): 287-294.

Faller, Lincoln B. *The popularity of Addison's Cato and Lillo's The London Merchant, 1700-1776.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.

Loftis, John. et al. *The Revels History of Drama in English.* Vol. V: 1660-1750. London: Routledge, 1996.

Mazella, David. ""Justly to fall unpitied and abhorr'd": sensibility, punishment, and morality in Lillo's *The London Merchant.*" *ELH* 68 (2001): 795-830.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *A History of English Drama 1660-1990.* vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Scouten, Arthur H. *The London Stage1660-1880.* vol. 3. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961.

Stone, Winchester, George Jr. *The London Stage 1660-1880.* vol. 4. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962.

Wallace, David. "Bourgeois Tragedy or Sentimental Melodrama? The Significance of George Lillo's *The London Merchant.*" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 25 (1991/1992): 123-43.

A Study of Dandyism in Ron Hutchinson's *Beau Brummell*

Akari Furuse

Synopsis

In Ron Hutchinson's play *Beau Brummell* (2001), we find that the bitter ending of the legendary dandy's life was all due to his narcissism and his witty tongue. With the four famous words, "Who's your fat friend?" Brummell instantly fell from his sublimest point of glory surrounded by the people of blood and wealth in Regency England and had to flee from his debt creditors to Calais in France. We are led to presume that the cause of his sad fate that brought him to poverty and insanity was in his narcissistic trait. Certain self-love and self-containment might surely be traced in the Regency dandy as well as the *fin-de-siècle* dandy as Oscar Wilde. However, in contrast to the ephemeral aspect of fashion, the dandy spirit was permanently established. Beau Brummell, in his fashion and mannerism, successfully embodied what it takes to become the leader of a society.

Introduction

Throughout the history of men's fashion, the focus of significant attention has been on this one man: George Bryan Brummell (1778-1840). Better known as Beau Brummell, he was the autocrat of fashion in the

Regency period (1811-1820) who changed the way men dress to this day and is celebrated as the original dandy. With so many legends attributed to this famous man, Brummell's fashion and manners display what defines dandyism.

In the two-act play *Beau Brummell* (2001) by Ron Hutchinson, although he is suffering greatly from poverty and insanity, Brummell is still covered in glory as the great dandy in his heyday when he was in London, and the irony lies in the fact that, now that he lives in exile in an asylum in France, he is approached by none. Some settings and the historical time line may vary from the factual details, but many anecdotes relating to Brummell are recounted on stage exactly as the famous legendary figure himself lived, enabling us to appreciate the glamour and transience of the Regency life almost two hundred years later.

The aim of this paper is to determine that Beau Brummell was not a mere celebrity in the modern sense with a strong trait for narcissism and yet he continues to appeal to us with a wonder of dandyism because he controlled and established the art of distancing as an effective method to acquire social power and make himself the leader of a society.

Ron Hutchinson's Portrayal of Brummell: A Modern Interpretation of the Dandy

Hutchinson's play depicts the pathos of Beau Brummell's life at its end. Set in the winter of 1819 when Brummell is in exile in Calais, long after his fall from the elegant fashionable society in Regency England, only two men are on stage. One is Beau Brummell and the other is his valet, Austin, a fictional character. To set the record straight, it is in 1816 that he secretly flees from his country to the continent. On arriving in France, Brummell first stays in a hotel in Caen and it is not until 1839, a year before his death in 1840, that he goes into an asylum in Calais. In spite of such alterations in the historical background, the play has altogether and comprehensively captured the essence of Brummell's life as a legendary figure and, what is more, as an

individual.

With his growing state of insanity, the play starts with Brummell holding a knife at his throat and trying to commit suicide while he is taking his bath, a part of his famous routine of *toilette*. Being familiar with this impulsive and self-destructive act, for it has continued since his arrival at the asylum, the valet distracts Brummell and takes the knife away by announcing an imaginary visit of Brummell's friend from the past, the Duke of Norfolk. Not only the Duke of Norfolk but the Duke of Devonshire and all other visitors are personified by Austin on stage. Many years after he left his home country, the celebrated fashion leader of the Regency high life is long forgotten and friendless; the visits are all in the dandy's mind and not real.

Here and there, during the play, the anecdotes surrounding Brummell are retold in the conversation between Brummell and Austin. First, there is one when Brummell, as the captain of the tenth Light Dragoons, refuses to go to Manchester for he "couldn't possibly be seen somewhere so unfashionable" (Hutchinson 9). Other stories, in which he tosses out his pile of stocks that he failed to tie right and how he has different glovemakers for his fingers and thumb, are all renowned legendary tales relating to Brummell that are told once again on stage. Every account presents his strict preciseness in fashion, as Brummell speaks in authority that "Style is in the details" (12). In another legend, the great master of fashion is also known to have had aristocrats, royal personages, and even Prince Regent watch him dress; only, considering the present state of poverty in a confined institution, such fame is worthless. In the play, in order to improve the financial situation, Austin cleverly suggests that they take admission from people in Calais to watch Brummell dress:

> AUSTIN. I had to do something.
>
> BRUMMELL. To make a show of me, a display.
>
> AUSTIN. You did the same in England.
>
> BRUMMELL. Now and again men of distinction, of taste, of refinement—the nobility, often, occasionally royalty too, yes, would express a wish to observe me as I dressed. A very different thing

from turning me into a carnival attraction.

AUSTIN. It would be done very tastefully. I was going to hire a harpsichord. (20-21)

Though it is comically presented, this episode proves that it was Brummell's excellent taste in fashion that gave him the admittance into the high fashionable world, reaffirming that, as Lewis Melville in *First Gentleman of Europe* observes, the greatest dandy of his day "dominated all his rivals, and even the Prince of Wales accepted him as an equal" (134).

Furthermore, Brummell is most celebrated for moderating men's fashion by using clean linen with starch for the stock and adding straps under the heel of pantaloons. For these changes, he takes his own credit in the innovation: "I tamed them, sir. I took the Dandies in hand, as I took the Englishman in hand" (36). The significance of the change is in offering a strong contrast to the flashy and colorful macaroni fashion that was in vogue at the time:

> A man wearing simple clothes, clean linen, nothing too tight or too fashionable, nothing which draws attention to itself or the wearer—the wearer himself, carrying himself with dignity, quiet, reserve—these things make him an enemy to excess—and excess is the antithesis of Style. (37)

What Brummell set as the rules in fashion is also directed towards the principles of what the ideal Englishman should follow: "The coat. The trousers. The shirt. Honest, simple, understated. All the things I tried to get the Englishman to be" (39). Criticizing the overindulgence and extravagance of the macaroni fashion, Brummell believes the exactness and preciseness should be apparent in the wearer's clothes as a result of his discipline and self-control.

Brummell's philosophy against excess, however, stands out because, in reality, the glamour and elegance of the Regency social life owes a great deal to the Prince of Pleasure—Prince Regent. Brummell also enjoys the great benefit of his connection with the Prince and his extravagant lifestyle: "I had

access, influence, grease" (44). It is thanks to the Prince's patronage that Brummell is given such a favorable position in ballrooms, clubs and even the court. Being on good terms with the Prince has brought Beau Brummell more wealthy friends among the aristocrats; however, his indulgent ways of life would not last.

For some time, before his flight to Calais, Brummell senses that the relationship with the Prince is not as close as before, as his biography by Kathleen Campbell recounts. Lord Alvanley once invites Prince Regent to the ball at Watier's club, in the hope that the Prince and Brummell would reconcile. Arriving at the entrance of the Argyll Rooms, Prince Regent greets Lord Alvanley with a gracious bow. Now, on seeing Brummell, the Prince stares and passes on, meaning the Prince has "cut" him in public. There is a tense silence in the room. Then, Brummell says charmingly, clearly and nonchalantly to Lord Alvanley, "Who's your fat friend?" Campbell concludes that "Brummell had his full revenge in those four words" (117). In fact, the whole play by Hutchinson arises from and centers on this anecdote, representing the turning point of Brummell's life as the greatest dandy.

To unravel the mystery of how Brummell falls out with Prince Regent, two flashback scenes of this episode are offered in the play. Contrastingly, Hutchinson's depictions of the incident slightly differ from Campbell's because Brummell is portrayed not simply as a dandy symbol but more as an individual with human attributes. In the first recollection, Brummell loses his temper and self-control in uttering the four words:

> BRUMMELL. My stomach rebels. My head spins. I'm being cut—cut by this grotesque fool, this Royal laughing stock.
>
> AUSTIN. You promised—
>
> BRUMMELL. I'd given him my friendship, tried to teach him everything I know of Style and Wit—
>
> AUSTIN. It doesn't do you any good—
>
> BRUMMELL. Heads are turned towards us. Whispering. Laughter. Everyone knows. The Prince is cutting Brummell. I clear my throat. I say 'Who's your fat friend, Alvanley?' and it's over, all of it, over. (15)

Considering the misery and madness of his current state in exile, Brummell's own feeling and recollection of the incident seem to have changed; still, it is clear that this instance of the casual pose in paying revenge to the Prince has effectively made "cutting" one of the distinguished aspects of dandyism.

In the second scene, Brummell can be sympathized more in that he acknowledges a feeling of regret and predicts the fall from his position:

> The Argyle Rooms...
> The Prince is expressly not invited...
> Music. Art. Poetry...
> 'Who's your fat friend, Alvanley?'
>
> Silence. An intake of breath. Someone drops a tray of glasses. The Prince staggers. There's a curious metallic taste in my mouth. I know that nothing will ever be the same. Someone walks face first into a pillar in astonishment. It is, I think, the sublimest moment of my life. It is also, of course, the worst. (41-42)

At once, as a result of his witty tongue, Brummell loses everything—his fame and whatever comes along with it. Amusingly, the valet presses Brummell to impart the secret of being witty. Wit and style are one and the same for Brummell. His wit is "more an attitude" (42) and the advice he gives to his valet is that "you would have to apprentice yourself to Wit, as you would to Style" (43). Not only his exquisite style in fashion but also his spirit, mainly represented in his sharp wit, has prepared the path for Brummell to enter, and to be thrown out of, the high society of aristocrats and royalties in Regency England. The curtain closes for Act One as Brummell anxiously awaits Prince Regent's arrival in Calais and entertains high hopes of being forgiven and going back to England, together with Prince Regent as good friends.

