

42

THE JEWISH ELEMENTS OF GEORGE ELIOT'S
DANIEL DERONDA - A STUDY OF GEORGE
ELIOT'S INTEREST IN AND KNOWLEDGE OF
JUDAISM

Presented for the degree of Master of Philosophy

by

William Baker

R. H. C. LIBRARY	
CLASS	YJK
No.	El. B. B.
ACC. No.	99,326
DATE ACQ	June 11.

ProQuest Number: 10096417

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

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



ProQuest 10096417

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an examination of George Eliot's interest in Judaism and the use to which she puts her knowledge of Jews and Judaism in her work, and especially in her last novel Daniel Deronda.

The Introduction outlines the subject of this study and Chapter 1 traces George Eliot's early Jewish knowledge. Chapter 2 is concerned with the development and extension of that knowledge in London and Germany through George Eliot's acquaintance with the work of Heine and Spinoza. Chapter 3 examines her philosophical interests and periodical reviewing, consideration of which leads in Chapter 4 to an analysis of her use of Jewish material in her early work, The Lifted Veil, Romola, The Spanish Gypsy. Chapter 5 deals with Europe at her time, her knowledge of Anti-Semitism and her reading of work dealing with the Jews and Chapter 6 looks at George Eliot's knowledge and use of Jewish Historians and the work of Jehuda Halevi in Daniel Deronda.

Chapter 7 consists of a discussion of the Jewish characters of Daniel Deronda. This is followed by a Conclusion in which "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" is considered, George Eliot's intentions summarised and the particular qualities of Daniel Deronda's greatness enumerated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should particularly like to thank Professor Barbara Hardy for allowing me to taste her deep knowledge of George Eliot. The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, New York, and the Jewish Memorial Council, London, assisted me with grants, as did Royal Holloway College, University of London. The Pforzheimer material is reproduced by kind permission of the Director of the Pforzheimer Library. I am indebted to the Librarians and staff of the Moccata Library, University College, London; the Pforzheimer Library, New York; the University of London Library; the Royal Holloway College Library; Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square; the Rare Book Room, Yale University Library; The British Museum and other libraries. Mr. J. C. Ross gave me much valuable assistance. My greatest debts are to my wife and to my mother without whose help nothing would have been achieved.

List of Abbreviations used in Footnotes

1. The Works of George Eliot

The references are taken from the First Editions (if published in volumes) or Parts (in the case of Daniel Deronda). Where there is serial publication, as with Romola, the name of the magazine, followed either by date or volume number and page, is given.

The following abbreviations are used:

The Lifted Veil., LV., followed by chapter, page.

Romola., R., Cornhill, volume, chapter, page.

Felix Holt., F.H., volume, chapter, page

The Spanish Gypsy., S.G., page

Daniel Deronda., D.D., book, chapter, page.

Large Roman numerals refer to Volume or Book, small to chapter; all page references are in arabic numerals.

2. Magazines, periodicals, newspapers

i. Contemporary. These appear in footnotes with title, except for Westminster Review, which appears as W.R. Fortnightly Review, as F.R.

ii. Modern. These appear with accepted abbreviations, i.e. Victorian Studies, as V.S.

3. Books. These are given their full titles and the editions used its date of publication.

The George Eliot Letters (edited by Gordon S. Haight). Volumes I - VII, Referred to as L., followed by volume number and page.

George Eliot A Biography by Gordon S. Haight is referred to as Biography.

George Eliot's Life as Revealed by Her Letters and Journals by J.W. Cross, 3 volumes 1885 is referred to as J.W. Cross followed by volume number and page.

4. Manuscripts

Commonplace Book. = George Eliot's Commonplace Book 1868-9

G.E. - J. = George Eliot's Journal, 1861-77

G.H.L. - J. = George Henry Lewes's Journal 1 June 1866 - 6 May 1870

G.H.L. - D. = George Henry Lewes's Diary, 1869 - 1876

5. [] = Matter supplied by G.S. Haight in his Letters or matter supplied by W. Baker

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction.	6 - 16.
Chapter 1. <u>Early Influences - "Everything Specifically Jewish is of a Low Grade."</u>	17 - 39.
Chapter 2. <u>Contact with Jewish Thought in the 1850's: The 1854 Visit to Germany: Heine: Spinoza.</u>	41 - 69.
Chapter 3. <u>The Development of George Eliot's Jewish Interests During the 1850's.</u>	70 - 93.
Chapter 4. <u>Jewish Material in the Lifted Veil, Romola, The Spanish Gypsy.</u>	94 - 132.
Chapter 5. <u>Historical and Literary Sources of "Daniel Deronda".</u>	133 - 154.
Chapter 6. <u>Jewish Historians, Jewish Mysticism and Jehuda Halevi.</u>	155 - 186.
Chapter 7. <u>The Jewish Characters of "Daniel Deronda".</u>	187 - 254.
Chapter 8. <u>Conclusion.</u>	255 - 260.
<u>Bibliography.</u>	261 - 281.
<u>Appendix.</u> Joseph Jacobs, "Mordecai: A Protest Against the Critics."	282 - 304.

INTRODUCTION

For a novel which has had a profound effect upon Jewish aspirations, Daniel Deronda has yet to receive its due recognition. Eliezer ben Jehuda, I.L.Peretz, Gordan, Smolensky and Lilienblum were all influenced by it and gained encouragement from it for their ambitions to see the restoration of Jewry to Israel. And on the gaining of independence, the Israelis acknowledged a more humane and tolerant English tradition than the colonial, by naming streets in Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv after the name of the author of D.D., George Eliot.

There is no question but that George Eliot and D.D. strike emotional chords in Jewish hearts. Nonetheless, since the novel's appearance in 1876 with one or two minor exceptions, no serious analysis of George Eliot's knowledge of Judaism and of the use to which she put this knowledge in her creative work, has been undertaken until recently. My own work in this field is a continuation of that begun by Alfred Abraham Möller in his Hamburg University doctoral thesis, George Eliots Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum und ihre Stellung zur Judenfrage. This thesis, appearing in 1933/4, is dominated - as its title implies - by the milieu in which it was written and it may well have been one of the last by a Jew to be accepted in a German University, until after the end of the Third Reich. The opening sections are devoted to an account of the ideological milieu out of which D.D. sprung. They consider the contemporary position of the Jews, nineteenth-century nationalism,

positivism, and current notions of evolution, heredit~~ary~~ and memory. Möller then examines Jewish material in some of George Eliot's earlier works, and discusses briefly certain of the sources of D.D.: Deutsch, Zunz and Halevi. He then examines critical reactions to the Jewish characters by both German and English critics of the late nineteenth-century. The rest of the thesis is devoted to a consideration of the characters of D.D., and the attitudes they adopt towards Judaism. Möller argues that *Deronda's* intellectual path to Judaism is in fact George Eliot's. He concludes with an examination of "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" and a final consideration of the ideological problems raised by D.D. concerning the maintenance of Jewish identity.

The main source which Möller drew upon was J.W. Cross's incomplete and at times inaccurate George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals (3 vols., 1885). Since the 1939-45 War Professor G.S. Haight's monumental seven volume edition of The George Eliot Letters (1954-55), and his George Eliot A Biography (1968), have appeared.¹ Further, some of the manuscript notebooks which George Eliot used for the preparation of her last novel have come to light, in the Pforzheimer Library, New York. These notebooks contain the author's reading lists, plans for the narrative, names of some of the projected characters, items of background information, etc. The tracing of these notebooks, which have not previously been worked on, was the task of many months; they reveal some of the exact material which George Eliot was using. Hence it is no longer necessary to speculate

1. For an assessment of Cross see L., I, xii-xvi.

with regard to many of the references in the text of D.D., as to the sources which the author was drawing upon. For example we can clearly see that in assembling Kabbalistic information for D.D. she was using C.H.D. Ginsberg's work, The Kabbalah Its Doctrines, Development and Literature, of 1865. Also, many of the references in the notebooks can be double-checked in George Eliot's or George Henry Lewes's own copies of the books in question, which are now to be found in Dr. Williams's Library, London. Many contain marginal comments by George Eliot which correspond with notebook references. Although Möller knew of the existence of the Williams collection he did not examine it in detail and he was unable to relate it to the Pforzheimer material. In addition, Yale University and Professor Gordon S. Haight have kindly allowed me access to a microfilm of relevant George Eliot and George Henry Lewes diaries, journals, commonplace books and other unpublished material. I have also had the opportunity to examine on microfilm other George Eliot notebooks held elsewhere.

D.D. has suffered from the reluctance of its critics, to extend their imaginative sympathies. Contemporary reactions to the novel tended to concentrate upon censuring its Judaic sections. Sir Leslie Stephen in his George Eliot (1902) well summed up the reactions and methods of approach of most criticism up to this time: "The Gwendolen story taken by itself is a masterly piece of social satire; but in spite of the approval of learned Jews, it is impossible to

feel any enthusiastic regard for Deronda and his surroundings."¹ The Tablet found "Daniel's acceptance of Judaism as a religion ... revolting",² and the Princess Halm-Eberstein, "improbable"³. The Jewish Chronicle, however, praised the work as a whole and found "Daniel Deronda's meeting with his mother ... perhaps the finest passage"⁴. On the critical reception George Henry Lewes commented to Edward Dowden that "We only see what interests us, and we have only insight in proportion to our sympathy. Now both these fundamental principles are forgotten by critics who ask, 'Who can be expected to feel interest in the Jews?' - 'Who can believe in such a prig as Deronda?' - 'Mordecai is a shadow, ' etc...."⁵

George Eliot knew that the Jewish element would be controversial. In an important statement of her intentions written to her friend and fellow social-novelist, Harriet Beecher Stowe, George Eliot not only explained the reasons underlying the critical refusal to accept the reality of the Jewish parts of her work, but stated some of the causes of her own interest in the Jews and Judaism. Her comments are worth quoting at length,

As to the Jewish element in 'Deronda,' I expected from first to last in writing it, that it would create much stronger resistance and even repulsion than it has actually met with. But precisely because I felt that the usual attitude of Christians towards Jews is - I hardly know whether to say more impious or more stupid

-
1. George Eliot, p 191.
 2. The Tablet, 4 November 1876, p. 387.
 3. Ibid., 26 August 1876, p. 266.
 4. The Jewish Chronicle, 22 September 1876, p. 394.
 5. L., VI, 336-337, [February 1877]

when viewed in the light of their professed principles, I therefore felt urged to treat Jews with such sympathy and understanding as my nature and knowledge could attain to. Moreover, not only towards the Jews, but towards all oriental peoples with whom we English come in contact, a spirit of arrogance and contemptuous dictatorialness is observable which has become a national disgrace to us. There is nothing I should care more to do, if it were possible, than to rouse the imagination of men and women to a vision of human claims in those races of their fellow-men who most differ from them in customs and beliefs. But towards the Hebrews we western people who have been reared in Christianity, have a peculiar debt and, whether we acknowledge it or not, a peculiar thoroughness of fellowship in religious and moral sentiment.¹

Thus her aim was didactic: to teach her fellow-countrymen more about the Jews and other despised minorities, and make them more aware of their essential fellowship with them.

D.D. is not a mere propagandist work. In his George Eliot and Judaism (1878), David Kaufmann argued that, with the exception of minor inaccuracies, George Eliot displayed in D.D. a real and detailed knowledge of Jewish thought, tradition and life. And Rabbi Kaufmann, head of the distinguished Yeshiva and Rabbinical Library in Budapest, went on to say that "it is solely because contemporary criticism has shut its eyes to the relation of the two stories which run through Daniel Deronda that its value as a work of art and its real significance as a book have not yet received full and true expression."² To Kaufmann the actions in the "English" sections of the book

1. L., VI, pp.301, 302. 29 October 1876.

2. George Eliot and Judaism, p.48.

were to be judged from the Hebraic standpoint, and so closely-knit within the overall structure were the English and Jewish sections that, if they were separated, the novel would collapse. Underlying his comments lies a belief in the reality of the Jewish characters, in their hopes, fears and aspirations as human beings. To the Rabbi, so well had George Eliot portrayed Jewish souls, that only Jews could really understand the book. Not surprisingly, Rabbi Kaufmann's was one of the few criticisms George Eliot allowed herself to read. She wrote to him,

Hardly, since I became an author, have I had a deeper satisfaction, I may say a more heartfelt joy, than you have given me in your estimate.... if I had been asked to choose what should be written about my book and who should write it, I should have sketched - well, not anything so good as what you have written, but an article which must be written by a Jew who showed not merely sympathy with the best aspirations of his race, but a remarkable sight into the nature of art and the processes of the artistic mind.

She particularly admired his "clear perception of the relation between the presentation of the Jewish element and those of English Social life."¹

George Eliot recorded in her journal, during the serial publication of D.D., that "The success of the work at present is greater than that of Middlemarch up to the corresponding point of publication." Yet, "What will be the feeling of the public as the story advances I am entirely doubtful", for, "The Jewish element seems to me likely to satisfy nobody."² A month earlier George Henry Lewes

1. L., VI, 378-379. 31 May 1877. George Eliot's emphasis.

2. L., VI, 238. George Eliot - J. 12 April 1876. Book III, "Maidens Choosing" had appeared on 1 April 1876.

had written to the publisher John Blackwood:

I was very sorry to find from your last [letter] that you did not take cordially to Mordecai - sorry because I think it on the whole one of the greatest of her creations, (and of course one likes to have one's admiration reflected in the admiration of others) - but mostly sorry because I knew it would damp her. It has cast a gloom over her already desponding mind; she feeling that the public will in general share your imperfect sympathy. All along this has been her vision of the effect which this presentation of the Jewish ideal would have; and I have vainly combated it. But whether it is liked or disliked do it she must and will.¹

George Eliot felt the need to defend the Jews and to exhibit their virtues and failings. There were some sympathetic reactions to what she was trying to do and these pleased her enormously. George Eliot and George Henry Lewes were "much gratified at the fervent admiration of the Chief Rabbi", Adler, "and other learned Jews". What especially pleased them was "their astonishment that a Christian should know so much about them and enter so completely into their feelings and aspirations"². This kind of acclaim had led John Blackwood to write to George Eliot that, "The praise of the Chief Rabbi is truly gratifying and the most convincing evidence that your intuitions as to Jewish character are as true as all the world admit them to be when you are painting your own countrymen and women."³

Anticipating subsequent criticism, George Eliot wrote to her friend, Mme. Eugène Bodichon, that responses such as Rabbi Adler's

-
1. George Henry Lewes to J. Blackwood, [27 February 1876,] L. VI, 224.
 2. George Henry Lewes to Elma Stuart, [12 October 1876,] L., VI, 294.
 3. L., VI, 281. 7 September 1876.

were "better than the laudation of readers who cut the book into scraps and talk of nothing in it but Gwendolen. I meant everything in the book to be related to everything else there."¹ And recent critics including G. Handley², D.R. Carroll³, M. Beebe⁴, and R. Preyer⁵ have defended the unity of the work. There has also been another radical attack on its structure, this time by J. Beaty⁶. Underlying all such attacks is the assumption that "the Gwendolen story is artistically superior to the other."⁷ I fundamentally disagree with this, and believe that disproportionate attention has been paid to the English story. An intention of this thesis is to redress the balance; and thus I will only by implication be concerned with the unity argument.

F.R. Leavis in 1948 went as far as to suggest that George Eliot's novel should be retitled "Gwendolen Harleth." He dismissed the Jewish elements as boring and thoroughly bad: "A distinguished mind and a noble nature are unquestionably present in the bad part of Daniel Deronda, but it is bad"⁸. In 1960, he revised his previous opinions on the novel, recognizing that the Jew provided the framework of moral values by which the rest of the novel has to be judged. His discussion of Klesmer's role brilliantly analysed George Eliot's criticism of English behaviour, attitudes and

-
1. L., VI, 190, 2 October 1876.
 2. G.R. Handley, A Critical Study of 'Daniel Deronda'. Its Relation to George Eliot's Fiction and to its Time.
 3. D.R. Carroll, "The Unity of Daniel Deronda", Essays in Criticism, IX, 1959, pp. 369-380.
 4. M. Beebe, "Visions are Creators": The Unity of Daniel Deronda," Boston Studies in English, I, 1955/6, pp.166-177.
 5. R. Preyer, "Beyond the Liberal Imagination: Vision and Reality in 'Daniel Deronda'", V.S., IV, 1960, pp. 35-54.
 6. J. Beaty, "Daniel Deronda and the Question of Unity in Fiction", Victorian Newsletter, IV, Spring 1959, pp.16-19.
 7. M. Beebe, Opcit, p.166 and Beaty Opcit, p.19.
 8. The Great Tradition, p.85, 82. Leavis's emphasis.

culture.¹

Underlying the early criticism of Leavis and the comments of Henry James and others are a refusal to believe George Eliot's Jews and the accusation that she had let her fancy run away with her with regard to the Zionist idea. Henry James's criticism of the novel which first appeared in The Atlantic Monthly, December, 1876, has been extremely influential. It takes the form of a conversation between three characters; Pulcheria, who ridicules the Jewish characters of D.D. and is superiorly anti-Jewish; Theodora, who sincerely admires this novel and finds its world "so vast, so much-embracing!" and Constantius, who praises the conception of Gwendolen Harleth, but finds the Jewish story "at bottom cold". Constantius, who seems to speak for James, casts supercilious scorn upon Daniel's plan to go to the East and his Jewish nationalist aspirations. Pulcheria remarks that Daniel and Mirah "had tea-parties at Jerusalem - exclusively of ladies - and he sat in the midst and stirred his tea and made high-toned remarks."²

It will be seen that the Zionist idea at this time was not so fantastic as James and Leavis seem to feel. The Government of Palmerston had seriously considered plans to create an autonomous Jewish settlement in the Middle East in order to defend the trade route to India, in view of the precarious position of the Ottoman Empire. Such ideas were being widely propagated in pamphlet form during the period and were to be found in such novels as Disraeli's Alroy

-
1. See F.R. Leavis, "George Eliot's Zionist Novel," Commentary, (October 1960), pp 317-325, reprinted as an introduction to Harper Torch book edition of D.D., New York, 1960.
 2. The Atlantic Monthly, pp.685, 691, 684.

(1833), and Tancred (1847), and Mrs. Tonna's Judah's Lion (1843). And the "Palestine Exploration Society", formed in London in 1865 in order to explore the Biblical lands was actively engaged in the drawing up of surveys to prepare the way for the settlement of immigrants from Russia and to determine Palestine's potential as an industrial, producing country. Moreover, it will be seen that George Eliot was made particularly aware of such activities through her friendship with E.O.M. Deutsch.

It was the early, evangelical environment of George Eliot's youth, with its strong emphasis upon the spoken Old Testament word and the life of the Jews and their history, that informed her of the promises concerning the dispersion and return of the Jews to Israel. Furthermore, a dominant, early, intellectual influence and one which was to remain with her was that of Spinoza. In 1849 - George Eliot was born in 1819 - she began to translate Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, the first modern work of Biblical criticism. Spinoza questioned the authenticity of the Biblical text long before the work of D.F. Strauss and Ludwig Feuerbach. Although her translations of the then fashionable D.F. Strauss's Das Leben Jesu, and Feuerbach's Das Wesen des Christenthums, found a publisher, her complete and lucid translations, with notes, of Spinoza's Ethics and of the Tractatus¹ still lie in manuscript form.

George Eliot's translation of the Ethics was completed in 1855, on her return from her visit to Germany with George Henry Lewes, which was a major landmark in her growing interest in Judaism and in the

1. George Eliot failed to complete the Tractatus.

psychological problems of Jewishness. In Berlin Lewes and George Eliot had frequented the salon of Goethe's biographer, Karl August Varnhagen, who had an intimate knowledge of German-Jewish life, for he had been the husband of Rahel Lewin, the leading salon personality of her generation. She had died in 1833, but her diaries, posthumously published by her husband, reveal a person deeply conscious of her Jewish background. Moreover George Eliot's contact with Varnhagen aroused her interest in the poet Heinrich Heine, who had been a frequent visitor to this salon. In January 1856, appeared her article "German Wit: Heinrich",¹ in which, in Haight's words, "there are long quotations from Heine, which provided the earliest English version of some of his writings."² Her interest in Heine was to be important not only because of his illumination of the psychological problems of being Jewish, but also because it was probably through his work, Romancero, that she was introduced to the figure of Yehuda Halevi.

George Eliot took an active interest in current thought about the nature of nationhood and the need of the individual for a national identity, of which the question of Jewish nationalism was in some sense a special case, made particularly acute by dispersal and persecution. George Eliot's Jewish concerns are reflected in her periodical reviews, in her other work preceding D.D., and in her collection of essays, Impressions of Theophrastus Such. I intend to examine George Eliot's work in order to show the development of her Jewish interests and the use to which she puts Jewish material in her fiction and poetry and especially in D.D.

-
1. Westminster Review, Vol. LX, pp. 1-33.
 2. Biography, pp. 193-194.

CHAPTER 1

EARLY INFLUENCES - "EVERYTHING SPECIFICALLY JEWISH IS OF A LOW GRADE"¹

THE EARLY YEARS

From an early age George Eliot read the Bible and thus grew up with Biblical Jewish History as her basic reading. At Mr. Wallington's school in Nuneaton, which she attended between 1828-1832, George Eliot was influenced by her teacher Maria Lewis. Haight writes that "Miss Lewis's serious evangelicalism rested on diligent study of the Scriptures; following her example, Mary Anne read the Bible over and over again during her four years at Mrs. Wallington's". Haight also writes that "The vigorous prose of George Eliot is based on a thorough familiarity with the King James version. To those days can also be traced the habit of introspection, which led to the psychological analysis for which her novels are notable, and a profound concern with religion."²

George Eliot's early letters, particularly those to Maria Lewis, contain many Biblical quotations and references. They show the influence which Evangelicalism had on her:

Do you know a sweet hymn of Dr. Ryland's on those words of the Psalmist "All my times are in thy hand"? I have felt this morning a kind of awe in reflecting after reading the sixteenth Psalm, that the exact place and time of my faith, temporal condition and spiritual advantages were and are the appointment of God. It seems to me the resort

-
1. L., I, 247. George Eliot to John Sibree, Jr., [11 February 1848]
 2. Biography, pp. 9, 11

of those who say to the Almighty, "Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways," rather than the fruit of a humble spirit, to consider our insignificance as mere atoms in the universe a reason for not daring to believe that we are the objects of the special and particular care of our Maker.¹

George Eliot quotes Job, chapter 21 verse 14 and Psalms, chapter 31 verse 15, and she uses the latter as a vehicle for her own meditations. George Eliot's letter illustrates the Evangelical's "daily experience of God - the day to day meditation in the silent bedroom, Bible in hand". A historian of Evangelicalism writes that the demands of Evangelicalism in terms of faith "are simple. Man must experience God.... God must have touched the heart so that a man experienced his own sinfulness and the power of his Saviour."²

As a young girl George Eliot read works, such as John Bunyan's The Pilgrim's Progress, Defoe's Holy Living and Holy Dying, and Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living and Holy Dying. These works are obsessed with the idea of the pervasiveness of sin and man's attempt to free himself from it. Bunyan's allegory impressed George Eliot and its language and forms remained with her.³ In an early letter to her life-long friend Sara Hennell George Eliot compared her own state of mind with that of Christian at the opening of Bunyan's work. George Eliot saw her life as "the shallowest, muddiest, most unblesting stream. Having got my head above this slough of Despond, I feel quite inclined to tell you how much pleasure your letter gave me."⁴

-
1. L., I, 11. George Eliot to Maria Lewis, 7 November 1838
 2. N. Annan, Leslie Stephen, pp.113, 110, 112, Annan's emphasis.
 3. See Mill on the Floss, and Mirah in D.D.
 4. L., I, 150. 3 November 1842. The Pilgrims' Progress and The Political History of the Devil, were amongst the "few books for children, in the Evans household," Biography, p.7.

Harold Fisch in his Jerusalem and Albion The Hebraic Factor in Seventeenth-Century Literature, regards the Anglican theologian Jeremy Taylor as a more Hebraic writer than Bunyan. Taylor, who George Eliot had read by June 1841,¹ opposes "the notion of inherited guilt," and Fisch quotes Coleridge's remark that " 'The Cross of Christ,' ... 'is dimly seen in Taylor's works.' "²

Daniel Defoe in his The Political History of the Devil concentrates upon original sin, and on the Devil's pursuit of the Jews throughout the world. The Devil was not, "satisfied with this general destruction of the whole people of Israel, for the ten Tribes were gone before; but he followed them even into their captivity". Defoe remarks that the Jews were particularly defiant to the Devil who "had no Difficulty with any Body but the Jews". Defoe uses the sufferings of the Jews as a warning against sin so that we may "defie the Devil and all his works."³ The eleventh chapter of The Political History of the Devil consists of a long discussion of Jewish Biblical History and may have given George Eliot an awareness of the Jews as a suffering race.