In Act Two, we find Brummell preparing nervously and shakingly to receive the Prince in his chamber in the asylum and carefully dressing himself with his only set of filthy attire. Great tension arises in Brummell as the Royal carriage comes near, but, to his dismay, the sound of the carriage does not stop and Prince Regent is not coming up the stairs to see his old friend.

And, this is what actually happened in history. On his state visit in 1821, Ellen Moers writes, people heard the Prince say, "I leave Calais, and have not seen Brummell" (30). Brummell as the ruler of fashion rivals the Prince, but, as a non-aristocrat, he is obviously no match: "The King had won. He had seen his old friend, his old foe—which you will—his old comrade, beaten, bankrupt, humbled, and he had passed him by" (Melville 151). The difference between Brummell and Prince Regent is clear when we contrast them in the effect of "cutting". Having a witty tongue is no more than a conspicuous pose for the dandy, making a non-aristocrat like Brummell seem superior to others with his exclusive pretensions; however, for the Prince, the conduct of refusing to recognize others comes naturally and is nothing worth paying regards to. In the end, Brummell will not and cannot leave the asylum and is left to his confined chamber with his imaginary visits from Prince Regent.

As Hutchinson's Beau Brummell represents, the 21st-century conception of dandy connotes ambivalence. On the one hand, as a narcissist, the dandy is self-contained, absorbed in his own reflection, and vain about his taste of fashion, while, as a celebrity, Brummell is an attraction, constantly admired in public on all occasions. Both characteristics have been adopted as parts of the philosophy of dandyism, leaving the inconclusive aspects as a mystifying search to the present.

Brummell as Narcissist: Life with a Mirror

Throughout the play, Hutchinson continuously makes Beau Brummell look at his own reflection in the mirror. As a man of fashion, it is more than understandable and should be taken as a matter of fact that, when Beau Brummell asks for a mirror along with tweezers, he should check his dress and appearance with minutest attention; yet, the use of the mirror implies more than just Brummell's obsession towards fashion.

To begin with, in the scene where he is cut by Prince Regent, Brummell is not placing himself in front of the Prince. He merely observes the Prince entering the ballroom "in the reflection of a mirror" and Brummell is certain

that Prince Regent is aware of him because "the glass tells me that much" (14). And, after Brummell only senses that he has been cut, he gives his witty remark in the four words. When the flashback ends, he despairingly asks for a mirror to raise his spirits because, taking a good look in the cheval glass at his profile from right and left, he "likes what he sees" (17). Brummell does not actually face what is going on. He uses the mirror to see it and avoids approaching others directly.

Moreover, the use of mirrors in many other parts of the play certainly shows the trace of Brummell's narcissistic trait. When Austin points out how unnatural it is for a man "to devote every waking hour of his life to how he looks in a mirror," Brummell replies, "How can one be lonely with a looking glass?" (38). Again, in another scene with the cheval glass in front of Brummell, Austin sarcastically comments:

> AUSTIN. There really is nothing going on in that head of yours when you look in a mirror, is there? Except how you look.
>
> BRUMMELL. What harm was ever done by a man in his chambers, tying his stock? What time could be more innocently spent? (56)

Whenever his anxiety grows, Brummell repeatedly asks for or runs towards the mirror since the reflection of himself in the glass is his only resort. Upon preparing to receive Prince Regent, Brummell carefully ties his stock. Looking at the perfect tie, he "seems reluctant to pull himself away from the image of himself" (73). As the moment of the Prince's arrival comes near, Brummell restlessly "heads to the cheval glass again" (75). Then, hearing the carriage pass by and realizing that Prince Regent did not come to Calais for him, he seizes the mirror, "looking into it with horror" (80). At the same time, it is not just the reality with which he is unable to confront. Brummell refuses to see his own reflection because he cannot face himself: "That isn't me—." Brummell is entrapped in his own reflection. His image in the glass is the only thing in which, Brummell believes, perfection is kept. Facing the mirror has become his way of protecting himself from reality. Now, with his hope of going back to England utterly gone, he is left as poor and insane as ever.

Austin, then, painfully brings Brummell to deal with the fact that he is

now forgotten. He has always spent his time with his own reflection, just as Narcissus would, and not with reality:

> AUSTIN. You did nothing with your life but live it.
> BRUMMELL. What else could I have done with it?
> AUSTIN. Lived it in front of a looking glass with all the other buggers standing around watching you looking at yourself knowing they were watching you looking at yourself.
> BRUMMELL. I always tried to look my best.
> AUSTIN. Is that all there is to life?
> BRUMMELL. All?
> AUSTIN. Isn't there something more?
> BRUMMELL. More?
> AUSTIN. The word Narcissus springs to mind. (81-82)

Brummell can only defend his Narcissism by saying he did nothing to hurt anyone except himself. He, then, "turns to the cheval glass," stares "with desperate longing into the glass", and "stands riveted in front of the cheval glass" (83). In the end, pathos alone remains against the brilliance of Brummell's life in the past. Before Austin is dismissed by Brummell and leaves his occupation as a valet for good, Hutchinson makes Brummell actually admit his Narcissism:

> BRUMMELL. That thing you said about Narcissus—
> AUSTIN. Yes?
> BRUMMELL. That was really very—you know—
> AUSTIN. It was?
> BRUMMELL. It might be the nearest you'll ever come to saying something worth repeating. (86-87)

As Austin takes his final leave, Brummell resumes his imaginary conversation, this time with Prince Regent, and "retreats into the ultimate privacy of madness" (88). When we see narcissism as an aspect of dandyism, there lies some truth but there is more than self-love or self-admiration to capture the whole fashion and spirit of dandyism. A mere narcissist would not

and could not outlive his fame in history.

Brummell as Celebrity

Just recently, the legendary dandy has not only been in but was literally under spotlight—in theater. Originally, Hutchinson's *Beau Brummell* was first performed at the Theatre Royal Bath in England on 27 February 2001 with Peter Bowles playing the dandy. And, in 2006, as a part of the Brits Off-Broadway Festival at 59E59 Theaters in New York, Ian Kelly portrayed the bitter end of a dandy as the half-gone madman on stage.

In the reviews of both productions of the play, Beau Brummell is appreciated as a modern-day version of a celebrity. In his review of the performance in Bath, Paul Taylor regards the dandy as "the precursor of all those moderns who are famous merely for being famous" (1). Anita Gates, in her review for *The New York Times* of the recent production, also writes that "Mr. Hutchinson's script is sometimes unnecessarily heavy-handed about parallels between Brummell's fame and current celebrity culture" (1). It cannot be helped that Brummell is perceived as a celebrity since the idea results from his own lines in the play, where he says he is received by everyone as "too much the Monument": "There is Beau Brummell, they would say, no visit to England is complete without a sight of the Tower or of him" (10). In a respect, Brummell is famous for being Brummell, for he was, when in Regency London, the first guest to the balls every night and was constantly referred to among the people of the high social life.

Another reviewer of the Off-Broadway production, Brian Scott Lipton, explains further that Brummell is mirrored as "the Paris Hilton of his day, someone who was famous simply for being famous" (1) and that "the fleeting nature" (2) is what the dandy and today's celebrity share in common. However, Lipton also acknowledges how Beau Brummell differs from Paris Hilton and the like-celebrity:

> It's true that the man's only real talent was his supreme sense of style—knowing just how long a cuff, how short a sleeve, or how tight a

> cravat should be—yet it catapulted him into the highest ranks of society and had a lasting effect on men's fashion. (1)

It is Brummell's singular taste that left a permanent influence on how men dress, and, considering the age in which people placed great importance on rank and class-distinction, Beau Brummell's remarkable ascendancy into the fashionable society of Regency England was exceptional in contrast to the celebrities of the present.

Kelly, who played the part of the Beau, has also recently published the dandy's biography *Beau Brummell: The Ultimate Dandy* (2005) and, in it, describes the confusion and multitude of definition the word "dandy" entails:

> 'Dandy' can be levied as compliment and insult to all the many vanities of men. Dandies are Macaronis, sexual adventurers, soldiers, chinless wonders, or all these things. Brummell's life described these various qualities also; to some he was Don Juan, to others a fop. He was briefly a soldier and always a poseur. Brummell himself saw one of the perennial shifts in the meaning of the word, from the positive to a term of derision. He was initially happy to be described as a dandy, just as he was to be called 'Buck' at school, and 'Beau' as a young man. But the dandy craze that followed in his wake, in London, then Paris and beyond, grew in his lifetime to such ridiculous proportions—men so tightly collared that they could not see their feet—that Brummell sought to distance himself from the term. His dandyism, moreover, invoked more than clothes: it was a way of being. (4)

Nobody has yet completely defined dandyism; even after the great ruling by Brummell, the dandy fashion has undergone so many variations that all the transient and ephemeral images of a dandy bear truths that are accurate while contradictory.

A narcissist is one image; the self-love or the undeveloped absorption of self of a narcissist is brilliantly depicted in Hutchinson's portrayal of Brummell. However, as Erik H. Erikson points out, by acquiring "a feeling of continued communal meaning" (71), narcissism in an individual is later

absorbed into more natural self-esteem. A fashionable dandy surely admires himself excessively; on the contrary, he is also mature and confident of his masculinity. The delicateness and shakiness of a narcissist in Brummell, as seen in the play, are more of the result of a dandy image that has evolved over the length of time. And, the dandy as a celebrity is another true public perception. Even so, it takes more than such humane aspect of self-love or the mere reputation of "famous for being famous" for the fashion and the philosophy of the great dandy to survive and continue to appeal to so many. More truly, Beau Brummell's impact lives on since it is he who created the modern concept of manners and masculinity. The key lies in how Brummell established the art of distancing as the necessary skill to become the self-assured and authoritative leader of a society.

Brummell as Leader: Establishing the Art of Distancing

His excellent and distinct taste in fashion undeniably characterizes Brummell's dandyism. "By becoming the supreme dictator in matters of dress," Stephen Robins writes, "he became more important than royalty" (75). In reality, Brummell nonetheless came into the world "without fortune and without rank" (419), as Benjamin Disraeli sums up Brummell's legendary reputation in his fashionable novel *Vivian Grey*. He never belonged to any individual or class. Even today, not everyone can become the leader of a society, with or without blood and fortune. Frankly, the issue of how Brummell was able, simply with his sense of fashion alone, to acquire social power and stand at the top of a society as the leader is still open to question. By revealing the secret of his dominance and mastery, we can interpret the true spirit of dandyism.

As seen in Hutchinson's play, both characteristics of a narcissist and a celebrity in Brummell's dandyism share the unique quality of how to separate and distance oneself from the outside world. The closeness or farness in space between the self and the other is crucial because such distancing can become

both an advantage and a disadvantage. As the originator of dandyism, Brummell is an expert in practicing this skillful art of distancing. It is the perfect stretch of space, separating the self from others, which enables an individual to display some air of supremacy and excellence. Marjorie Fink Vargas from the view of proxemics suggests that the leader of a group is generally placed higher and occupies a bigger and more private space. In comparison, Brummell, eminent, acclaimed and confined in his stature, successfully makes his leadership in the elegant fashionable society of the late 18th- and early 19th-century England. During the play, Brummell admits that it was his mastery of how to wear the stock so high that "propelled" (70) him to the highest rank, and the genius of the English is to let a man "rise by merit" (68). Brummell has never been among the crowd but above: he effectively keeps a good distance from the others.

For Brummell, the art of distancing is at once a natural creation and a designed one. To consciously mark the space between him and others, especially those higher in rank, Brummell does often "cut"—the sharpness in fashion and in wit which defines the spirit of dandyism. In tailoring, the neat and precise cut of his coat and trousers sets out recognition that Brummell is not just any other individual among the crowd. Such splendid taste in fashion comes to the dandy instinctively. On the other hand, "cutting", as in snubbing and ignoring others in public, is an affected pose that Brummell deliberately takes to give off an air of indifference and exclusiveness. Through the sharp cut in fashion and affectation, Brummell originally employs the art of distancing to prove that a personage who is aspiring to become a leader requires a good distance to see and to be seen—the two sides of view that are significantly important for a dandy. By carefully seeing others in response to the verbal cutting in public and being seen as a perfect model of fashion, Brummell establishes himself a masterful and authoritative position in the society, controlling others from his own natural and intended effect of dandyism. Therefore, cutting, verbally and non-verbally, not only separates himself from others but also conveys the air of eminence and excellence which adds to the dandy an essential quality to become the leader of a society.

More importantly, this effective art of distancing empowers the dandy as

well as any person without fortune and rank, because, as John Harvey observes, it is "the style, conspicuously unflashy, of an impeccable self-respect, of a self-respect not tied to rank" (29). Furthermore, Harvey finds in Brummell's dandy style of fashion the "honorable" quality, which is necessary in making a leader in any society of any age:

> The dandy style declines the assertion of rank, but is still a style more of assertion than of conciliation, asserting a character equivalent to rank, the character of the "gentleman"—a term that had many inflections, but which steadily tended to emancipate itself from the ties of money and blood. (31)

Along with the cold and level-headedness in making his obsessive need for perfection the essence of the dandy style, it is his dictatorial ruling of fashion and mannerism that admits Brummell into the fashionable society. Jerrold Seigel agrees that "Brummell's power was in the effect he achieved over others, but he was never really dependent on them, as a performer may be on his audience" (100). As the result of his self-reliance, Brummell dominates over others as he maintains his image as contained, reserved, and aloof; therefore, no one dares to set foot in the space to approach the great personage. The independent and more private self is the foundation for Brummell to uphold himself as a social leader. With the adequate space between himself and the other, Brummell skillfully practices the art of distancing in effect to create "the pose of supposedly effortless superiority, elegance or 'cool' [that] was admired and copied in Brummell's wake, a style and manner that have also endured" (Kelly 469); ultimately, Brummell's dandyism continues to set a standard of the modern fashion and manners for those who aspire to influence and control as the leader of a society.

Conclusion

Seeing Brummell as a narcissist and a celebrity, dandyism still entails so many ambivalent and contradictory aspects that defining its genuine spirit is

still a meaningful challenge. Melville mentions that "with the departure from England of Brummell, the cult of the dandy began to decline" (153). On the contrary, the writers of the fashionable society like Edward Bulwer-Lytton and Benjamin Disraeli, and later Victorian novelists, such as William Makepeace Thackeray and Charles Dickens, took more interest in the dandy characters. Brummell's dandyism has not gone out of vogue. His legendary tales again and again appear in various works of art. The fashion and spirit of the great dandy continue to fascinate us even today as portrayed in Ron Hutchinson's *Beau Brummell*.

Works Cited

Campbell, Kathleen. *Beau Brummell: A Biographical Study*. London: Hammond, Hammond & Co., 1948.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Vivian Grey*. London: Peter Davies, 1926.

Erikson, Erik H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. 1968. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994.

Gates, Anita. "A Fashion Plate, Broken." Rev. of *Beau Brummell*, by Ron Hutchinson. New York Times.com. 20 May 2006.
<http://wwwtheater2.nytimes.com/2006/05/20/theater/reviews/>

Harvey, John. *Men in Black*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Hutchinson, Ron. *Beau Brummell*. London: Oberon Books, 2001.

Kelly, Ian. *Beau Brummell: The Ultimate Dandy*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2005.

Lipton, Brian Scott. "Beau Brummell." Rev. of *Beau Brummell*, by Ron Hutchinson. TheatermMania.com. 15 May 2006.
<http://www.theatermania.com/story/8250>

Melville, Lewis. *The First Gentleman of Europe*. Vol. 1. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1906. 2 vols.

Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1960.

Robins, Stephen. *How to be a Complete Dandy: a little guide for rakes, bucks, swells, cads and wits*. London: Prion Books, 2001.

Seigel, Jerrold. *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics, and Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830-1930*. 1986. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins UP, 1999.

Taylor, Paul. "The decline and fall of the British dandy." Rev. of *Beau Brummell* by Ron

Hutchinson. Independent.co.uk. 2001. 29 May 2001.
<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre/reviews/the-beau-theatre-royal>

Vargas, Marjorie Fink. *Louder than Words: An Introduction to Nonverbal Communication.* Ames: Iowa State UP, 1986.

超絶主義者ブロンスン・オールコットの教育観
——自己教育と自己信頼——

水本有紀

SYNOPSIS

In studying Amos Bronson Alcott's views of education, it is important to focus on the ideas of "self-education" and "self-reliance." His educational ideas are characterized by transcendentalism as well as his similarity with Pestalozzi, whose philosophy of education was considerably affected by Rousseau's. Bronson, who had educated himself through peddling and teaching, thought that it was very significant for children to learn the importance of self-motivation and self-education. He adopted into his own educational concept the transcendental idea that children were created equal, stressing the importance of the individuality of each pupil. Bronson, who was called "the American Pestalozzi," thought the goal of education was to develop "the children's tendency toward truth." His transcendental idea of education, of which the over-riding purpose was to let children perceive the "influence of nature and Providence," would lead to the reformation of society.

はじめに

2006年度ピューリッツァー賞を受賞したジェラルディン・ブルックス (Geraldine Brooks, 1955-)の *March* はルイザ・メイ・オールコット(Louisa May Alcott, 1838-88)の *Little Women* (1868)などに登場する父親マーチ氏を主人公にした小説である。マ

ーチ氏は当然のことながらルイザの父親であるエイモス・ブロンスン・オールコット(Amos Bronson Alcott, 1799-1888) がモデルであり、作者ジェラルディン・ブルックスは、ブロンスンの書簡や日記を詳細に読んだ上でこの作品を書き上げた。貧しいながらも自分を信じて前向きに生きる四姉妹の姿、プランテーションの主人に隠れて奴隷の子どもに読み書きの勉強を教えるマーチ氏の姿に、ブロンスンの教育観を垣間見ることができる。

March で描かれているとおり、ブロンスンは13歳で学校を終え、小間物の行商などをした後、23歳で教師となった。ピューリタニズムの影響がさまざまな形で残っていた当時のニュー・イングランドでは子どもの自発性を抑えることが教育であると見なされ、体罰も教育の重要な要素として取り入れられていた。超絶主義者であったオールコットは人間性の覚醒と天賦の才能の調和的発達を説くスイスのペスタロッチ(Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, 1746-1827)に感化されたこともあり、子どもの自発性を尊重して子どもを一人の人間として扱った。やがてその教育法が注目を集めるところとなり、35歳で新しい学校を開いたが、逆にその斬新な教育法が保守的な親たちの反感を買い、さらに黒人の女子児童を学校に受け入れたことが追い討ちをかけて学校を廃止せざるを得なくなった。結局、その後も教育者として成功することはなく、ブロンスン・オールコットは世間的には失敗した教育者であった。

ルイザが書いた短編集 *Spinning-Wheel Stories* に収められている"Eli's Education"は、物事を学ぶにはいかに多大な努力を払わなければならないかを子どもに教える教訓話であるが、その中に次のような一節がある。

> His innocent and tender nature made all children love him, and gave him a remarkable power over them; so when the first hard months were past, and his efforts began to bear fruit, he found that what had seemed an affliction was a blessing, and that teaching was his special gift. (*Spinning-Wheel Stories*, 75)