In August 1838 George Eliot made her first excursion to London and Cross records that "At that time she was so much under the influence of religious and ascetic ideas, that she would not go to any of ~~the theatres~~ with her brother, but spent all her evenings alone reading. A characteristic reminiscence is that the chief

-
1. See L., I, 95, George Eliot to Maria Lewis, [4 June 1841] in which George Eliot quotes Jeremy Taylor.
 2. Jerusalem and Albion, pp. 179, 182. Coleridge, Table Talk, 4 June 1830.
 3. The Political History of the Devil, (1726), pp. 188, 168, 18. Defoe's emphasis.

thing she wanted to buy was Josephus's 'History of the Jews'.¹ There is a possibility that Maria Lewis, or her other teachers, Mary and Rebecca Franklin,² informed George Eliot about Josephus who in his History gave a contemporary non-Biblical reference to Jesus and an eyewitness account of his own life in Palestine at the time of Jesus's birth. On the other hand, George Eliot may have found references to Josephus in one of the many printed sermons and tracts circulating in the Midlands of her youth or from Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living and Holy Dying which contains references to Josephus.³

It is remarkable and unusual that a young girl from provincial England on her initial visit to London should be chiefly preoccupied with obtaining a History of the Jews. George Eliot, of course, was a unique person, but it is worth wondering if there were any especial reasons for her request. It may be that already by 1838 she had begun to question the authenticity of the Biblical texts and hence desired an example of comparative source material relating to the life of Jesus and his times. She may already have become deeply involved with Jewish history. There is a further possibility which I should like to suggest. Perhaps as a girl George Eliot may have had Jewish friends or acquaintances who fascinated her. There had been a number of Jews residing in the Birmingham and Coventry areas for a long period. B. Poole's History of Coventry (1852), for instance, refers to "the death on December 13th 1835 of Isaac Cohen,

-
1. J.W. Cross, I, 39.
 2. George Eliot at Miss Franklins's Baptist Boarding School, attached to Baptist Chapel in Cow Lane Coventry from 1832-35.
 3. Jeremy Taylor, Works (1850-6), See Vol. 3, pp. 97, 167.

aged 108."¹ Birmingham and Coventry were used as a base for Jewish hawkers travelling in the West Midlands. Though there were Jews living in towns nearby, such as Coventry, there would seem to be little evidence that I am aware of, concerning the presence of Jews in Nuneaton (George Eliot's birth-place) in the early 1820's. But it would not be an impossibility to establish Jewish residence in Nuneaton and an obituary that I came across in The Nuneaton Chronicle, 11 March 1892, seems to confirm that Jews lived in Nuneaton. The newspaper tells of the life of the owner of one of the main bookshops in the town at the Old Manor House, a few minutes walk from Mrs. Wallington's school. The owner, Abraham Shute, came originally from London and started business on his own account in 1824 as a bookseller and pawnbroker. His career would therefore fit into the pattern of Jewish growth in the Provinces. Not only did he come from London and set up his business but part of his concern was initially pawnbroking, "a common occupation for small Jewish entrepreneurs."²

The possibility that George Eliot met Jews as a girl does find fictional confirmation. It is a truism that her novels are impregnated with characters drawn from her own experience. There is one instance of the presentation of a Jewish character of whom it is most unlikely that George Eliot would have found his actual representation in any other milieu than that of the Midlands of

-
1. Quoted Cecil Roth, The Rise of Provincial Jewry, p. 53.
 2. J. Rumney, The Economic and Social Development of the Jews in England 1730-1860, (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of London, 1933), p. 27, and see Chapter 2, "Dispersion and Distribution".

her youth. Felix Holt, set in the Midlands of 1832-3, contains a portrait of Baruch Nolan a retired London hosier. Nolan is a wealthy and highly respected inhabitant of Treby Magna¹ where

No question had ever been raised as to Mr. Nolan's extraction on the strength of his hooked nose, or of his name being Baruch. Hebrew names "ran" in the best Saxon families; the Bible accounted for them; and no one among the uplands and hedgerows of that district was suspected of having an Oriental origin unless he carried a pedlar's jewel-box.

As I have said, Jews were known in the Midlands as pedlars. Baruch Nolan's reminiscences in the novel, his belief in the English past of "good old King George the Third"², are but illustrations of the outsider being more loyal than the indigenous population: John Blackwood appropriately commented to George Eliot that "That retired London tradesman is a jewel".³

This evidence is suggestive rather than positive. It is however definite that in 1838 George Eliot decided to read Josephus. The effort to obtain his work was one of her chief tasks during her first London visit and it may be assumed that George Eliot obtained and read Josephus's work. There is a copy of The Whole and Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, translated by William Whiston (1810), in Lewes's collection in the Dr. Williams's library.⁴ There is only one passing reference to Josephus in George Eliot's correspondence⁵ and J.W. Cross's reference to Josephus is to the "'History of the Jews'"⁶.

-
1. According to I.Q. Mudge and M.E. Sears, A George Eliot Dictionary, p. 225, Treby Magna is Coventry.
 2. F.H., II, xx, pp. 73-74.
 3. L., IV, 245. 26 April 1866.
 4. Dr. Williams's B. 1 - 4,
 5. L., I, 181, George Eliot to S.S. Hennell, /September 1844_/
 6. J.W. Cross, I, 39.

This may be a confusion on Cross's part as Whiston's translation consists of separate works including, Antiquities of the Jews, an account of ancient Biblical history, The Life of Flavius Josephus, the author's autobiography, The Wars of the Jews, and his defence of his work and Jewish tradition, On the Antiquity of the Jews against Apion.

Josephus tells of the background of the Apocryphal stories and the New Testament, of the Jewish rebellion, the destruction of the Jewish state and Jerusalem, and of the dispersion of the Jews throughout the Mediterranean world. Although The Wars of the Jews are an account of heroism and suffering, Josephus is critical of his own people and he writes that he

must be allowed to indulge some lamentations upon the miseries undergone by my own country. For that it was a seditious temper of our own that destroyed it, and that they were the tyrants among the Jews who bought the Roman power upon us, who unwillingly attacked us, and occasioned the burning of our holy temple

For Josephus there were no stereotypes, the Jews had not virtue entirely on their side and the Romans were not necessarily evil conquerers. He wrote his work for the Roman audience amongst whom he was living after his capture. His concern, according to his Preface, was to record what happened as an historian and to try to suppress his "lamentations".

The Wars of the Jews are then an interesting example of historical writing. They illustrate - as indeed does Josephus's

1. The Whole and Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, 3, 246.

own life - the intricacies of human motivation. Josephus became an assimilated Roman living at peace under the conquerors of Palestine, Vespasian and Titus. He has gone down in Jewish memory as a collaborator and he must have been convinced that the only possibility of improving the conditions of his country was by submission and co-operation. Josephus, by implication, given the conditions and audience for whom he was writing, longed for the restoration of his country according to the Prophetic Books. He did lament Israel's destruction and his account of resistance at Massada, in its simple statement of events, could not have failed to move George Eliot to sympathy for a group who took their own lives as an assertion of their remaining freedom rather than surrender and live under a foreign yoke.¹

George Eliot's reading of the Old Testament as a child would have made her aware of the content of the Prophtic Books and their message of a spiritual physical exile and then return to Israel. Joseph Klausner in The Messianic Idea in Israel from its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah deals with the Prophetic ideas. He analyses the concept of a twofold Messiah, political and spiritual, and writes that "The political part of the belief in the Messiah took ... first place during periods of trouble and distress precisely because it proclaimed comfort and the hope that political freedom would return to the Jewish people." The political

1. Josephus, The Wars of the Jews, IV, pp. 257-272.

elements in Jewish Messianism come to the fore after the seige of Jerusalem by the Emperor Vespasian.¹ The growth of Zionism is a combination of spiritual and universalistic ideas and political national ideas.

The paradox between suffering, general humanity, the spiritual return, and the practical political, occurs in Josephus. He did not blame the Romans entirely for the destruction of Jerusalem. But, "the misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to those of the Jews, are not so considerable as they were; while the authors of them were not foreigners neither. This makes it impossible for me to contain my lamentations."²

Although Josephus blames the Jews for their defeat, in his defence of his account of Jewish history, Against-*Apion*, he idealistically writes, "There ought ... to be but one temple for one God; for likeness is the constant foundation of agreement. This temple ought to be common to all men, because he is the common God of all men."³ In practice the temple could not be common to all men as it had been destroyed. The reality of the situation counterpoints the ideal. And this conflict between what has happened to the Jews and what ought to be, also begins to trouble George Eliot.

1. J.Klausner, The Messianic Idea, p. 11, and see p. 394.

2. Josephus, The Wars of the Jews, III, 246.

3. Josephus, Against Apion, II, 357.

Foleshill 1841 - 1849: Hennell, Strauss and Spinoza.

Mathilde Blind¹ wrote that before beginning Charles Christian Hennell's² Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity in late 1841, George Eliot read the Bible through again. From Hennell's work George Eliot would have gained some knowledge of post-Biblical Jewish interpretation. Josephus would have given her some introduction to the more specifically Zionist ideal of a Jewish physical restoration after captivity and dispersion. Hennell referred to that kind of vision when he wrote that: "At Babylon Jacob or Israel was like a plant growing on a harsh soil. The nation was in slavery, and had none of the beauty and splendour of an independent people." For Hennell the restoration of Israel will come with the expiation of sin, "when the people have ~~then~~ thoroughly repented of their sins, and gone through the penalty decreed, Jacob shall be restored as a nation; a fresh race of Jews shall spring up, and become a firm and flourishing people."

-
1. Mathilde Blind [Cohen] (1841-1896), Jewish poetess, friend of George Eliot. In her biography George Eliot, 1883, Blind wrote that even before George Eliot became involved with the intellectual circle at Rosehill Coventry she acquired "some knowledge of Hebrew by her own un-assisted efforts." p. 24. The Arbury Estate Library (now in Warwickshire County Archives) contains eighteenth-century Hebrew Grammar Books. Although George Eliot's father worked on the Estate there seems to be no evidence that George Eliot, as a very small girl or later, had access to the Library.
 2. Charles Christian Hennell (1809-50), scholar and Biblical critic.

He quotes Lamentations verse five chapter seven, "Our fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities."¹ And in D.D.² Mirah and Mordecai Lapidoth suffer for the sins of their father.

In analysis of the book George Eliot wrote for Chapman's Analytical Catalogue in 1852 Hennell's main concerns were indicated,

Having sought to show ... that a belief in miracles is not entailed on us by the fact of the early growth of Christianity, the author enters on the enquiry whether the claims of the Evangelical writers on our credence are such as to sustain the miraculous part of their narratives. The answer is in the negative, Passages are adduced from the Old Testament, and from the Apocryphal and Rabbinical writings, to show that there is scarcely anything absolutely original in the teaching of Jesus;

and in a letter to Charles Bray, S.S.Hennell wrote, "The Jews held more rational notions concerning the Deity than any other ancient nations, ... they were the first people amongst whom the belief in one universal and beneficent Creator was made part of their religious system."⁴

1. Inquiry, pp. 362, 364, 365.

2. Cf. Mordecai's "Mine was the lot of Israel. For the sin of the father my soul must go into exile." D.D., VI, xliii, 260.

3. J.W.Cross, New Edition [1887] pp. 62-63.

4. Charles Hennell to Charles Bray, 21 February 1837. Quoted S.S.Hennell, C.C.Hennell, A Memoir, 1899 (private circulation) pp. 36-37.

In summarising the Rabbinical attitudes to Chapter 53 of Isaiah, Hennell stated that they make no mention of Jesus Christ and he specifically discussed the views of two great Rabbinical interpreters, David Kimchi¹ and Aben Ezra.² Of the Book of Isaiah, Hennell explained that it "was a favourite ... among the Jews, from the beauty of its imagery and the grandeur of its views concerning their nation, which it represents as destined to a splendid revival".³ The Book of Daniel to Hennell, and to Rabbinic commentators, gives a prophecy of persecution (the "abomination of desolation").⁴ Not only does Hennell refer to Kimchi and Aben Ezra but to Rabbi Jochanan ben Eliezer,⁵ and Maimonides, to the Talmud,⁶ the Mishna,⁷ the Gemara,⁸

-
1. David Kimchi (c1160-c1235) Franco-Spanish Rabbi whose commentaries influenced 1611 A.V. See Inquiry, p 365.
 2. Aben Ezra (c1092-c1167). Biblical Commentator and Poet. Friend of Jehuda Halevi, who dedicated poems to him. Ezra used Cordoba and Toledo as bases for wandering around the Spanish Jewish communities as a scholar and poet. See Inquiry, p.366.
 3. Inquiry, p.368.
 4. See Inquiry, p.378 and Cf. George Eliot on "the prophecy of Daniel" by which she was deeply moved. L., I, 242. George Eliot to S.S. Hennell 27 November 1848
 5. Jochanan ben Eliezer, second-century C.E. rabbi whose additions to the second part of the Talmud were said to have completed the Jerusalem Talmud, 469 C.E.
 6. Talmud: Literally 'Teachings', many notes on, in George Eliot Notebooks.
 7. Mishna: Legal codification; again George Eliot made many notes on.
 8. Gemara: Commentary on, and supplement to, Mishna: again many notes on.

and the Zohar.¹ In that way George Eliot probably gained her first knowledge of specific Jewish post-Biblical schools of interpretation of the Old Testament and in C.C.Hennell's work she would have found the two interests to which she returned again and again in Judaism, Jewish suffering and the long tradition of Jewish historical interpretation.

George Eliot's acquaintance with the Bray Family at Rosehill, with Sara Hennell and the Sibrees,² led to her introduction into a milieu of fervent discussion on comparative religion and the historical origins of the Scriptures.³ In 1840, owing to the influence of Carlyle's work, and partly due to her own inclinations, George Eliot began to learn German. It was to Germany that she looked for historical criticism of the Bible and to thoroughness in scholarship. From German scholarship, George Eliot gained most of her theoretical Jewish knowledge not only before she settled in London, but for long after.⁴

The development of George Eliot's knowledge of Hebraic words and concepts was assisted by her translation of D.F.Strauss's Das Leben Jesu, which she was working on from January 1844 to April

1. See Chapter 6 of this thesis. Hennell describes the "ancient Rabbinical writings" - Talmud, Zohar and the Midrashic books, Inquiry, pp. 452-453.

3. For an account of this see L., I, 89-168; and Biography, pp. 32-67.

2. For the Sibrees, see L., I, lxxiv.

4. Most of the scholars to whom she refers for help with the composition of D.D., for example - Geiger, Sachs, Zunz - were German Jews. For a much fuller discussion of this see Chapter 6, and the reading lists in her Notebooks.

1846. In a letter written to Sara Sophia Hennell during the Spring of 1846, George Eliot shows knowledge of small details concerning the Passover. She writes that "the eve of the passover was not the proper time for eating the Paschal meal." She names the Jewish months and observes that the Jewish day runs from sunset to sunset the following day.¹ I am not suggesting that Strauss would have been the first source open to her as to Jewish dates or points of detail - Josephus would have given her the Jewish dating. Nor would I say that George Eliot was unaware of Hebrew before beginning Strauss.² He deepened her awareness of the intricacy involved in Biblical commentary. Her intuitive perceptive awareness of what was important in Biblical commentaries demonstrated in a letter she wrote to Sara Hennell on /13 June 1845/ concerning the difficulty she was having translating Strauss on Leviticus verse ~~eighteen~~ chapter sixteen:

There is one word I must mention, - Azazel is the word put in the original of the O.T. for the scape-goat. Now I imagine there is some dubiousness about the meaning and that Strauss would not think it right to translate scape-goat, because from the tenor of his sentence he appears to include Azazel with the evil demons. I wonder if it be supposed by anyone that Azazel is in any way a distinct being from the goat. I know no Hebrew Scholar, and have access to no Hebrew Lexicon.³

-
1. L., I, 213. George Eliot to S.S.Hennell, Folshill, April 1846, George Eliot's emphasis.
 2. George Eliot displays some knowledge of Hebrew in letter to Maria Lewis, L., I, 105. 3/4/ September 1841. However, M.Blind specifically states that George Eliot "had taught herself Hebrew when translating the Leben Jesu", George Eliot, p. 203.
 3. L., I, 195. George Eliot's emphasis.

Her imagination was correct as the Hexicon would have testified.

The A.V. translation¹ "scapegoat" was adapted from Bible commentators who took the view of certain Jewish translations that the word "Azazel" was the name of a demon in the wilderness: in other words, the goat driven or escaping, into the wilderness. In the Talmud, "Azazel" was translated by "steep mountain", and applied to the rock in the wilderness from which an animal was thrown. In fact, "Azazel" was not a proper name but a rare noun meaning "entire removal" and an old technical term for the entire expiation of the sin and guilt of a community "symbolised by the sending away of the goat into the wilderness."²

George Eliot in [1845] was not aware of the centuries of exposition which her question concerning "Azazel" would uncover. Strauss's discussion of Jewish concepts of the Messiah was a useful instance of George Eliot's early introduction to Biblical and post-Biblical differences of interpretation and to her knowledge of Messianic concepts. Strauss's discussion was also relevant to the differences in the meaning of the word "Azazel" which puzzled George Eliot. Strauss writes, "the Old Testament, while it does indeed contain the doctrine of an expiation of the sins of the people to take place at the messianic era . . . has no trace of this expiation being effected by the suffering and death of the Messiah."³ Strauss then went on to argue that there were in late Jewish writings

-
1. Leviticus, xvi, 8, "and Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats: one lot for the Lord and the other lot for the scapegoat."
 2. The Pentateuch and Haftorahs, Ed. J.H.Hertz, p. 481.
 3. D.F.Strauss, The Life of Jesus, Vol. 3, p. 59.

Passages in which a suffering of the Messiah is spoken of, and in which this suffering is even represented as vicarious, on behalf of the people:²¹ but first, this is only a suffering, and no death of the Messiah; secondly, it befalls him either before his descent into earthly life, in his pre-existence,²² or during the concealment in which he keeps himself from his birth until his appearance as Messiah.²³

There is here a summary of Judaic spiritual, rather than political, thought on the Messianic Concept.¹

Strauss's footnotes would have given their translator a basis for much Jewish knowledge. Each note referred not only to a different school of Rabbinic interpretation but to different periods of interpretation: "No. 21" referred to "Pesikta in Abkath Rochel", to a part of the homiletic type of literal exegesis of late Rabbinic times found in the Midrash;² "No. 22" contained a reference to "The Zohar", a mystical exegesis probably a product of the thirteenth century Spanish-Judaic period; "No. 23" had as its explanation "Gemara Sanhedrin", in other words, sections of the Babylonian Talmud.³ Thus from one page of Strauss,⁴ George Eliot would have gained knowledge of Judaic concepts of the Messiah, detail as to Jewish exegesis, its composite parts and periods. And in the notebooks used in the preparation of Daniel Deronda we shall see that George Eliot made copious notes on such terms as the "Zohar".

Strauss's method was to treat the Biblical accounts of Jesus as myths. He defined myth as "marvellous and unhistorical extravagant

-
1. On the differences between the Jewish and Christian Doctrines of the Messiah see J.Klausner, pp. 519-531.
 2. Probably a product of fourth century C.E.
 3. In its present state by the middle of the eighth-century C.E.
 4. D.F.Strauss, Vol. 3, p. 63.

tales used to demonstrate a moral". His aim in Das Leben Jesu is to remove the supernatural element in the New Testament. He looks upon the New Testament as "a beautiful, sacred poem of the human race....[which] exhibits to us in the life of an individual what man ought to be, and, united with him by following his doctrines and examples, can actually become."¹ One of the long term results of Strauss's approach upon George Eliot was to lead her to become more and more mythological, to become absorbed in the history of legends and the origins of nations, and she came to believe that one legend was comparative to another and in that way illuminated certain common qualities in humanity.²

Strauss's work provides the basis for some of the elements of George Eliot's last novel. In his discussions of Jesus's power to cast out the devil Strauss wrote that the knowledge of opinions on demonics in Jewish thought would prove helpful. In a footnote on Matthew verse two chapter fourteen³ Strauss mentioned that there were differences in meaning in the Hebrew words "Ibbur" and "Gilgul". He said that "Gilgul" meant "the passage of disembodied souls into the bodies of infants, while in the process of formation, ... according to which the soul of a dead person might unite itself to that of a living one, and to its

1. D.F.Strauss. Vol.3 pp.430-431.

2. See Pforzheimer, Notebooks.

4. Matthew xiv, 2. "It is John the Baptist, he is risen from the dead".

power." In the same footnote he referred to "a good spirit who had entered into a prophet for the strengthening of his power as according to a later Jewish idea the soul of Seth was united to that of Moses, and again the souls of Moses and Aaron to that of Samuel."¹ Such an idea is close to Wordsworth's perception of the

Commemoration holy, that unites
The living generation with the dead;²

George Eliot uses the idea of the transmigration of souls in handling the relationship of Mordecai and Daniel Deronda. She probably came across the idea when she was translating Strauss, as early as 1846, and the idea remained with her to be used fictionally in D.D. One of the reasons, I suggest, for the appeal of the idea of transmigration to George Eliot was that it contained a practical application of a universal ideal of the living learning from the dying and dead. Indeed, an immediate effect of Das Leben Jesu, was to leave George Eliot with the feeling for humanity as a whole rather than for any particular nation or racial group. However, I would hesitate to go as far as L.H.Kriefall who regards Das Leben Jesu as the major influence upon D.D.³

-
1. D.F.Strauss, Vol. 2, p. 244, fn. 22.
 2. Wordsworth, "ode 1815", lines 66-7 in "Poems dedicated to National Independence and Liberty", The Poetical Works of W.Wordsworth, Ed. E.de Selincourt, H.Darbishire, 3, 154. and lines quoted Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.122.
 3. A good deal has been written on George Eliot's debts to Strauss and the importance of Das Leben Jesu for her intellectual development. Little has been said concerning the specific Hebraic content of Strauss. For instance, Luther Harry Kreifall in his unpublished doctoral dissertation: A Victorian Apocalypse: A Study of George Eliot's Daniel Deronda and its relation to D.F. Strauss Das Leben Jesu, concentrates on the Christian aspects of Strauss ~~in~~ and their effect on D.D. and he emphasises the Christian content of both.

Before and after her work on Strauss George Eliot used Spinoza and probably his Tractatus Theologico Politicus.¹ To Spinoza, the Jews were not a unique group. He argued in Chapter 3 of T.T.P. that the Jews had maintained their historical continuity as they had preserved the historical continuity of their institutions. Thus, in Spain, those Jews who had broken away from their past disappeared as Jews even though they had remained alive. For Spinoza, the national existence of a people was preserved in the continuity of its social inheritance and not in its mere biological continuity. The Jews were unique only in so far as they had maintained their institutions. It was because of the very preservation of socio-political institutions that they had been persecuted as they had separated themselves from other peoples. To Spinoza one nation or race was not any more or less gifted than another, and "in regard to intellect and true virtue, every nation is on a par with the rest, and God has not in these respects chosen one people rather than another."²

In spite of Spinoza's rationalist explanations of Biblical events,³ and his arguments for humanity as a whole rather than one

-
1. References to Tractatus Theologico Politicus (T.T.P.) will be from the complete translation of R.H.M.Elwes, The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza (1883). The reprint I am using is the Dover Paperback, Vol. I, (1955).
 2. T.T.P., p. 56.
 3. Haight refers to T.T.P. as "the true source of all the Higher Criticism". L., I, p. xliv,iv. Spinoza was deeply versed in Jewish tradition. Owing to its subject matter, T.T.P. demonstrates that more obviously than his other works. See especially in T.T.P. Ch. XV. on Revelation and Spinoza's disagreement with Maimonides. Wolfson's The Philosophy of Spinoza, illuminates the Jewish background to Spinoza's work as a whole.

particular chosen nation, his arguments in Chapter 3, of T.T.P. do not explain why the Jews had been persecuted with such ferocity. He writes that the Jews "have been preserved in great measure by Gentile hatred,"¹ but does not go on to say that he can foresee this hatred abating. Spinoza argues that if a nation in exile wishes to keep its customs and institutions it will be persecuted. There would here seem to be a tension between the continuation of a nation's individual traditions and customs in exile and the physical necessity of an exiled people having to live within a foreign country thereby having to conform to the ways of the majority of the inhabitants of that country.

George Eliot became concerned during the 1840's with the search for "individual and social happiness."² By that phrase was meant not only her own happiness, now that she had discarded organized religious faith, but the happiness of humanity as a whole. In a letter of [1842], written before she had read Spinoza, George Eliot speaks of "the deep, blue, glorious heavens, bending as they do over all, presenting the same arch, emblem of a truer omnipresence, where ever we may be chased, and all the sweet, peace-breathing sights and sounds of this lovely Earth."³ A thought which is close to Spinoza's vision.

At this period George Eliot reacted almost violently to the specifically racist theories that she found in the novels of Disraeli.

-
1. T.T.P., p. 55.
 2. L., I, 128. George Eliot to Robert Evans, [28 February 1842].
 3. L., I, 133. George Eliot to Mrs. Abijah Hill Pears, [31 March 1842]. Cf. Josephus' Preface to Antiquities of the Jews, Vol. I, p. vi. "there is nothing there - in disagreeable either to the majesty of God, or to his love to mankind for all things have reference to the nature of the universe."

In Coningsby, Disraeli's hero Sidonia mixes truth and fantasy: he relates how the Jews "had defied exile, massacre, spoliation"; talks of "The Hebrew as an unmixed race"; accounts for their survival through "the unpolluted current of their Caucasian structure, and to the segregating genius of their great Lawgiver"¹; and stresses Jewish intellectual achievements, "the Jewish mind exercises a vast influence on the affairs of Europe".² In Tancred Sidonia reappears to revive the destinies of the Jews and the British, the former being the purest and cleverest race of all. Spinoza observes that the Jews "may even, if occasion offers, so changeable are human affairs, raise up their empire afresh, and ... God may a second time elect them."³

Amongst the reasons George Eliot gave her father for not attending church was that she considered that "the system of doctrines built upon the fact of /Jesus's/ life and drawn as to its materials from Jewish notions to be most dishonourable to God and most pernicious in its influence on individual and social happiness."⁴ In much stronger tone she wrote to John Sibree,

The fellowship of race, to which D'Israeli exaltingly refers the munificence of Sidonia, is so evidently an inferior impulse which must ultimately be superseded that I wonder even he, Jew as he is, dares to boast of it. My Gentile nature kicks most resolutely against any assumption of superiority in the Jews, and is almost ready to echo Voltaire's vituperation. I bow to the supremacy of Hebrew poetry, but much of their early

-
1. Coningsby, Book IV, Ch. x, pp. 232-233. In the same chapter Sidonia relates the history of the Spanish persecution of the Jews.
 2. Coningsby, Book IV, Ch. xv. p.261.
 3. T.T.P., p. 56¹.
 4. L., I, 128. George Eliot to Robert Evans, [28 February 1842].

mythology and almost all their history is utterly revolting. Their stock has produced a Moses and a Jesus, but Moses was impregnated with Egyptian philosophy and Jesus is venerated and adored by us only for that wherein he transcended or resisted Judaism. The very exaltation of their idea of a national deity into a spiritual monotheism seems to have been borrowed from other oriental tribes. Everything specifically Jewish is of a low grade.¹

Despite such criticisms, most of her early reading was Jewish. We have only to look at Bray and Strauss to see how great a reliance they had placed upon Judaic sources and interpretations in order to explain Christianity. George Eliot had rejected the religion of her youth, Christianity, so she rejected the Jewish. Yet her unavoidable awareness of Judaism, given her theological interests, made Judaism something special.