この作品には主人公イーライが16歳から30歳までの間で様々な経験を通して自らを教育していく過程が描かれているが、実はこのイーライも、ブロンスンがモデルである。この作品は時代設定や家族構成など、ほぼ事実に基づいて描かれているが、ブロンスン自身はイーライと違ってまったくと言ってよいほど経済観念を持ち合わせておらず、また大学教育を受けていなかった。しかし、作品で描かれている行商や教師という仕事を通して自己を教育していくイーライの姿はまさしくブロンスンそのも

のであり、この自己教育こそがブロンスンの教育観の根底を成している。

ブロンスンはかなりの読書家で、読書を一つの手段として自らの自己教育を行ってきたが、決して先人の見様見真似で教育改革を行ったのではない。ブロンスンの教育観を正面から取り上げた宇佐美寛氏も「彼[オルコット]は読書によって知ったことを使って、彼の目の前にいる子どもたちを解釈し説明しようとしたのである」(『ブロンスン・オルコットの教育思想』, 151) と指摘するように、書物から得た知識を参考にしながら、しかし最終的には己の内なる声に忠実に行動してきたのである。これが、ブロンスンの教育観の中核を成す姿勢であり、この姿勢はエマスン (Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1803-82) も次のように賞賛する、「自己信頼」を遂げた人間のあるべき姿なのである。

> Familiar as the voice of the mind is to each, the highest merit we ascribe to Moses, Plato and Milton is that they set at naught books and traditions, and spoke not what men, but what they thought. A man should learn to detect and watch that gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within, more than the lustre of the firmament of bards and sages. (*Essays and Lectures*, 259)

このエマスンの「自己信頼」の考えは、例えばブロンスンが当時は禁忌とされてきた黒人児童の入学を快諾したエピソードに顕著に表れている。子どもは生まれながらにして平等であるという超絶主義的考えを生涯持ち続けたブロンスンは、自らも自己の声に忠実であり続けた。社会を改革しようとする者は時として周囲から非難を浴びるものだが、ブロンスンの場合も黒人児童を入学させたことが災いして、結局 1839 年にテンプル・スクールは廃校に至った。ブロンスンが実践した教育は、賛同する者も多くいた一方、当時の社会にとってはあまりにもリベラルで革新的なものであった。

ブロンスンは教育に従事する中で、時には疑問に直面し、思索に耽りながら、それでも不動の信念に到達しようと奮闘した。ブロンスンの目指した自己教育とは、超絶主義のいう「神聖なる自己」を発見し人間が人間らしく生きる道へと導くべきものである。さらに、教師という職業の意義について彼は

> The task of the teacher is holier than that of the minister because it deals with souls new-come, unstained, and still "trailing clouds of glory." (*Pedlar's Progress*, 79)

と述べ、次のような考えを示している。

> Of all employments, that of an instructor opens the most full and spacious channels of enjoyment. From our fellow beings are we indebted for a greater proportion of our happiness; and in instruction the very subject of our attention is a fellow being, the very object of our labour is the means of obtaining and imparting that happiness. Hence on this subject everything is favorable to the indulgence of those feelings which carry complacency and joy and rapture to the heart. (*The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, 6)

このように、ブロンスンはより崇高に、より神聖になりうる可能性を秘めた子どもの成長に直接手を貸す教師という仕事を「牧師よりも神聖な職業」と賛美し、理想的な教育は社会の改善につながると考えた。当時のアメリカで最も敬意を払われていた牧師を「書籍にとらわれた理論家」に過ぎないと揶揄し、教師をそれ以上に重要なものだと断言したところに、教育と教師に対するブロンスンの並々ならぬ情熱が感じられる。

以下、本稿では、プロテスタンティズムが自由主義化しつつあった時代に、教育者でもあり社会改革者でもあったブロンスンが築き上げた教育観について、主に超絶主義の観点から、そしてしばしばブロンスンとの類似性を指摘されてきたペスタロッチなどとの関連性を加味しながら考察する。

1. 時代背景

ブロンスンの教育観を見ていく上で、その時代背景として、ピューリタニズムの教育観を考察しなければならない。なぜなら、超絶主義を始めとする当時の様々な思想がそうであったように、ブロンスンの教育観は、衰退してきていたとは言えさまざまな面で隠然たる影響を与え続けていたピューリタニズムに対抗する形で生まれたものだからである。ピューリタニズムの根源には、アダムの堕落後、人間は「悪しきもの」となっているため、まだ回心を経験して「あるべき」人間の段階に至っていない子どもは、体罰を伴う厳しい教育を受けさせなければならないという考え方があった。しかし、ブロンスンは、子どもは本質的に善良なる存在であり、教師はその子どもに生まれながら備わっている真理へと向かう力が十分に発揮されるよう補助的な役割

を果たすべきだと考えた。

ブロンスンの教育思想に深く共鳴し、自分の設立した学校にブロンスンの名をとってAlcott Houseと名付けたグリーヴス (James Pierrepont Greaves)が、ブロンスンに送った1837年12月16日付の手紙の中に "The child has an inward, sacred, and unchangeable nature; which nature is the Temple of Love." (*Transcendentalism in New England*, 270) という言葉がある。この手紙へのブロンスンの返事は残念ながら残っていないが、このグリーヴスの言葉に表れている、子どもは神聖な不変の性質を備えているという考え方が、人間の可能性を主張する超絶主義者ブロンスンの教育思想の核心となっている。

先行研究では19世紀におけるピューリタニズムの衰退の歴史を背景にブロンスンの教育観を考察したものは決して多くないが、宇佐美氏は「自由主義的」あるいは「左翼」プロテスタンティズムと関連付けてブロンスンの教育観を解釈するべきだとし、「ブロンスン・オルコットは、このような時代、19世紀前半において、「左翼」プロテスタンティズムの持つ意味を教育思想にまで再構成し、教育実践を自ら行なうことを通じてそれを検討・吟味し、自己の思想として具体化していった思想家であり、ピューリタニズムに反対する契機を自己のうちに最も明確に自覚した教育実践者であった」(『ブロンスン・オルコットの教育思想』, 64)と述べて、ピューリタニズムの影響が根強く残っていた当時のアメリカでのブロンスンの業績を研究する上で、ピューリタニズムとの関連を軽視するのは不自然である、と指摘している。また、シェパード (Odell Shepard) は、ブロンスンがピューリタニズムの影響が比較的緩やかであった南部の人々のヨーロッパ貴族風文化に強い感慨を覚えた点を指摘した上で、

> "Instantly the Connecticut pedlar (*sic*) realized that they were right in so doing—and at that moment every rag or tag of a merely negative Puritanism which may still have been clinging to him fell away, forever." (*Pedlar's Progress*, 53-54)

と、この出来事が今までブロンスンの心のどこかに存在し影響し続けていたピューリタニズムを払拭する機会になったと述べている。

さらにシェパードは "that the sole and unsupported spirit of a man may come into an immediate relation with its Maker." (*Pedlar's Progress*, 70) を指摘し、宇佐美氏が言及している「左翼」プロテスタンティズムの中で反ピューリタニズムの傾向

が最も顕著なクェーカー主義とブロンスンとの関連を示唆し、ブロンスンが行商で訪れたノース・カロライナでのクェーカー教徒との出会いが、ブロンスンの人生観、教育観に強い影響を与えたと述べている。この運命的な出会いを契機として、ブロンスンはウィリアム・ペン (William Penn, 1644-1718) やロバート・バークレイ (Robert Barclay, 1648-90) といったクェーカー指導者の著作を読んだり、クェーカーと議論を交わしたりし、神があらゆる人間の内に宿るというクェーカー主義の核心とも言うべき信念に傾倒していった。さらに、シェパードも述べているように、このようなクェーカー主義の影響は、後に開花するブロンスンの超絶主義思想へとつながっていく。

> With the power of piercing to inner essences which he was to show on many other occasions, he singled out as the central teaching of the Friends their doctrine of the 'inner light,' their belief that the individual soul may be so illuminated by the divine spirit as to speak its word to men. This belief and doctrine he made his own—or perhaps one might better say that it made him. It helped him, or forced him, to take his first long step toward transcendentalism. (*Pedlar's Progress*, 70)

ブロンスンの思想、特に教育観は、子どもの善性を信じるという点で「左翼」プロテスタンティズム、更にはクェーカー主義の流れを汲むものであり、反ピューリタニズム的立場にある。

体罰に関しても、ブロンスンはピューリタニズムとは全く別の考えを持っていた。当時の教育で体罰が日常的に行われていた要因はピューリタニズムの影響以外にも考えられるが、ピューリタンの原罪観が体罰を正当化する一因であったことは確かである。しかし、ブロンスンは、最高の善である真理が（クェーカーの内なる光のように）子どもの心の内に生まれたときから存在しているため子どもは内部から良くなっていくものだと考え、体罰のような外部からの矯正はいっさい行わなかった。その代わり、子どもの自律性を重んじて、子どもに対する罰を、クラス全体の話し合いで決めることにしていた。

そうして決めた罰のひとつに、ある一定期間、クラスから仲間はずれにされる方法があった。同じく超絶主義者であり、テンプル・スクールでブロンスンの助手をしていたエリザベス・ピーボディ (Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, 1804-94) はその教育の様子を記録した *Record of a School* (1845) で次のように記している。

> He talked with them, on the Monday before this last analysis; and having again adverted to the necessity of pain and punishment, in a general point of view, and brought them to acknowledge the uses of this hurting of the body, as he always phrased it, in concentrating attention, &c., he said, that he now intended to have it administered upon his own hand, instead of theirs; but that would never do it. But he soon made them understand that he was serious. They said they preferred being punished themselves. But he was determined that they should not escape the pain and the shame of themselves administering the stroke upon him, except by being themselves blameless. (*Record*, 145)

ブロンスンは問題を起こした子どもに体罰を与える代わりに、教師が責任を負うべきだと考え、その子どもにブロンスン自身の手を叩かせた。そうすることで、その子どもの中に羞恥心、痛みを感じさせ、自分の過ちがクラスというコミュニティ全体に及ぼした影響を認識させるのがブロンソンの狙いであった。ちなみに、ブロンスンやエマスンを始めとする超絶主義者が当時、孔子や孟子などの中国古典思想に翻訳によって通じていたことを考え合わせると、この羞恥心が、性善説を唱えた孟子が説いた「四端の心」の中の羞悪（悪を羞恥すること）と重なる点で極めて興味深い。ブロンスン自身が著した文献が少ないため、ブロンスンへの東洋思想の影響についてはあまり知られていないが、アーサー・クリスティ（Arthur Christy）が "In his time Alcott probably had no equal as a popularizer of Orientalism." (*The Oriental Religions*, 73) と指摘しているように、ブロンスンはエマスンやソロー（Henry David Thoreau, 1817-62）と並んで、当時のアメリカにおける東洋思想の普及に中心的な役割を果たした人物であった。ブロンスンが孟子の思想に通じていたと考えるのが自然であろう。

教室に体罰用の鞭や棒が常置されていた時代において、このブロンスンの「罰」の与え方は人々の注目を集めたが、その点に関してピーボディは次のように述べている。

> The effect was a profound and deep stillness. Boys who had never been affected before, and to whom bodily punishment was a very small affair, as far as its pain was concerned, were completely sobered. There was a more complete silence, and attention, and obedience, than there had ever been. (*Record*, 145)

特に、体罰を受けることを何とも思っていなかった子どもには多大の効果があり、子

どもの自らの反省を促すのに役立っているとして、ピーボディはさらに、"This is the most complete punishment that a master ever invested,—was the observation of one of the boys, at home [. . .]." (*Record*, 145)と記している。この独特の体罰の方法が子ども達に与えた影響の大きさがよく分かる。体罰に関するブロンスンの考え方も、外部からの圧力によって子どもを矯正するのではなく、子どもに自分の良心に触れさせ、心からの自己反省を促すという点で、自己教育の特徴を多分に含んでいる。"the diviner nature of the child; the conscience" (*Observations*, 9)という言葉に示されるように、ブロンスンはこの良心を神的なものとして扱った。教師の指導によって幼い子どもが自分の中に存在している良心に気付き、それに従うことを身に付けることができれば、子どもは自己を信じ、自己に従うようになる。

> It is by its wise and happy cultivation that the infant mind finds within, the sources of self-dependence, and self-control, and by its divine suggestions is led to the knowledge and worship of its author, and to the divine truths of the christian revelation. (*Observations*, 9)

神的な存在である良心とは、超絶主義の観点から考えると、神を内包する自己に他ならない。つまり、ここで言う良心に従うことは「自己信頼」と同義である。

また、孟母三遷とまではいかないが、"The influence of circumstances is powerfully operative on the young child."(*On the Nature*, 130) という言葉からも分かるように、ブロンスンは環境が子どもに及ぼす影響を重要視していた。具体的な例としては、学校に手本とすべき人物の肖像画を飾り、それが子どもに与える影響の大切さを重んじていた。

> "The physical layout provided for individual work space, equipped with individual desks and blackboards, at the same time as it allowed for the possibility of groupings around the master. A large Gothic window dominated the room, with a bas-relief of Christ and busts of Socrates, Plato, Shakespeare, Milton, and Sir Walter Scott gazing down upon the children." (*American Education*, 87)

ブロンスンは、環境が子どもたちの感情に大きく影響を及ぼすことから、教育とは見本とすべき人物を通して子どもの感情と想像力を養うことであると考えた。数人掛けの長い机が主流だった当時において、子ども一人一人に一つの机をあてがったことも、ブロンスンが個人としての子どもを尊重し、子どもの学習環境を重視していたことを物語っている。

2. 自己教育と自己信頼

ブロンスンの教育観を考察する上で、キーワードとなるのが本稿の副題にも挙げた「自己教育」と「自己信頼」である。ブロンスンは自分の考えを書物の形で残すことをあまり得意としなかったが、自身の講演を基に書いた *On the Nature and Means of Early Intellectual Education as Deduced from Experience* という論文の中で自己教育に触れている。ブロンスンは子どもを対象にした初等教育において、"the uniform development of the child's nature, by which he progressively experiences himself, and his relations, and is prepared for self-guidance, and self-education." (129) の重要性を述べ、自身の考える理想的な教育を受ければ、子どもは「自己管理」と「自己教育」の術を体得できると主張している。

この自己教育と自己信頼は、超絶主義の核心を成す概念でもある。悪魔の誘惑に負けて堕落するまで人間は善なる存在であるので、キリスト教に性悪説は本来当てはまらないが、ピューリタニズムの教育観を、誤解を恐れずにあえて性悪説と見なすならば、ブロンスンの超絶主義的教育観は孟子、ソクラテス、プラトン、ルソー (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1712-78)、カント (Immanuel Kant, 1724-1804) などが説いた性善説であると言える。ピューリタンは子どもを邪悪さの権化とみなし、子どもは生まれたままでは地獄に行く運命にあるのだから、天国に入るためには教会が天国への道を案内できるような信心深い信者とならなければならないと主張した。そして、邪悪な存在として生まれた子どもは、大人の厳しい指導によってその邪悪な本性を抑制する力を身に付けなければならず、そのためには体罰などを通して正しい行いを大人が教えなければならないとされた。それに対して、ブロンスンの超絶主義的性善説は、子どもを本来善い、正しい性質だけを持って生まれてくるものと見なした。ブロンスンの立場からすると、子どもの悪い性質は全て後天的に身に付いたものであり、まわりの環境によって子どもの心の中に悪が入り込む。したがって、ブロンスンが実践した教育では、多くの学校で行われていた読み書き、語句の暗記よりも、むしろ道徳教育に力が注がれることになった。

道徳教育を重視するという点では、ブロンスンのよき友人であり、超絶主義の創始者でもあったエマスンも同じであった。教育とは、神と直接つながる広大な「自己」に頼ること、すなわち「自己信頼」を教えることだとしていたエマスンも、子どもが自己を信頼するよう導き、また教師や親など教える側の人間が子どもを一個の人間として尊重する ("respecting the pupil" [*Complete Works* 10, 143]) ことを、教育の

最大の意義としている。

> The great object of Education should be commensurate with the object of life. It should be a moral one; to teach self-trust; to inspire the youthful man with an interest in himself; with a curiosity touching his own nature; to acquaint him with the resources of his mind, and to teach him that there is all his strength, and to inflame him with a piety towards the Grand Mind in which he lives. (*Complete Works* 10, 135)

エマスンは教育の最大の目的として、自己の信頼と自分の本性に対する注意深い関心を抱かせることを挙げているが、いずれも神を内在する自己を尊敬することにつながる。ブロンスンとエマスンは共に、超絶主義の中心概念である自己信頼を教育観の礎としていた。"Thou art the law"、"Thou art unto thyself a law, / And since the soul of things is in thee,/ Thou needest nothing out of thee." (*Journals* 2, 397) というエマスンの詩行は、超絶主義の中核を成す言葉であると同時に、エマスンの超絶主義的教育観にもつながる。自己の中には神が内在しており、それゆえ自己は偉大で神的である。その自己を自身の掟とし、自己を知り、その自己に頼ることが人生の目的であり、それを教えることが教育の目的であるとエマスンは考えた。それと同様、ブロンスンの"The child becomes a law to himself."(*Observations*, 22)という言葉も、子どもを個人として尊重し、何よりも子どもの内にある神性を重んじるブロンスンの教育観を表している。ブロンスンによれば、子どもは自己の声に忠実になることを教われば、自己を統制できるようになる。このような自己信頼を礎とする思想は自己に全幅の信頼をおいて、その可能性を信じる。

では、実際にブロンスンはどのような学習活動を通じて自己信頼に礎を置く教育を実践したのだろうか。ブロンスンがペスタロッチの教育観に共鳴して設立した学校、テンプル・スクールのカリキュラムでは日記を書く作業にかなりの時間が割かれ（資料参照）、ブロンスン自身、12歳から生涯日記を付け続けることによって自己を省み、自身の自己教育の一環としていた。子どもたちは一週間の終わりに自分が書いた日記をもう一度振り返り反省することを習慣づけられており、ブロンスンの考えるところによれば、日記を書くことは単に文章力を磨くというよりは、むしろ日々の出来事の中で自分自身が感じたことを知ることによって、自分自身を向上させていく手段であった。

> They [Children] have often embodied the substance, thus elicited, in their own language, and transferred it into books kept by each for this purpose. By this means, they are led to form the important habit of self, as well as of relative, observation; and to keep a journal of their intellectual progress, collecting and preserving the materials which enter into the formation of their mental being. Life is wrought up into interesting and improving forms of discipline. To cultivate the habit of self-introspection, as a maturer mode of observation, ethical reading has also been employed. (*On the Nature*, 142)

日常で起こった出来事に対する自分の考えを自分の言葉で日記に記すことにより、このような子どもの思考回路をより効果的に、より深く働かせることにつながるとブロンスンは考えた。更に、日記は自己反省の手段として利用されただけでなく、日記に書かれている子どもの経験が作文や読み書きといった言語活動の授業でも利用された。

また、ソクラテスの会話の方法を参考にして編み出された「会話」と呼ばれる授業では、子どもにとっては神秘的すぎるほど抽象的であったり、たとえば宗教や性の問題など、当時はまだ年齢的に早すぎると考えられていたテーマについて話し合われた。ブロンスンは、"The child's inquiries indicate his intellectual condition and wants. They should be treated with sacred regard, and answered with faithful accuracy."(*On the Nature*, 144) と述べるとともに、"We can never be sure of the good or evil imparted, until the child has returned to us the ideas as reflected through his mind." (*On the Nature*, 145) と指摘する。子どもがどのようなことを考え、教育によってどのような影響を与えられているかを確かめるためには、教師は子どもの自由な発言を真摯に受け止め、その裏に隠されている本当の意味を知らなければならないと考えている。子どもから湧き上がる疑問を軽視し、誤った方法で対処することを問題視し、ブロンスンは次のように主張している。