By the time she had finally left Foleshill in 1851, George Eliot had a thorough grounding and extensive knowledge of Judaism in its old forms. Although she would have found many references in her reading to Jewish life in Spain, she knew far less about Diaspora life than she knew of the period of the dispersion and of the preceding Biblical epochs. Her knowledge of Jewish suffering in exile was to bring what was as yet a submerged conflict to the fore of her concerns. The conflict was that between a belief in humanity and the awareness of what human beings had done to one another. That conflict only found a fictional resolution.

I have, in this chapter, attempted not an account of George

1. L., I, 246, 247. George Eliot to John Sibree, [11 February 1848]. George Eliot's emphasis.

Eliot's intellectual development¹, but discussed her early interest in Jews, the reasons for her interest, and have attempted to assess how much conceptual and practical knowledge she was equipped with before she settled in London. Her knowledge became extremely extensive, it embraced the Talmud, Midrash and Zohar, Messianic ideas and a knowledge of Jewish Biblical and early post-Biblical existence. Her reading would have made her aware of the life of the Jews in the Diaspora, especially in Spain, but she did not know the extent of the suffering that was involved. It is to the development of her Jewish knowledge in London that I now wish to turn.

1. A much discussed topic. Of older studies see Minoru Toyodo Studies in the Mental Development of George Eliot (Tokyo) 1931, has a useful Bibliography, as has P. Bourl'honne, George Eliot: essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-54 (Paris 1933).

CHAPTER 2

CONTACT WITH JEWISH THOUGHT IN THE 1850's: THE 1854

VISIT TO GERMANY: HEINE: SPINOZA.

I have tried to show that George Eliot's response to Disraeli's Tancred revealed a distaste for extremism and a negative reaction to Jewish claims of distinctiveness. Luther Harry Kriefall in his unpublished University of Michigan doctoral dissertation (1967), A Victorian Apocalypse: A Study of George Eliot's "Daniel Deronda" and its relation to David F. Strauss' "Das Leben Jesu", believes that a negative reaction to Judaism continues to be evident in George Eliot's journal contributions of the fifties and up to the time of her short story "The Lifted Veil" (1859). Kriefall using the evidence of George Eliot's periodical reviewing of contemporary works of Higher Biblical Criticism, argued that George Eliot does not place special emphasis on, or exhibit particular interest in, Judaism or Jewish ideas. He sees a discrepancy between George Eliot's position in the forties and the fifties compared to that of the period of D.D. and T.S. The difference "can only mean that sometime, presumably in the sixties, she made a break with certain presuppositions she had in common with the German critics of the Old Testament about the evolutionary character of Israel's faith."¹ In other words, she denied the uniqueness of Israel. However, I have shown that from these German critics, especially Strauss, George Eliot gained a good deal of knowledge

1. L.H. Kriefall, p.57.

of Biblical and early post-Biblical Judaism and that her response to Judaism was not simply negative but complicated.

Instead of concentrating, as Kriefall does, exclusively upon theological concerns and material, I shall examine the secular post-Biblical Jewish thought with which George Eliot came in contact in the early 1850's especially during her visit to Germany with George Henry Lewes in 1854. I shall argue that the development of George Eliot's relationship with George Henry Lewes and their 1854 visit mark a turning point in her attitude to Jewish religion and culture: a change from ~~an~~ hostility to an active sympathy for, and a deep interest in, Judaism and the Jewish spirit.

George Henry Lewes who probably became interested in Judaism through his reading of Spinoza in 1836,¹ did not disguise his pro-Jewish sympathies. Given the opportunity to act in the public theatre he chose for his debut the part of Shylock and his interpretation made people raise their eyebrows. Charles Sever, the Manchester Guardian theatre critic, would seem not to have objected to Lewes's lack of acting experience but to the Jewish sympathy in Lewes's performance. Sever wrote "There was too much repose, almost gentleness, in his general manner.... his countenance was mild, and in its occasional expression reminded us of one of the early divines of the Church rather than the sordid, malignant, revengful Jew."² Lewes would seem to have been too much in sympathy with "all outcasts"³ rather than with Shakespeare's play or Charles Sever's prejudices. However, Lewes was more of a

-
1. Fortnightly Review, Vol. XXII, 1866, pp. 385-406.
 2. Manchester Guardian, 11 March, 1849, p. 3.
 3. Fortnightly Review, Op.cit, p. 387.

reformer than a Shakespearian actor. His energies were directed towards his co-editing with Thornton Hunt, the Leader, a radical magazine which after the failures of liberal causes in Europe in 1848-9 became a forum for exiled revolutionaries from its first appearance in March 1850.¹ The first edition of the Leader contained a manifesto and a statement of the editor's belief in "the noble endeavour to throw down all barriers erected between men by prejudice and one sided views; and by setting aside the distinctions of Religion, Country and Colour to treat the whole human race as one brotherhood, having one object - the free development of our spiritual nature."² This sympathy included the Jews who were in England the underprivileged group for whom Lewes's concern would have most naturally been aroused.

England in the 1840's and early 1850's saw a struggle by the wealthier sections of Anglo-Jewry for equality before the law and for the abolition of Jewish civil disabilities, a struggle which took³ the form of Jews attempting to hold local and national office without the customary procedure of taking Christian Oaths. Apart from a political struggle for formal recognition by a long established predominantly wealthy Sephardi Mercantile community,⁴ the period saw the growth of the Ashkenazi community. There was also a steady flow of immigration, especially of destitute Jews, from Russia, Poland and Holland,⁵ and an influx of poor but highly educated refugees who had participated in the abortive European

-
1. For details about The Leader and George Henry Lewes's early attitudes, see Anna Theresa Kitchel, George Lewes and George Eliot: A Review of Records.
 2. The Leader, 30 March, 1850. p.1.
 3. For details see Cecil Roth, A History of the Jews in England, p.258
 4. See Rumney, Ch.9.
 5. See Rumney, pp 8-9.

revolutions of 1848-9.¹ The 1840's saw the foundation of an Anglo-Jewish press represented by the publication of the Jewish Chronicle in 1841. Plays, novels and Parliamentary debates of the period provide a testimony to the period's interest in the Jews. However, the situation of the Jews on the Continent and especially in Germany, would seem to have more directly aroused George Eliot's attention.

The Jews in Germany

Lord Acton wrote of George Eliot's 1854 journey to Germany, which followed closely upon the start of her lifelong intimacy with Lewes, that it "opened out wider horizons." Not only in Germany did she come in contact with important cultural traditions, but as Acton wrote, "The altered attitude towards the Jews, which gradually prepared her last novel, began at this time."² That

-
1. "Jews were prominent in the revolution of 1848 from the beginning. ... in Berlin out of 230 casualties, twenty were Jewish." P.G.J. Pulzer, The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria". Some of the refugees were known by George Henry Lewes and George Eliot and visited them at the Priory: e.g. Theodor Goldstücker (1821-72), who came to England as a political refugee in 1850. In May 1852 he became Professor of Sanskrit at University College, London, "his house in St. George's Square, Primrose Hill, was the resort not only of Oriental Scholars of all countries, but of literary men in the widest sense." Literary Remains, 1, p.ix. For Goldstücker's visit see L., IV, 194.
 2. "George Eliot's Life", The Nineteenth Century, 17 March 1885, p.481.

attitude was to be seen in George Eliot and George Henry Lewes's response to the production of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's Nathan der Weise which they watched in Berlin on 11th November, 1854.

In her recollections of Berlin George Eliot wrote that, "Our hearts swelled and the tears came into our eyes as we listened to the noble words of dear Lessing, whose great spirit lies immortally in this crowning work of his."¹ In a letter home to her friend Charles Bray, George Eliot wrote,

Last night we went to see "Nathan der Weise." You know, or perhaps you do not know that this play is a sort of dramatic apologue the moral of which is religious tolerance. It thrilled me to think that Lessing dared nearly a hundred years ago to write the grand sentiments and profound thoughts which this play contains In England the words which call down applause here would make the pit rise in horror."²

On the other hand however, contemporary evidence tends to suggest that English Jews were finding fewer barriers to legal recognition and forms of social acceptance than their German co-religionists.³

An important advocate of this principle of tolerance was Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), whose Jerusalem (1783), expounded his philosophy of tolerance based upon his belief in human reason and in the common humanity of all men, rather than upon an expression of religious indifference or the opinion that Judaism and Christianity had the same roots. The belief that Jews and

1. J.W. Cross, 1, 363-364.

2. L., 2, 185. 12 November 1854.

3. "The fierceness of the pro-Jewish reaction in some German plays of the forties is proportionate to the prejudice which the authors try to fight - a prejudice which was much more violent generally than in England". L.C. Klein, The Portrait of the Contemporary Jew in English and German Fiction, 1830 to 1880, pp. 81-82.

Gentiles could live in harmony was based upon the sympathetic mutual relationships which Mendelssohn himself enjoyed with friends of different faiths. His closest companion was Lessing,¹ who became the dramatic exponent of Mendelssohn's ideas of tolerance. In Nathan der Weise Lessing depicted a Jew who was morally superior to his Moslem and Christian counterparts and more tolerant towards others. It was not Lessing's intention in his drama to imply that the Jewish religion was intrinsically superior to the other great religions of the world,² but that a person's individual ethical standards were quite separate from his religious faith. The intrinsic merit of the personality was independent of the religious tradition to which it was associated. Lessing's moral was that religious differences were unimportant and that there was every reason for individuals from differing religious backgrounds and beliefs to endeavour to mutually tolerate one another.

Such a belief in innate human moral qualities would have appealed to George Henry Lewes in his belief in a common humanity. However, part of the enthusiasm of response to Lessing's drama may well have been due to their awareness of the situation of Jews in Germany. In a situation of mutual tolerance there would be little need to stress the themes of reconciliation between people of different faiths. As Jacob Katz wrote in his work, Exclusiveness and Tolerance. Studies in Jewish and Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times:

-
1. There would seem to be a concensus of opinion among biographers of both Lessing and Mendelssohn that Lessing based his character study of Nathan der Weise upon his friend Mendelssohn.
 2. Lord Acton wrote that George Eliot "must have heard Humboldt's saying that Judaism is more easily reconcilable with science than other religions". The Nineteenth Century, 17 March, 1885, p. 481.

In actual fact, the kind of relationship which Mendelssohn enjoyed with friends of a different faith existed among a limited circle of intellectuals only. Even for them it was but a brief social episode; less than a generation after Mendelssohn's death in 1786, there was once again a social cleavage to be found between Jews and Christians, even in Berlin. By and large, they ceased to meet socially. When occasionally they did come together, both were acutely aware of their different status as ruling majority and inferior minority, and intercourse was no longer free or easy.

During their stay in Berlin, George Eliot and George Henry Lewes frequented the salon of Karl August Varnhagen von Ense (1785-1858). Not only had he written a biography of Goethe (Goethe in den Zeugnissen der Mitlebenden) - his library possessed some of Goethe's letters and Manuscripts.² Though a Gentile, he had married a Jewess, Rahel Lewen, who died in 1833 leaving her much younger devoted husband to mourn her, and to preserve her memory faithfully until the date of his own death in 1858. He and his wife had been the intimate correspondents of Heinrich Heine, and Varnhagen had definite opinions on the Jewish question.

Rahel Lewen, with Dorothea Mendelssohn³ and Henrietta Herz,⁴ were good examples of the response of a section of German Jewry to their situation. In her study of those three personalities, Salon Sketches, Bertha Meyer wrote,

-
1. Katz, p.180 and see his fn.2.
 2. J.W. Cross, 1, p.350. The professional reason for the journey to Weimar and Berlin was in order that George Henry Lewes should be able to collect material for his biography of Goethe: The Life and Works of Goethe, see L., 2, 184. George Eliot to Charles Bray, 12 November 1854.
 3. Dorothea Mendelssohn (1764-1839), daughter of Moses Mendelssohn and wife of the dramatist and metaphysician Friedrich von Schlegel.
 4. Henriette Herz (1764-1847), ran an influential Berlin salon, and like Dorothea Mendelssohn was a converted Jewess.

all three early found themselves faced with the never-ending struggle of the Jew, the necessity of battling against racial prejudice and attempting to rise above it; they consciously set themselves the task of bridging the great gulf between themselves and society, of gaining a foothold of equality in the Gentile world. It was this desire for equality, this passionate desire of the Jew to 'belong', to be no longer an outcast on the face of the globe; that was the cause of the wave of conversion which took place during the nineteenth century.