> "The original tendency toward truth, as manifested in inquiry, is thus perverted, by inducing a doubtful and broken experience, in which truth and error are indiscriminately blended, and the foundations of authority and faith wantonly destroyed." (*On the Nature*, 144)

教師が真理とは何かを教えてやらなければ、生まれたときから子どもに備わっている

真理を追究する力は歪められてしまい、それが教育における問題のひとつだとブロンスンは考えていた。日記や「会話」といった独特の学習活動を通して、ブロンスンは子どもの潜在能力、つまり真理を見出し獲得する力を引き出そうとしたのである。

3. アメリカのペスタロッチ

以上、超絶主義の観点からブロンスンの教育観を見てきたが、ブロンスンの教育観を見る際、先に触れたペスタロッチとの類似性にも目を向ける必要がある。ブロンスン同様、ペスタロッチも草木の持つ向日性のように子どものうちに存在する真理へ向かう力を重視していた。ブロンスンとペスタロッチの関連に関してはいくつかの先行研究があるが、たとえば自身も超絶主義者であったフロシンガム(Octavius Brooks Frothingham, 1822-95)は、ブロンスンとペスタロッチの教育観の類似性を指摘しながらも、ブロンスンはペスタロッチの思想をそのまま受け売りしたのではなく、ブロンスンの中に潜在的にあった独自の考えが、ペスタロッチの思想と極めてよく似ていたのだとしている（"The plan, albeit nearly the same with that practiced by Pestalozzi in Switzerland, was original with Mr. Alcott, the product of his peculiar philosophical ideas." [*Transcendentalism in New England*, 264])。またシェパードも、ブロンスンがペスタロッチの思想に精通しており、その影響を受けたことを指摘している。

> During the second and third decades of the nineteenth century, Pestalozzi's teaching was inescapable anywhere in Europe, England, or America. Bronson Alcott did not escape it even in the Connecticut hills. Before he had been many months in Cheshire he certainly knew the chief Pestalozzian principles, which taught that education ought to be: moral and religious; organic, harmonious, and complete; not mechanical but designed to penetrate and regulate the entire being; free, natural, and individual; based upon intuition rather than upon memory and the lower reason; gradual and progressive and linked, like a chain; social and domestic, and closely related to life. All this sounds very like Alcott. It actually is Pestalozzi. (*Pedlar's Progress*, 85)

シェパードは、ブロンスンがジャーナルの第一巻の副題を"The Cheshire Pestalozzian School"としていることや、ウィリアム・ラッセル (William Russell)の *Pestalozzi's Principles and Methods of Education* の編集を手がけたことなどを挙げ、ブロンスンがペスタロッチ主義にかなり通じていたことを示唆している。ところが、シェパードもフロシンガムと同様、ブロンスンがペスタロッチの影響を強く受けはしたものの、そのまま模倣したわけではなく、むしろペスタロッチの考え方がブロンスンの中にあった独自の思想を補強したのだと考えている。

> He had not a dependent mind. Always remarkable quick to seize the essential idea of a man, a book, an institution, he was equally quick in converting it into the substance of his own thought, in making it over into himself." (*Pedlar's Progress*, 85)

したがって、「アメリカのペスタロッチ」と呼ばれたブロンスンとペスタロッチの関連性については、ペスタロッチ主義が既に築き上げられていたブロンスンの教育観を補強する手段の一つであったと考えるべきである。こういった解釈の傾向を踏まえた上で、ブロンスンの教育観をペスタロッチ主義の観点から考察する。

ブロンスンは、当時流布していた教育とは違い、子どもの中にある真理へと向かう潜在的な力を重要視した。ペスタロッチが真理へ至る道を教えることが正しい教育だとしたように、ブロンスンもまた、真理へと導く教育こそが真の教育であると見なした。それは画一的な既成の科目内容を教え込むのではなく、子どもの中に潜在的に備わっている能力・才能を引き出すというものであり、その第一歩が自己自身の根底を探ることに他ならない。言い換えれば、ブロンスンの言う真の教育とはペダゴジーではなくエデュケーションである。(ちなみに、ペダゴジー[pedagogy]は、もともとは「子どもを学校に連れていく奴隷」という意味のギリシャ語 ["paidagōgós"] が語源であり、「外部からの強制的な教育」を意味した。一方エデュケーション[education] は、ラテン語の ["educare"(to bring out)] が語源で、「子どもの能力を引き出す」という意味があり、子どもの可能性を伸ばすことに重点を置いたブロンスンの教育方針と重なる。) さらに、子どもは本質的に善きものであり、「子どもの心の中には知識と真理への志向性が存在している」としたブロンスンは、知識・真理を学ぶことにより子どもは内面から純化され高められると考えた。彼は

> "The tendency toward knowledge and truth exists in the young mind, and if

it does not manifest its activity, and become vigorous and effective, it is owing to our neglect, or misguidance." (*On the Nature,* 142)

と述べているように、知識や、神により示された「真理」を得る能力は、子どもに生まれつき内在しているが、もしこの力がその働きを発揮しなければ、その子どもが受けた教育は誤ったものであるとブロンスンは考える。したがって、ブロンスンが理想とする教育は、外部から強制的に行うのではなく、子どものうちから自然と真理に目覚めるよう補助することを最大の目的としていた。

次に、ペスタロッチがその教育思想を形成する上で大きな影響を受けたルソーのことを考えてみたい。ブロンスン、ペスタロッチ、ルソーは、多少の違いはあるにしろ、その教育思想において、立場と方向性を同じくする。「教育論」という副題が付けられたルソーの代表作『エミール』は、親も兄弟もいない一人の孤児に、一人の教師が人里離れた僻処で理想的な教育を施すという小説であるが、その前半部分では子どもの誕生から 15 歳までの時期は人間の肉体と感覚を磨き、個人として完成させることが理想的教育の目的とされている。ブロンスンが 15 歳未満の子どもを対象に教育活動を行い、何よりもこの時期の教育が自己教育にふさわしいものだと見なしていた点は共通点の一つとして注目に値しよう。ルソーは、後天的な習慣や環境に影響を受ける以前の生まれたままの純粋な人間の状態、人間性を最高の善（真理）と見なし、その自己に内在する善性が自己自身を教育することが理想の教育であるとルソーは考えた。そして、ルソーは三種類の教師、つまり自然という教師、事象という教師、人間という教師を定め、それぞれの役割を説明している。自然の教育というのは、生まれたままの純真無垢な状態をいかに開花させるかに尽き、人間の教育とは、自然の教育によって導かれた感覚、器官の内部的発展をいかに用いるかを教えることである。そして、事象による教育というのは、われわれ人間を刺激する事象から経験を獲得することであるとしている。

このルソーの事象による教育とほぼ軌を一にする形で、ブロンスンは実際に教育における日常での経験を重視し、一般原理を教えてから身近な出来事を解釈する演繹法ではなく、身近な事象から一般原理を導き出すという帰納法を採用していた。たとえば、地理を教える場合にも、まず子どもが日常生活でなじみのある森、小川、道、山などといった身近な風景に言及することから始めた。そして実際に子どもに地図を書かせ、想像力を働かさせ、そうすることで地理という学習をより具体的に体得させたのである。その様子について、ピーボディも次のように賞賛の声を残している。

> When the children come to draw these lakes and rivers, of which they have seen pictures, or with which they associate scenes of human life from the journals of travelers and naturalists, they will find it much more easy to remember their names, than if they had no other idea than a mere black line may convey. It is not impossible, also, for the *instructer* (sic) to assist the young imagination to take bird's-eye views of the rivers and lakes of a continent, by suggesting to them to look down as from a balloon upon the earth, and see how these rivers flow from the mountains, mingle together, and find the sea." (*Record*, 123)

文法や読書の時間でも、ブロンスンはとにかく、子どもの生活に密着した事象を取り上げることから授業を始めた。そのことは、ブロンスンの"Education is a process instituted in human experience by the ceaselessly operating influence of nature and Providence." (*On the Nature*, 149) という言葉によく表れており、ブロンスンが子どもを教育する上で日常生活の大切さをいかに重視していたかが分かる。

* * *

1820年代の末から1830年代にかけて、ボストンを中心としたニュー・イングランドでは、ピューリタニズムの流れを汲む伝統的な教育に対する批判が展開され、それに代わるものとして、ペスタロッチ主義や帰納法原理に基づく新しい教育が提唱され、ロック(John Locke, 1632-1704)、ルソー、ペスタロッチなどのヨーロッパの教育思想を参考としながら、新たな教授方法の確立が模索された。具体的には、伝統的な体罰による支配と強制的な権威を特徴とする教師ー生徒の教育関係、ならびにモニトリアル・システムにおける生徒の心身の細部にまでおよぶ監視、非人格的な権威にもとづく教師ー生徒の関係を批判し、子どもへの眼差しを否定的で強制的なもの(=外在的なもの)から、肯定的で自発的なもの(=内在的なもの)へと、教育の方針を180度転換する試みであった。(『アメリカ公教育思想形成の史的研究』, 240-41)

当時のマサチューセッツにおいて、こうした新しい教育を推進した代表者の一人がエリザベス・ピーボディの義弟となったホレース・マン (Horace Mann, 1796-1859) であるが、このマンの教育法は保守派から強い批判を浴びた。その批判とは、例えば「欠点と従属が自然にともなう幼年時代には、恐怖が最も支配的であり、私たちはそれを利用すべきであり、それが良い目的に役立つようにすべきである。しかし、もし

も私たちが服従を確実にするために恐怖の利用を認めるならば、私たちは、その結果として体罰の利用も認めるべきである」というものであった。(『アメリカ公教育思想形成の史的研究』, 253) なお、こうした保守派と改革派の争いを一歩離れて別の角度から見ていた人物がいる。ホレース・ブシュネル (Horace Bushnell, 1802-76) である。

ブシュネルは自身の「養育」論を当時流行の熱心な自己教育とは区別した。この自己教育の計画は「人間性は根源的に善であると思う多数の人びと」("many who assume the radical goodness of human nature" (quoted in *The American Adam*, 70)) の考えであって、その範疇にブロンスンの「向日性」にたとえられる教育法も入るが、ブシュネルはこれを、ピューリタニズムとは正反対の "vegetable process" (quoted in *The American Adam*, 70) に似た脆弱なものと見なした。*The Christian Nurture* で、"Although [a child] was born as clear of natural prejudice or damage as Adam before his sin, spiritual education [. . .] would still involve an experiment of evil, therefore a fall and a bondage under the laws of evil." (quoted in *The American Adam*, 70) と述べていることからも分かるように、ブシュネルは、たとえ子供が罪を犯す以前のアダムのように生来の偏見や害毒を免れて生まれたとしても、精神的な教育は悪の経験を、悪の法則のもとにおける堕落と屈従を伴うであろうと考えた。ブシュネルにとって、人生とは「悪との闘いと堕落と救済とを伴う」("involves a struggle with evil, a fall and a rescue" [quoted in *The American Adam*, 70]) ものであり、成熟とは「悪の苦痛と善の価値という……二重の経験」("a double experience . . . the bitterness of evil and the worth of good" [quoted in *The American Adam*, 70]) を伴うものであった。

こうした熱い議論が戦わされた中で、19 世紀のアメリカの教育思想が確認した原理は、本稿でブロンスンを通して確認したものとすべて重なるが、

①子どもは個人として尊重されるべき人間である。

②子どもは、望ましい方向に自ら発展しようとする力を内に持っている。

③教師は、子どものこのような自己発展を助けてやればよい。子どもの自由な精神活動を助ければよいのであって、強制的方法を排するべきである。

の 3 つであった。18 世紀から 19 世紀のアメリカにおけるプロテスタンティズムの歴史は、このような個人主義化・自由主義化の歴史である。こうした時代に、このような思想の変化をもたらした教育思想家・実践家として、まず挙げるべき人、それがブロンスン・オールコットである。言い換えれば、ブロンスンにおいて 19 世紀のアメ

リカにおけるキリスト教の個人主義化、自由主義化、大衆化が教育思想の側面で最も明瞭な形をとって現れたのである(『現代に生きる教育思想　1　アメリカ』, 187-88)。

むすび

ブロンスンは大学教育を受けたことがないため、教育の理論、指導方法を専門的に学んだことはなく、また大学教育（高等教育）をそれほど重要視していなかった。それよりも、社会の悪にまだ染まっていない神に最も近い存在である子どもの教育の重要性を強調していた。それは、何らかの癖を身に付けてしまった大人よりも、まだ修正の余裕が十分ある子どもの方がブロンスンの目指す教育にふさわしいと考えたからである。ブロンスンの考える真の教育を受けた子どもは、日常生活での観察や経験の中で真理を見出す力を獲得し、自己を管理し教育する状態に到達できるのである。

自然という教室で正しい教育を通して真理へと導かれていく子どもの様子をブロンスンは自身の教育論について書いた論文 "On the Nature and Means of Early Intellectual Education as Deduced From Experience" の中で次のように記している。

> If his observation is disciplined, and his mind interested in analogy; if he has true faith in the teaching of nature and experience; if his whole mind is placed under the willing guidance of these agencies, he is already in the path which conducts to truth; he has found the key which unlocks its gates. He is able to appreciate truth which exists for him everywhere: it is not confined to the book, nor dispensed solely from the teachings of the school-room. Nature is to him a vast school-room; and he delights to take his primal lessons from the pointing finger of Providence. (*On the Nature*, 141)

この教育を受けずに成長すると、人間は真理を見出すことは出来ないとブロンスンは考え、次のように締めくくっている。

> The errors of previous ages of external observation are all accumulated in man's discordant and broken experience, without order, sequence, unity, or analogous data; obscuring truth, by the clouds and darkness thus gathered over it. But this era will pass away. Light will break forth from the supposed

> desert of the infant mind. The star of observation will guide the wise men to the infant cradle, to study the young child, who is born a teacher to humanity. (*On the Nature*, 163)

子どもが生まれながらに備えている "the tendency toward knowledge and truth"を伸ばすことがブロンスンの教育の目指すところであり、その教育は"the ceaselessly operating influence of nature and Providence" でもある。つまり、ブロンスンの言う教育の究極にあるのは自然とその自然を創り動かしている神である。その神へ至ることがブロンスンの教育が目指す究極の目的であると言えよう。その過程で人間は自己に目覚めて「自己信頼」を遂げ、真理を把握する。神が内在している自己を信じ、その自己に頼ること、つまり「自己信頼」とは、言い換えれば "the path which conducts to truth" に到達することであり、その段階で人間は "the key which unlocks its [truth's] gates" を手に入れることができる。ブロンスンにとって自然は広大な教室であるが、その教室で教育されると人間は神の指から直接教えを授かることとなる。つまり、ブロンスンの考える教育の最終目標は神を知ることである。

ブロンスンは自分の思想を体系化して、論理的に表現することが苦手であり、このことが教育改革者として誤解される一因であり、さらに従来低い評価しか与えられてこなかった原因のひとつともなっている。エマスンはブロンスンと出会ったとき、ブロンスンの思想に深い感銘を覚え、ブロンスンに金銭的援助を申し出るとともに、コンコードへ移るよう勧め、以後、ブロンスンは超絶主義の牽引者の一人としてエマスンたちと行動を共にすることとなった。そのブロンスンの "the key which unlocks its gates" をエマスンは代表作 *Nature* で "The golden key / Which opes the palace of eternity" と表現することとなる。エマスンの次の文章はブロンスンの思想を集約する文章とも言えよう。

> Once inhale the upper air, being admitted to behold the absolute natures of justice and truth, and we learn that man has access to the entire mind of the Creator, is himself the creator in the finite. This view, which admonishes me where the sources of wisdom and power lie, and points to virtue as to
> "The golden key
> Which opes the palace of eternity,"
> carries upon its face the highest certificate of truth, because it animates me to create my own world through the purification of my soul. (*Essays and Lectures*,

41-42)

教育者ブロンスンは娘のルイザほどには世間に知られず、教育の世界では失敗者という印象が強く、実際、大きな成功を収めたというわけではない。しかし、現在コンコードにある Alcott School[1] という学校や *Outrageous Questions: Legacy of Bronson Alcott and America's One-Room Schools* という子ども向けの本などを、ブロンスンの教育思想が現代に生き続けていることの証拠として挙げることができるだろう。教師（大人）中心の教育が普通だった時代に、子どもの目線に立ち、子ども中心の教育を行おうとしたブロンスンは、子どもの個人としての尊さと自発性を信頼し、自分の経験と思想を中心に自己信頼を体現した教育家として今後高い評価を受けるべきだろう。最初に触れた *March* という小説などがそのきっかけとなるのではないだろうか。

注

* 本稿は、言語文化研究会第24回例会（2008年3月16日　於聖トマス大学）における口頭発表の原稿に加筆したものである。

1 Alcott School のホームページ (http:www.colonial.net/schoolweb/alcottweb/overview.php) にブロンスンに関する簡単な紹介文が載っている。"While most assume that Alcott was named for Louisa May Alcott, the truth is that it was named for her father, Bronson, who served as the Superintendent of Concord schools in the nineteenth century. Bronson was a writer and philosopher of some renown, whose ideas on education and child-rearing have led to his being viewed by some as the father of American child psychology."

引証文献

Alcott, Amos Bronson. *Observations on the Principles and Methods of Infant Instruction.* Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1830.

_____. *On the Nature and Means of Early Intellectual Education as Deduced From Experience.* Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1833.

_____. *The Journals of Bronson Alcott.* Vol. 1. Ed. Odell Shepard. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, Inc., 1966.

Alcott, Louisa May. *Spinning-Wheel Stories.* Holicong: Wildside Press, 2004.

Bushnell, Horace. *Christian Nurture.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

Christy, Arthur. *The Orient in American Transcendentalism.* New York: Octagon Books, 1972.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *American Education: The National Experience 1783-1876.* New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson.* Vol. 10. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

_____. *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson.* Vol. 2. Ed. Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.

_____. *Essays and Lectures.* Ed. Joel Miles Porte. New York: Literary Classics of the U.S., 1983.

Frothingham, Octavius Brooks. *Transcendentalism in New England.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Lewis, R. W. B. *The American Adam.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., 1955.

Peabody, Elizabeth. *Record of a School.* Bedford: Applewood Books, 2005.

Shepard, Odell, ed. *Pedlar's Progress.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937.

市村尚久編集『アメリカ』(現代に生きる教育思想　第一巻) ぎょうせい, 1981.

宇佐美寛『ブロンスン・オルコットの教育思想』東京: 風間書房, 1975.

梅根悟監修『アメリカ教育史Ⅰ』(世界教育史大系　17) 講談社, 1975.

北野秋男『アメリカ公教育思想形成の史的研究――ボストンにおける公教育普及と教育統治――』東京: 風間書房, 2003.

資料

(Amos Bronson Alcott, *How Like an Angel Came I Down,* rec. Elizabeth Peabody and ed. Stephen Mitchell, (New York: Lindisfarne Press, 1991).)