Rahel Lewen wrote to Dorothea Mendelssohn's first husband, a Jew, David Veit, in March 1805, that at her birth some supernatural being seemed to have endowed her with many gifts but had then added the words which were like a stab in her heart, "Be a Jewess! And now my whole life is a wound."¹

Rahel was unable to escape from the facts of her birth. She was reminded continually of being a Jewess who had had success in German Society, and destitute Jews continually sought her patronage. The anti-semitic riots and demonstrations known as the "Hep! Hep! Riots" of 1819 - the German reaction to the defeat of Napoleon and hence the defeat of Jewish hopes for early emancipation² - affected Rahel deeply and she closely identified herself with Jewish suffering. Just before she died in 1833, Varnhagen recorded her to have said, "What a history! here am I, a fugitive from Egypt and Palestine; and I find help, love and care with you," and she continued, "What for so long a period of my life seemed to me the

1. Meyer, pp 200, 201, 104

2. Napoleon's regime had attempted to put theoretical ideas of tolerance into practice by, for instance, convening a Jewish Assembly in 1806-7 to discuss Jewish-Gentile relations, see Katz, Ch. xv. Whilst parts of Germany were under French occupation from 1806 to 1813, from 1809 the "Code Napoléon" was in operation and the Ghettoes were officially disbanded.

the greatest shame, the harshest suffering and misfortune, namely that I was born a Jewess, I would not now renounce for any price."¹

Varnagen exhibited a perceptive understanding for the situation of German Jews. He frequently commented upon the desire of the German Jews to flee from their heritage. His diary of October 20 1842 recorded: The King was asked what he really wanted of the Jews. He answered: I wish them well in everything, but I also want them to feel themselves as Jews. These words are a key to a great deal: - I was asked, what the Jews really wanted. I answered: to leave them time to become Christians." Varnhagen held that the Jews were in reality God's chosen people and in his memoirs he expressed the view forcefully. He wrote that the Jews were "The progenitors of two religions, one for themselves and the other for the entire world; a people so gifted that their very oppressors and torturers sang their psalms, honoured their patriarchs, and elevated one of their condemned to the rank of a God."²

It would have been highly unlikely that George Eliot and George Henry Lewes did not come into contact with Jewish people during their stay in Germany. Jews represented about 2% of the

-
1. Meyer, p.108
 2. Quoted from Varnhagen's Memoirs, Tagebücher, by S. Liptzin, Germany's Stepchildren, pp 21, 22.

total population of Berlin,¹ and according to Salo W. Baron, the Jewish populations of Berlin and Frankfurt by the late 1840's were no longer predominantly of the lower middle-classes. Instead of being herded together in Ghettoes at a high proportion in relation to their numbers, they had entered the upper bourgeoisie of bankers and intellectuals.² It was likely that in their frequent meetings,³ Varnhagen's observations on the Jewish question were brought to the Lewes's attention. Neither George Eliot or George Henry Lewes in any of the correspondence or diaries that I have seen comment upon their meeting with Jews in Germany,⁴ but George Eliot's response to the work of Heinrich Heine provides some testimony to her first hand knowledge of the plight of German Jewry.

-
1. Ismar Elbogen. A Century of Jewish Life, p 82
 2. S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews (1937), "there was intercourse with the German aristocracy and littérateurs....Life was increasingly moulded in accord with the general standards of 'society'!" Vol. 2, p.247.
 3. George Eliot and George Henry Lewes met Varnhagen almost daily from the time of their arrival in Berlin on 3 November, 1854 till leaving on 11 March, 1855. See L., 2, 184-193, and J.W. Cross, 1, "Impression of Berlin", pp 349-364.
 4. Apart from their response to Lessing there are two references to Jewish subjects, both in the "Impressions of Berlin". Of Varnhagen George Eliot wrote that "His appreciatory groans always in the right place when G. was reading "Shylock", did us both good under the chills of a German audience." J.W. Cross, 1, 353. Of Professor Gruppe (see L., 2, p.192 fn 2), she wrote that "He drew some Jews' faces with a pen admirably." J.W. Cross, 1, 356.

Heinrich Heine

The feeling of "Hass-Liebe" (in English, "love-hate") runs as a continuous theme through the reactions of Jews to Germany. The most explicit expression of that sentiment was to be found not in the writings of Varnhagen von Ense, recording Rahel Lewin's attitudes, but throughout the work of his friend and intimate correspondent, Heinrich Heine (c 1797-1856), who was a frequent visitor at Rahel's salon from 1822¹ until he left Germany for Paris in 1831. It was George Eliot's reactions to the publication of Heine's Sämtliche Werke in 1855 and his Vermischte Schriften² of 1854 which were to be an immediate product of her German visit.³

In her reviews of Heine's later work George Eliot demonstrated that she was aware of the conflicting emotion within Heine to his Judaism. Heine's Geständnisse, his confessions, written in the last years of his life, contained his most eloquent praise of the Jewish people; an attitude in complete opposition to that he had taken earlier in his life. He rejected his previous admiration for the Hellenistic - "I see now that the Greeks were merely beautiful youths, whereas the Jews have always been men, strong, inflexible men, not only in former days but down to the present time, despite eighteen

-
1. In the same year, 1822, Heine joined the "Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden" which had been founded in 1819.
 2. These volumes contained the bulk of Heine's Jewish writing. Sibilla Pfeiffer: George Eliot's Beziehungen zu Deutschland (Heidelberg, 1923), treats Heine as a purely German non-Jewish influence upon George Eliot, see pp.200-214.
 3. See, a) "German Wit: Heinrich Heine", Westminster Review, LXV, (January 1856), pp.1-33.
b) "Heine's Book of Songs", Saturday Review, 26 April 1856, pp 523-524.
c) "Heine's Poems", Leader, 1 September 1855, pp 843-844.

centuries of persecution and misery." His reaction to the nebulous position of the Jew in German society asserted itself in a manner similar to Rahel Varnhagen's attitude a few days before she died. Heine continued:

if pride of birth were not a foolish contradiction in the champion of the Revolution and its democratic principles, the writer of these pages could be proud... that he is descended from those martyrs who gave the world a God and a moral code, and who have fought and suffered on all the battlefields of thought.

Even at his most xenophobic Heine could not help appealing to universal principles. He recognised that "pride of birth" was foolishness, and for him the Jew was a symbol of the universal struggle for advanced ideas and thought against philistinism. Part of George Eliot's admiration for Heine was due to the latter's belief in common humanity and "democratic principles"¹. Of Heine's recalcitrant Jewish nationalism and extreme sensibility to the slightest manifestation of anti-semitism, George Eliot wrote understandably. She wrote simply, revealing her sensitive comprehension of Heine's Jewish feeling. "It is not for us to condemn, who have never had the same burthen laid on us".²

In Geständnisse Heine believed that the Jews were unique, that they provided a flame of morality for all the nations of Europe. Heine's attitude was very reflective of Hass-Liebe. Like Rahel Lewin, Heine had the sense of being lost in Europe and yet not being part of Egypt or Israel. He wrote that, "Judaea always seemed to me like a piece of the Occident lost

-
1. Quoted W. Rose, Heinrich Heine: Two Studies of his Thought and Feeling, p.127.
 2. Westminster Review, January 1856, p.26.

in the Orient."¹ A sentence which reverberated in George Eliot's mind and found its place in her preparatory notebooks for D.D. almost twenty years after she had first read it - Judäa erscheint mir immer ein Stück Occident, das sich mitten in den Orient verloren!² - its haunting appeal being in its conveyance of racial restlessness. However in the jottings found among Heine's manuscripts after his death appeared the comment, "The Germanic peoples adopted Christianity because of their kinship with the Jewish moral principle, in fact with Judaism generally." The next sentence of the manuscript note now reads with heavy tragic irony, but was revealing especially of Heine's attitude to the country in which he was born, "The Jews were the Germans of the Orient, and now the Protestants in the Germanic countries (in Scotland, America, Germany, Holland) are nothing else than old-oriental Jews."³ There was here - apart from the appeal to moral affinity and value - an appeal to a notion of "kinship" which, was an important intellectual influence upon George Eliot. In Heine's case, perhaps, the concept was used in order to rationalise his desire to be accepted by the Germans. It had an important function in his work. For his sense of the Jews being Westerners lost in the East, the term Heine used for "kinship" was Wahlverwandtschaften from the title of Goethe's novel. It was originally a chemical term, used by Goethe to denote the involuntary affinity of people with kindred natures and George Eliot's conception of "kinship" was essentially the same as Heine's.

These ideas reinforced beliefs in the common humanity of mankind. In an early play, Almansor (1820-21), Heine explored the

-
1. Rose, p.131.
 2. Pforzheimer MS, 429, f.27.
 3. Rose, pp.131-132.

kinship and individual love. Of Heine's tragedy, George Eliot commented, "The tragic collision lies in the conflict between natural affection and the deadly hatred of religion and of race - in the sacrifice of youthful lovers to the strife between Moor and Spaniard, Moslem and Christian."¹ It would not be extending meaning too far to equate the medieval Moors of Almansor with the Jews of Germany, the Moors' position among the Spaniards being that of a despised minority group. In the drama, Zuleima, a Moorish beauty, had accepted baptism out of religious conviction, whereas another young Moor, Almansor, had left Spain rather than be forcibly converted. Almansor returned to Spain and fell in love with Zuleima. Much of the drama is concerned with the conflict in Zuleima between the sincerity of her belief in her adopted faith and her awareness of Moorish persecution at the hand of the Christians. She is much troubled by the adherence of her lover Almansor to his ancestral faith. Heine's resolution of the dramatic conflict was to assert Almansor's masculine strength and pride, the virtues of Geständnisse - "The Jews (had) always been strong, inflexible men"² - and Almansor carried Zuleima away to the hills where he forced her to commit suicide with him rather than to submit to a Spanish Christian yoke.

Such a drama had thematic parallels, with George Eliot's verse drama The Spanish Gypsy. That the conflicts which assumed dramatic form in Almansor were representative of Heine's own deep inner tensions were demonstrated by his observations on his drama, "Into this play I have cast my own self, together with my paradoxes, my wisdom, my love, my hate, and my whole craziness."

-
1. Westminster Review, January 1856, p.11.
 2. Geständnisse, quoted Rose, p.121.
 3. Rose, p.102, from Briefe, 29 October 1820. Heine's comment written shortly after finishing Almansor.

That "craziness" would have been the result of such deep personal experiences as the incident in a Berlin Biergarten where Heine was insulted by an anti-semitic female. He chose to express his memory of the incident in his poem "Donna Clara" the action of which is set in medieval Spain. Donna Clara, the great Alcade's daughter, tired of festivities in her father's palace, wanders listlessly in the palace gardens. She has been attracted and seduced by a strange young knight who does not attempt to dissuade her from her anti-semitic innuendoes. George Eliot well described Heine's technique in the poem when she wrote "even in his short lyrics his tears sometimes pass into laughter and laughter into tears".¹ Donna Clara asked her gallant to reveal himself. Slowly and lingeringly embracing her he replies,

I, Señora, your Belovèd
Am the son of the renowned,
Famed, and scripture-learned Rabbi,
Israel of Saragossa!²

The belief in kinship, in love between members of differing races, takes on a bitter twist, and George Eliot wrote that it "makes us feel the agitated beating of their hearts. He indicates a whole sad history in a single qu^estrain ... it is beautiful, simple, and perfect as a 'big round tear!'"

If from Heine, George Eliot learnt some of the ironic undercurrents of a religion of humanity, she also learnt a "whole sad history".³ She not only gained general awareness of the extent of post-Biblical Jewish suffering and in particular the problem of being a Jew in Germany, but a deep awareness, as D.D. provides testimony, of the

-
1. Westminster Review, January 1856, p.28.
 2. Translated by M.M. Bozman, The Poetry and Prose of Heinrich Heine, p.284.
 3. Westminster Review, January 1856, p.29.

particular historical situations of which the "whole sad history" was composed. Instrumental in giving her that knowledge would have been Heine's unfinished prose story Der Rabbi von Bacharach and its two dedicatory poetic lamentations in memory of Jewish martyrdom in Medieval Christian Europe.

At the centre of Heine's prose work is the figure of Rabbi Abraham of Bacharach, the head of a Rhineland Jewish community during the opening decade of the sixteenth-century. During the Haggadah service on Passover Eve, two non-Jewish strangers arrive at Rabbi Abraham's home. They are offered hospitality and place the corpse of a dead child underneath the Seder Service table in order that the whole Jewish community of Bacharach should be condemned to destruction for ritual murder.¹ Of the Jewish population, the Rabbi and his wife Sarah escape. They sail down the Rhine to reach a Frankfurt deserted and silent on Passover and Easter day. The detailed description which follows of their wandering through the isolated Jewish quarter of Frankfurt and their participation in the packed synagogue service may have served as a model for the description of the Frankfurt Juden-gasse Deronda visits.² Certainly, Der Rabbi von Bacharach provided an example for George Eliot of the use of historical Jewish materials as the basis of a prose work.

-
1. A historical phenomenon of accusing Jews, especially at Passover and Easter time, of ritually slaying a young Christian child. For a detailed account see M. Samuel, Blood Accusation The Strange History of the Beiliss Case. The 1840 Damascus Incident was an example from the early Victorian era. There were manifestations in Eastern Europe of blood libel accusations in the late 1860's and early 1870's.
 2. D.D., IV, xxxii, 298-303.

Some of the materials George Eliot was to use for D.D., were also to be found in Heine's collection of satirical poetry, "Hebräische Melodien" contained in his Romanzero. For instance, in his poem "Prinzessin Sabbath", Heine movingly renders the plight of the German Jew. In the privacy of his own home the Jew on a Friday evening would regain his dignity and self-respect, symbolized in the opening lines of the great Medieval Sabbath hymn quoted by Heine in the poem.

Lecho daudi likras kallah -
Lover, come, the bride awaits you.¹

Prior to embracing his bride, the Sabbath, the Jew in the everyday world had to endure contempt and cursing and George Eliot used Heine's description of the Jewish position as the motto for Book IV, Chapter xxxiv of D.D.

The most pervasive influence upon George Eliot of her reading of Heine's "Hebraische Melodien" would seem to rest not in his occasional poems but in his lengthy epic poem upon a specific Jewish subject "Jehuda ben Halevy". The poem is abundantly full of Heine's drawing upon Medieval poetry and legend, and contains explicit testimony to his deep sense of kinship with the Jewish people and their history. The poem, full of Hebrew words and quotations, focuses upon the great poet and philosopher of medieval Spain, Jehuda Halevi (c.1075 - c.1141), who travelled nostalgically to Jerusalem towards the close of his life and became a symbolic figure in whom Heine saw not only the eternal longing of the Jewish people but also something of his own experience. The poem was probably George Eliot's first introduction to Halevi, whose poetry she was to imitate, and whose major philosophical work, the Kusari, she

1. Translated Aaron Kramer, in The Poetry and Prose of Heinrich Heine, p.265.

was to directly quote in D.D. Halevi was more than the archetypal wandering Jewish poet and scholar, a symbol of Jewish restlessness. Like Moses he was a slain prophet and poet. In reality, although he did depart from Spain for Egypt en route to Jerusalem, he probably died in Egypt before reaching the Holy City. Legend would have it that he reached the gates of Jerusalem and before entering her gates was slain by a Saracen horseman.¹

Heine described Halevi as physically

.....pallid,
Proud and thought-engraven forehead,
By the eyes' intense absorption,
Watching ... with searching sadness.

Halevi had renounced worldly pleasures, the love of women and earthly riches for a glimpse of Jerusalem,

She, the Rabbi's central passion,
Was a sad and wretched creature,
Poor and pitiful and ruined,
and her name - Jerusalem.²

It would be far from the truth to say that Heine had renounced the sensual pleasures, but his grand passion was his art, and George Eliot described him as a "Titan chained to the rock."³ Physically in his last years Heine was weak; yet he continued to assert, in spite of all his sufferings, "an astonishing force of spirit", the expression of a dynamic human spirit. Mathew Arnold in his "Heinrich Heine" (1863) essay wrote:

For nearly eight years he lay helpless on a couch with the use of his limbs gone, wasted almost to the proportions of a child ... the sight of one eye lost, that of the other greatly

-
1. See, Hebrew Poems from Spain, p89.
 2. Translated by Louis Untermeyer, The Poems of Heinrich Heine, pp 369,379.
 3. Westminster Review, January 1856, p.26.

dimmed ... all this, and, besides this, suffering at short intervals paroxysms of nervous agony In the astonishing force of spirit with which he retained his activity of mind, even his gaiety, amid all his suffering - he was truly brave.¹

The same could be said of Mordecai's spirit in D.D. and there would seem to be strong physical and spiritual affinities between Heine, Halevi, Mordecai, and as we shall observe, Spinoza.

Spinoza

In Berlin on 8th November, 1854, George Eliot began her translation of Spinoza's Ethics. Spinoza was a consumptive who had sacrificed a comparatively comfortable existence in the large Jewish community of Amsterdam for the position of a philosophical pariah forced to subsist on his lens-grinding, the dust from which shortened his life. He suffered persecution and social ostracism because of his great passion, not for a woman, but for what he considered to be truth, "the intellectual love of God"² to which all else assumed a subordinate role.

George Henry Lewes writing in the Fortnightly Review in 1866, of his encounters with Spinoza's life and philosophy thirty years earlier, told how he had met a German Jew named Cohn in the parlour of a tavern in Red Lion Square, Holborn. In his description of Cohn, affinities between such Jewish intellectuals³ as Jehuda Halevi,

-
1. Essays in Criticism, First series. Reprinted in The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold. Ed. R.H. Super, Vol. III, p.117. For an account of Heine's influence on George Eliot as well as M. Arnold, see S. Liptzin, "Heine, the continuation of Goethe: A Mid-Victorian Legend", Journal of English and German Philology 1944, pp 317-325.
 2. Ethics V, xxxii, Corollary. All quotations from Ethics are from George Eliot's MS. translation of the Ethics.
 3. For an interesting synthesis of the ideas of distinguished Jewish intellectuals, including Spinoza and Heine, see I. Deutscher, "The Wandering Jew as Thinker and Revolutionary", Universities Left Review, 4, (Summer 1958), pp.9-13.

Heine and Spinoza, were, I think made clear,

He [Cohn] remains in my memory as a type of philosophic dignity. A calm, meditative, amiable man, by trade a journeyman watchmaker, very poor, with weak eyes and chest, ... I habitually think of him in connexion with Spinoza, almost as much on account of his personal characteristics, as because to him I owe my first acquaintance with the Hebrew thinker.¹

Affinities between Spinoza and Heine were particularly strong through the fact of their isolation from the community into which they had been born. After his excommunication from the Amsterdam Jewish community - a ceremony which had a particular fascination for George Henry Lewes² - Spinoza's isolation was great. He remained in the Netherlands, yet was not Dutch but a Jew: "Excluded from the society of Jews he found no refuge in that of Christians; nor had he at first a select circle of sympathising friends to whom he could turn"³.

Like Heine, Spinoza had been excluded from his parent community and exiled to another in which he did not feel completely at ease.

-
1. F.R., Vol. XXIII, pp. 382-387.
 2. There are three main George Henry Lewes pieces on Spinoza:
 - (a) Spinoza's Life and Works. Westminster Review, Vol. xxxix May 1843, pp 372-407, which makes use of Lewes's earlier work on Spinoza in Contributions to the Penny Cyclopaedia 1842-3. pp.350-3. (with George Henry Lewes's own corrections. Dr. Williams's Library, A.12.24.)
 - (b) History of Philosophy from Thales to Comte 4th ed. corrected and partly rewritten (1871).
 - (c) F.R. article, in which he repeated, p.394, his lurid detailed description of the excommunication ceremony, first described by him in his 1842-3. Cyclopaedia contribution.
 3. F.R. p.395.

In spite of being exiled from society Spinoza was not bitter, but was known for the absolute integrity and honesty of his life. Such a life particularly appealed to his mid-Victorian admirers.¹ "What he said, he did; what he wrote in philosophic treatises he tried to live in philosophic earnestness. He was very poor, and was often tempted ~~by~~^{-tempted} money, tempted by vanity, tempted by his senses; but these lures were powerless."² Even before her life with George Henry Lewes and the beginnings of her translation of the Ethics, George Eliot was attracted by Spinoza's morality. She wrote in an 1848 letter to John Sibree, at a time when she was unhappy living at Foleshill, that it was difficult

to be great in this world, where there is a tariff for spiritualities as well as for beeves and cheese and tallow. It is scarcely possible for a man simply to give out his true inspiration - the real profound conviction which he has won by hard wrestling or the few and far between pearls of imagination - he must go on talking or writing by rote or he must starve. [run on] →
Would it not be better to take to tent-making with Paul or to spectacle-making with Spinoza.³

Thus Spinoza was a model for conduct, even if a sentimentalised model, before George Eliot had become immersed in her translation of the Ethics.

Three major focal points of interest which were to profoundly and pervasively influence George Eliot emerge from the Ethics: Spinoza's metaphysics; his psychological ideas; and his belief in tolerance (as expressed in the final two books of the Ethics).

-
1. See, F.R. and compare J.A. Froude, his main essay on Spinoza appearing in Westminster Review, Vol, LXIV, July 1, 1855, pp 1-37 and M. Arnold, the Complete Prose Works, Vol. 3, "Tractatus Theologico - Politicus" (1862), pp 56-65 and "Spinoza and the Bible" (1863), pp 158-182. At the end of the latter essay Arnold quoted Heine as having said of Spinoza "His life was a copy of the life of his divine kinsman, Jesus Christ." p 182.
 2. F.R., p. 397
 3. L. 1, 252, [February 1848].

However, before explicating these three centres of interest, the underlying Judaic element in the Ethics must be made explicit.

George Henry Lewes was aware of that Judaic quality when he classified Spinoza as "~~the~~ Hebrew thinker."¹ The fundamental belief in the Ethics, that "Whatever is, is in God, and nothing can exist or be conceived without God"², was close to the traditional monotheistic belief contained in the Hymn or Unity in the Jewish liturgy,

Thou encompassest all and fillest all; and since thou art all, Thou art in all Thou are not separated or detached from anything, nor is any place empty or devoid of Thee.... Thou art and existeth in all; all is Thine, and all is from Thee.³

Although that prayer would probably not have been known to George Eliot in the 1850's there was a strong possibility that she was not unaware of the work of Maimonides.⁴ She was likely to have noticed that in his Ethics Spinoza carried on a lengthy dialogue with traditional Jewish philosophy as represented by Maimonides.

Spinoza occasionally became explicit in his references to Jewish philosophical discussion. In the course of the Scholium to Proposition VII, Part 1, he tried to explain how "a mode of extension and the idea of that mode" were "one and the same thing expressed in two different ways." Spinoza recognised that that was a "truth which some of the Hebrews" appeared "to have seen through a cloud." Jewish thinkers, in particular Maimonides, had written,

The Holy One, blessed be He! perceives His own truth, and knows it just as it [really]

-
1. F.R., p.387.
 2. Ethics, part 1, Prop. XV, p.12.
 3. Genesis Rabbah, 68,9. Quoted H.A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of Spinoza, 297.
 4. For George Eliot's initial knowledge of Maimonides see Ch. 1, p29.

is. And He does not know with a knowledge distinct from Himself, as we know; because we and our knowledge are not one, but, as to the Creator may He be blessed! He, His knowledge, and His life are one, in every possible respect, and in every mode of Unity; seeing that if He were living with a life, and knowing with a knowledge distinct from Himself, there would be many Deities[viz]. He, His life, and His knowledge. But the matter stands not thus, but [on the contrary], He is one in every possible respect, and in every mode of Unity. Hence you may say: that He is the knower, the known, and knowledge itself, all at once.

To discuss Spinoza's Ethics at length would create difficulties. As Hilda M. Hulme has written, in what is probably the most specific analysis yet to appear of Spinozistic elements at work in an individual George Eliot novel, "Fragmentary quotation will not serve, ... to bring out the main force of Spinoza's rigorously ordered proportions".² Discussion of Spinoza's conception of metaphysics by other George Eliot scholars has tended to be oversimplified. Bernard J. Paris accepts Spinoza's work simply as "pantheism".³ Professor G.S. Haight oversimplified when he wrote of the Lewes's period in Germany that while George Henry Lewes wrote his biography of Goethe, in those ideas George Eliot was naturally steeped at [that] time, she resumed the translation of Spinoza, completing the whole of The Ethics. Spinoza's pantheism, more substantial than that of Wordsworth and Shelley, which had stirred her earlier, helped her balance the conflicting claims of soul and society, freedom and duty.⁴

-
1. M. Maimonides, Main Principles (English-Hebrew Translation by H.H. Bernard), 1832, p.87, Part 1, XII, and XIII. George Henry Lewes's copy in Dr. Williams's Library, C.3.21. In Lewes's hand verso side end back papers: "Knowledge in God, 87, conf. Spinoza" and in margin p.87, "Spinoza", Part XIII marked.
 2. Hilda M. Hulme, "The Language of the Novel Imagery" in Middlemarch Critical Approaches to the Novel, p.119.
 3. B.J. Paris. Experiments in Life, George Eliot's Quest for Values. p.12.
 4. L., 1, xiv.-xlvi, of course Spinoza's 'pantheism' is of interest and George Eliot sounds very pantheistic after her rejection of Christianity

For George Henry Lewes "The all-equalising serenity of Spinoza"¹ was not precisely pantheism, if we take pantheism to mean an identification between Universe and God - their being one and the same. Lewes went out of his way to deny that Spinoza's metaphysics were pantheistic by quoting the romantic metaphysician Schelling on the problem.

God is that which exists in itself, and is comprehended from itself alone; the finite is that which is necessarily in another, and can only be comprehended from that other. Things, therefore, are not only in degree, or through their limitations, different from God, but toto genere. Whatever their relation to God on other points, they are absolutely divided from him on this, that they exist in another, and he is self-existent or original.²

The Scholium to Proposition XXIX of the first part of the Ethics gave Spinoza's distinction between the universe and the all-powerful. He separated the "natura naturans", by which we were "to understand that which is in itself and is conceived by itself.... God considered as a free cause", and the "natura naturata". By the "natura naturata" Spinoza understood "everything that follows from the necessity of the nature of God or any of his attributes, i.e. all the modes of the attributes of God, considered as things which are in God and which cannot exist or be conceived without God."³ Everything including those modes as "determined by the necessity of the divine nature, not only to exist, but also to exist and act in a certain manner".⁴ In his summary of the opening book of the Ethics Spinoza recapitulated his ideas upon the meaning of "the necessity of the divine nature".⁵

1. F.R., p 352.

2. Penny Cyclopaedia, p.352.cf.J.A. Froude W.R. p.26, "let us remember that we are far indeed from the truth if we think that God to Spinoza was nothing else but that world which we experience. It is but one of infinite expressions of Him."Froude's emphasis.