QUARTER CARD OF DISCIPLINE & STUDIES IN MR. ALCOTT'S SCHOOL, FOR THE SPRING TERM CURRENT 1836

The tuition and discipline are addressed in due proportion to the threefold nature of childhood

THE SPIRITUAL FACULTY (Means of its Direct Culture)	THE IMAGINATIVE FACULTY (Means of its Direct Culture)	THE RATIONAL FACULTY (Means of its Direct Culture)
Listening to Sacred Readings Conversations on the Gospels Writing Journals Self-Analysis & Self-Discipline Listening to Readings from works of Genius Motives in Study & Action Government of the School	Spelling & Reading Writing & Sketching from Nature Picturesque Geography Writing Journals & Epistles Illustrating Words Listening to Readings Conversation	Defining Words Analyzing Speech Self-Analysis Arithmetic Study of the Human Body Reasonings on Conduct Discipline

TIME	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
IX	Studying Spelling & Defining & Writing in Journals	Studying Geography & Sketching Maps in Journals	Studying the Gospel & Writing in Journals	Studying Parsing Lesson & Writing in Journals	Paraphrasing Text of Readings & Writing in Journals	Completing of Account of week's studies in Journals
X XI	Spelling with Illustrative Conversations on the Meaning & Uses of Words	Recitations in Geography with Picturesque Readings and Conversations	Readings & Conversations on Spirit as displayed in the Life of Christ	Analyzing Speech Written & Vocal on Tables with Illustrative Conversations	Readings with Illustrative Conversations on the Sense of the Text	Readings from Works of Genius with Applications and Conversations
	RECREATION ON THE COMMON OR IN THE ANTE-ROOM					
XII I	Studying Arithmetic with Demonstrations in Journals	Drawing from Nature with Mr. Grecter	Conversations on the Human Body and its Culture	Composing & Writing Epistles in Journals	Studying Arithmetic with Illustrations in Journals	Review of Journals, Week's Conduct & Studies
	INTERMISSION FOR REFRESHMENT AND RECREATION					
III IV	Studying Latin & Writing in Journals	Studying Latin with Recitations	Recreation & Duties at Home	Studying Latin with Recitations	Studying Latin & Writing in Journals	Recitations and Duties at Home

甲南英文学会規約

第1条　名称　本会は、甲南英文学会と称し、事務局は、甲南大学文学部英語英米文学科に置く。

第2条　目的　本会は、会員のイギリス文学・アメリカ文学・英語学の研究を促進し、会員間の親睦を計ることをその目的とする。

第3条　事業　本会は、その目的を達成するために次の事業を行う。

1. 研究発表会および講演会
2. 機関誌『甲南英文学』の発行
3. 役員会が必要としたその他の事業

第4条　組織　本会は、つぎの会員を以て組織する。

1. 一般会員
   - イ．甲南大学大学院人文科学研究科（英語英米文学専攻）の修士課程の在籍者、学位取得者、および博士課程・博士後期課程の在籍者、学位取得者または単位修得者
   - ロ．甲南大学大学院人文科学研究科（英語英米文学専攻）および甲南大学文学部英語英米文学科の専任教員
   - ハ．上記イ、ロ以外の者で、本会の会員の推薦により、役員会の承認を受けた者
2. 名誉会員　甲南大学大学院人文科学研究科（英文学専攻、英語英米文学専攻）を担当して、退職した者
3. 賛助会員

第5条　役員　本会に次の役員を置く。会長1名、副会長1名、評議員若干名、会計2名、会計監査2名、大会準備委員長1名、編集委員長1名、幹事2名。

2. 役員の任期は、それぞれ2年とし、重任は妨げない。
3. 会長、副会長は、役員会の推薦を経て、総会の承認によってこれを決定する。
4. 評議員は、第4条第1項イ、ロによって定められた会員の互選によってこれを選出する。
5. 会計、会計監査、大会準備委員長、編集委員長、幹事は、会長の推薦を経て、総会の承認によってこれを決定する。
6. 会長は、本会を代表し、会務を統括する。
7. 副会長は、会長を補佐し、会長に事故ある場合、会長の職務を代行する。

8. 評議員は、会員の意志を代表する。
9. 会計は、本会の財務を執行する。
10. 会計監査は、財務執行状況を監査する。
11. 大会準備委員長は、大会準備委員会を代表する。
12. 編集委員長は、編集委員会を代表する。
13. 幹事は、本会の会務を執行する。

第6条 会計 会計年度は4月1日から翌年3月31日までとする。なお、会計報告は、総会の承認を得るものとする。
2. 会費は、一般会員については年間 5,000 円、学生会員については2,000円とする。

第7条 総会 総会は、少なくとも年1回これを開催し、本会の重要事項を協議、決定する。
2. 総会は、一般会員の過半数を以て成立し、その決議には出席者の過半数の賛成を要する。
3. 規約の改定は、総会出席者の2／3以上の賛成に基づき、承認される。

第8条 役員会 第5条第1項に定められた役員で構成し、本会の運営を円滑にするために協議する。

第9条 大会準備委員会 第3条第1項に定められた事業を企画し実施する。
2. 大会準備委員は，大会準備委員長の推薦を経て会長がこれを委嘱する。定員は3名とする。

第10条 編集委員会 第3条第2項に定められた事業を企画し実施する。
2. 編集委員は、編集委員長の推薦を経て会長がこれを委嘱する。定員は、イギリス文学・アメリカ文学・英語学各2名とする。編集委員長は、特別に専門委員を委嘱することができる。

第11条 顧問 本会に顧問を置くことができる。

本規約は、昭和58年12月9日より実施する。
この規約は、昭和62年5月31日に改訂。
この規約は、平成7年7月1日に改訂。
この規約は、平成11年6月26日に改訂。
この規約は、平成13年6月23日に改訂。

『甲南英文学』投稿規定

1. 投稿論文は未発表のものに限る。ただし、口頭で発表したものは、その旨明記してあればこの限りでない。
2. 論文は 3 部（コピー可）をフロッピーディスクと共に提出し、和文、英文いずれの論文にも英文のシノプシスを添付する。ただし、シノプシスはＡ４判タイプ用紙 65 ストローク×15 行（ダブルスペース）以内とする。
3. 長さは次の通りとする。
   イ．和文：ワードプロセッサー（40 字×20 行）で A4 判 15 枚程度
   ロ．英文：ワードプロセッサー（65 ストローク×25 行、ダブルスペース）で A4 判 20 枚程度
4. 書式上の注意
   イ．注は原稿の末尾に付ける。
   ロ．引用文には、原則として、訳文はつけない。
   ハ．人名、地名、書名等は、少なくとも初出の個所で原語名を書くことを原則とする。
   ニ．その他については、イギリス文学、アメリカ文学の場合、*MLA Handbook*, 6th ed. （New York: MLA, 2003）（『MLA 英語論文の手引き』第 6 版，北星堂，2005 年）に、英語学の場合 Linguistic Inquiry style sheet (*Linguistic Inquiry* vol. 24) に従うものとする。
5. 校正は、初校に限り、執筆者が行うこととするが、この際の訂正加筆は必ず植字上の誤りに関するもののみとし、内容に関する訂正は認めない。
6. 締切は 11 月 30 日とする。

甲南英文学会研究発表規定

1. 発表者は、甲南英文学会の会員であること。
2. 発表希望者は、発表要旨を A4 判 400 字詰め原稿用紙 3 枚（英文の場合は、A4 判タイプ用紙ダブルスペースで 2 枚）程度にまとめて、3 部（コピー可）をフロッピーディスクと共に提出すること。
3. 詮衡および研究発表の割りふりは、『甲南英文学』編集委員会が行い、詮衡結果は、ただちに応募者に通知する。
4. 発表時間は、一人 30 分以内（質疑応答は 10 分）とする。

NEWS

6月30日（土） 甲南英文学会総会

研究発表

根之木朋貴「Slucingにおける継承体系分析」

上野未央「Billy Budd, Sailorにおける吃音の象徴性に関する一考察」

シンポジウム「英語英米文学研究と英語教育の実践」

司会: 有村兼彬

講師: 坂井浄子（富田林立藤陽中学校）

田中基洋（鳥取城北高校）

東田真輔（神戸市立向洋中学校）

堀　和也（岡山市立芳田中学校）

高内由夏（園田学園高等学校）

特別講演

司会: 井野瀬久美恵

講師: 小関隆（京都大学人文研究所准教授）

「ウィリー・レドモンドと塹壕の夢――アイルランドはいかに第一次大戦を経験したか」

10月10日（水） 岩田良治氏（天理大学教授）、「英語の不連続構文の歴史的考察」の論文により甲南大学より文学博士号を授与。

この２年間に会員による次の書物が出版されました。今後、この欄に順次掲載してまいります。出版物（単著、編著、共著）をご連絡いただきますようお願いいたします。

会員の著書（単著、編著、共著）

2006年4月～2008年6月末

松村昌家・村岡健次訳『ある時代の肖像――ヴィクトリア朝イングランド』
ミネルヴァ書房、2006.12

中島俊郎『イギリス的風景――教養の旅から完成の旅へ』NTT出版、2007.2.

松村昌家(編)『夏目漱石における東と西』思文閣出版、2007.3.

井野瀬久美恵『大英帝国という経験（興亡の世界史 16)』講談社、2007.4.

西條隆雄他(編)『ディケンズ鑑賞大事典』南雲堂、2007.5

横山三鶴（部分訳）『D. H. ロレンス書簡集 IV』吉村他編、松柏社、2007.9.

_____.（部分訳）『D. H. ロレンス書簡集 V』吉村他編、松柏社、2008.3

岩田良治『英語の不連続構文の歴史的考察』英光社、2008.3.

松村昌家(共編)『阪神文化論』思文閣出版、2008.4.

甲　南　英　文　学　　*No.23*

平成20年6月18日　印刷　　―非　売　品―
平成20年6月28日　発行

編集兼発行者　甲　南　英　文　学　会

〒658-8501 神戸市東灘区岡本8-9-1
甲南大学文学部英語英米文学科気付