3. Ethics, Part 1, prop.xxix, schol.p33 George Eliot's emphasis.

4. Ibid, demonstr., p.32.

5. Ibid, p 31.

He wrote,

In the foregoing propositions I have explained the nature of God and his properties: that he necessarily exists; that he is God; that he exists and acts solely from the necessity of his nature; that he is the free cause of all things ... that all things are in God, and so depend upon him that without him they can neither exist nor be conceived; and lastly, that all things have been predetermined by God not indeed by freedom of will or absolute arbitrement, but as a necessary consequence of the absolute nature and infinite power of God.¹

Spinoza went on to argue that man was motivated by one end, "the good or useful which [men] desire." Man considered the natural universe as having been created for his benefit and thus had the illusion of freedom. In that way the traditional philosophical arguments and religious beliefs for design in nature were transformed by Spinoza into psychological motives which had induced man to attribute the delusions of his own freedom, and of the purposiveness of his own actions, to nature and to God.

Religion was invented by man as a sort of drug. Spinoza emphasised strongly in the Ethics his belief in the relativity of truth and the necessity of man, to exist without opium, to be aware of the conflicts within himself, and to acknowledge the conflicts. In the Appendix to the first part of the Ethics Spinoza had argued that from the ideas of final causes as manifested, for instance in the traditional philosophical and theological argument for design in nature, and the belief that all things were constructed for men, had arisen the conception of "good and evil, merit and sin, praise and blame, order and confusion, beauty and deformity".² He put forward the principle that all the variety of forms of good and evil

1. Ethics, part 1, appendix p 48. George Eliot's emphasis.

2. Ibid, p.50, George Eliot's emphasis.

were relative to each man and that they really were "but merely imagined things", and that men took "imagination for understanding."¹

He succinctly argued that,

no wonder ... so many controversies have arisen among menalthough human bodies are alike in many things, there are more in which they differ, and thus what to one appears good, to another appears evil, what to one appears order, to another appears confusion; that to one is pleasant; to another is unpleasant; and so of the rest.... It is commonly said: So many men, so many minds.²

Here was expressed a conception of the workings of the human mind, and Spinoza's psychological ideas followed logically from his conception of the relativity of truth.³

Spinoza believed that the primary human motivation was the preservation of being, what he called "conatus."⁴ For him the most satisfactory way to preserve being was to be aware of the adequate and the inadequate affecting the human mind. On that, J.A. Froude's expansion of Spinoza's argument was illuminating. Froude wrote,

While we are governed by outward temptations, by the casual pleasures, the fortunes or the misfortunes of life, we are but instruments, yielding ourselves to be acted upon as the animal is acted on by its appetites, or the inanimate matter by the laws which bind it - we are slaves.... So far, on the contrary, as we know clearly what we do, as we understand what we are, and

1. Ethics, part 1, Appendix, p.62.

2. Ibid, pp 64, 65.

3. In his F.R., article Lewes recalled how in 1836 he "had casually met with a passage, ... in which Spinoza maintained the subjective nature of evil." The passage to his mind had "lighted up that perplexed question" on the idea of final causes p.387.

4. Ethics, part III, prop iv-x, see especially Prop ix, Scholium iv-x.

direct our conduct not by the passing emotion of the moment, but by a grave, clear, and constant knowledge of what is really good, so far we are said to act - we are ourselves the spring of our own activity - we desire the genuine well-being of our entire nature.

Such a doctrine would be relevant to George Eliot's novels and to her treatment of her characters. Indeed in a letter she wrote to Mme. Eugène Bodichon on Boxing Day 1860, George Eliot put forward an argument similar to Spinoza's. George Eliot was explaining her own religious position,

As for the "forms and ceremonies," I feel no regret that anyone should turn to them for comfort, if they can find comfort in them: sympathetically, I enjoy them myself. But I have faith in the working-out of higher possibilities than the Catholic or any other church has presented, and those who have strength to wait and endure, are bound to accept no formula which their whole souls - their intellect as well as their emotions - do not embrace with entire reverence. The highest "calling and election" is to do without opium and live through all our pain with conscious, clear-eyed endurance.²

That was Spinozistic not only in the sense that what was right for one man may not be right for another, or in its awareness of the necessity for a person to acknowledge the reality of his position, or in its rigorous distinction between the intellect and the emotions.³ The repudiation of the doctrines of final causes and of the church, or formalised religion, as a refuge from the tempests

-
1. Westminster Review, p.29 Cf Froude's article George Eliot wrote, "I don't at all agree with Froude's own views, but I think his account of Spinoza's doctrines admirable." L., 2.211 George Eliot to Sara Hennell, 21 July [1855].
 2. L., 3, 366. George Eliot's emphasis.
 3. Ethics, part III.

of the world, the "faith in the working out of higher possibilities"¹ - an artistic working out - was George Eliot's form of Spinoza's ultimate and continuous pursuit, "the intellectual love of God"²: the understanding of the finite and infinite universe and the ideas of the application of strict righteous conduct to one's fellow men in spite of their prejudices.

Spinoza, like George Eliot, was accused of eliminating all religion in the effort to escape from superstition. He replied to his accuser, Isaac Orobio, in the following manner,

Is it to cast off Religion to acknowledge God as the supreme good, and to love him with singleness of soul, which love must constitute our highest felicity, our most perfect freedom? That the reward of virtue is virtue, and the punishment of ignorance and impotence is ignorance? and that everyone should love his neighbour and obey the laws?³

In the final two parts of his Ethics Spinoza put forward his ideal as to how society should be conducted. Not only was the individual capable of transcending his limited finite surroundings by pursuing the highest form of human activity and knowledge, "the intellectual love of God" but it was possible to conceive of a total community of individuals who would live according to the guidance of reason. That community would be free, in the sense that no community in which "The inability of man to govern and restrain his passions"⁴ was not overcome, could never be free. It would not only accord full religious tolerance to its members but would be characterised

-
1. L.3, 366.
 2. Ethics, part V, Prop xxxii, Corollary, p.65.
 3. Epist, xlix, Spinoza to Jacob Ostens, Spinoza Opera Omnia (Ed. C.H. Bruder. Tachnitz, Lipsae 1843, 3 vols.) Vol.2. p.294. Frequent refs to this edition in George Eliot's translation of Ethics. Epist, xlix, quoted George Henry Lewes, F.R. p.398.
 4. Ethics, part IV, preface, p.1.

by the positive qualities of neighbourly benevolence and mutual assistance.¹

Such a philosophy of toleration would clearly have had a great appeal to George Eliot and George Henry Lewes in the 1850's, in the light of their personal experience and beliefs. The major ideas and influences at that time were Jewish in origin and their exploration came from the 1854 German visit. It is to the fictional and poetic response to these ideas to which I now wish to turn, but before doing so it will be necessary to briefly examine certain non-Jewish influences at work on George Eliot and her response to Biblical criticism.

1. See his views on toleration in T.P.T.

CHAPTER 3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GEORGE ELIOT'S JEWISH INTERESTS DURING
THE 1850's.

Certain specific ideas which George Eliot came across in the 1850's in her reading of Feuerbach, Comte, Spencer, Lewis and Riehl assisted her in the development of her Jewish interests. These sources are familiar and have been much discussed.¹ So in this chapter I shall emphasize the ideas in relation to the Jewish theme. Alfred Abraham Möller, in his neglected dissertation, examines some of the ideas which affected George Eliot's attitude to Judaism under the headings, "Race", "Heredity", "Memory" and "Tradition". This aspect of his thesis is brief, although Möller does trace George Eliot's change from a belief in abstract cosmopolitan and humanitarian ideals, epitomized in her attitude to Disraeli's Tancred, to the recognition that for the individual his own historical tradition and environment has great importance.¹ It is a consideration of George Eliot's reading, especially its Judaic element, to which my attention must be concentrated.

Of the philosophers influencing George Eliot, Feuerbach is the one toward whom her attitude remains constant. At the time of her translation of Das Wesen des Christentums, (1854),

-
1. For an account see W. J. Harvey, "The Intellectual Background^{of the Novel}", in Middlemarch Approaches to the Novel, pp 25-27.
 2. Beschäftigung mit den Judentum, pp. 14-19.

she conveys her enthusiasm to her friend Sara Hennell, "With the ideas of Feuerbach I everywhere agree, but of course I should, of myself, alter the phraseology considerably."¹ From this opinion she found no reason to deviate later. The attraction of Feuerbach's work is well indicated by Karl Marx in his fourth "Thesis on Feuerbach" which Sidney Hook quotes in his work From Hegel to Marx. Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx. Marx writes, "Feuerbach (s)...achievement consists in dissolving the religious world and revealing its secular foundations."² In Das Wesen Feuerbach stresses the basic emotional nature of man, of which religion is but a projection. He sees religion as "the dream of the human mind" which encourages belief in an objective other in which all of man's best qualities are vested: "But even in dreams we do not find ourselves in emptiness or in heaven, but on the earth, in the realm of reality". The essence of religion is man and the object of religious worship and devotion are fetishistic expressions of human emotion. Thus for Feuerbach, "Nature, the word, was to the Hebrews the product of a dictatorial world, of a categorical imperative, of a magic fiat." However, "If we let fall the limits of nationality, we obtain - instead of the Israelite - man."³

Feuerbach believed that emotionally man cannot be alone, man needs another person and he lives with other people in a community. The expression of man's emotional need is love, which

1. L., II, 153. [29 April 1854], Cf. Biography, pp. 137-138.

2. From Hegel to Marx, p. 291.

3. Marian Evans, The Essence of Christianity, (1854)pp.xi, 419. George Eliot's emphasis.

in religion becomes the love of God, of an idea, rather than the love of a human actuality. Expression of human love is the supreme virtue in Feuerbach's morality, "what wonders does not love work in our social life."¹ What faith, creed, opinion separates, love unites." Man is part of the world, of his present environment and of the continuity of the past, "A loving heart is the heart of the species throbbing in the individual."¹ Man is not alone when he is in a community of his fellow men and experiencing fruitful relationships with others. Sidney Hook explains the significance of such a belief, "Its abiding sense lies in its reference to an undefined natural and social whole of which man is an organic part, and which without impinging on his individual freedom, lifts him to a consciousness of a common lot and destiny with other men."²

Scientific method rather than man is the primary concern of Auguste Comte's early work. By the sciences, Comte meant Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry and Physiology and his six volume Cours de Philosophie Positive (Paris, 1830-1842) contains his positive philosophy, and the explanation of his scientific interests. The history of the sciences seems to show a tripartite development: the theological, the metaphysical, the positive. The search for absolute knowledge, for the final cause is vain. This truth is only recognisable in the third stage of development, the positive, where the pursuit of final causes is replaced by the study of the natural relations of succession and résemblance."³ Comte's objective

-
1. The Essence of Christianity, pp.47, 266.
 2. From Hegel to Marx, p.254.
 3. Cours de Philosophie Positive, translated by Harriet Martineau, The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, 2 vols., 1853, 1, p5.

is to find relations and if possible constant factors between the multifarious elements of differing sciences and his method is therefore comparative.

Throughout Comte's analytic work certain basic factors remain constant. There is not only a three tier stage of development scientifically, but socially, historically and religiously. In The Course de Philosophie Positive, after describing the positive framework of the sciences, he traces a tripartite social and historical development. Hence in dealing with the origins of Western religions Comte argues that "If the Jews had not made a beginning" in monotheistic practice "some other nation would have offered the requisite organs".¹ Society starts with the theological, moves to the metaphysical and then to the positive stage of development.

J.W. Cross remarks that although George Eliot admired Comte's work greatly, "Parts of his teaching were accepted and other parts rejected....she subscribed to the Comtist Fund, but never, so far as I am aware, more directly associated herself with the members of the Positive Church." In her letters George Eliot acknowledges her debt to Comte² but as Cross points out "It was limited adherence."³ The reason for this is ~~due to~~ the fact that the later works of Comte are less scientifically orientated than the earlier work. As their titles imply, for instance, Système de politique positive, (4 Vols., 181-4) and Catéchisme positive (1852),⁴ they are attempts at extending the range of

1. The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte, 2, p.254.

2. L., III, 438, 439.

3. Cross, III, 419.

4. G.S. Haight wrote that George Eliot "was deeply impressed by Comte's Catéchisme Positive, translated by Congreve in 1858, and discussed it earnestly with ... friends. The Religion of Humanity appealed strongly to her feelings but she could never bring her reason to unqualified belief in it," L., I. lxii. Cf. Biography, pp. 300-302.

positivism to propagate a universal political and religious system. Richard Congreve, an English follower of Comte's religion, writing to a fellow positivist just before George Eliot's death, indicates well George Eliot's relationship to positivism, "Mrs. Lewes never accepted the details of the system, never went beyond the central idea."¹, which is to be found in Comte's early work.

Analysis of George Eliot's method of work will substantiate Paris's contention that George Eliot adopts at times Comteian descriptive methodology, and will illustrate where George Eliot specifically agrees and disagrees with Comte and indicate some of the material she chose to select for the composition of D.D. In one of the Pforzheimer Notebooks George Eliot cites examples of suffering and heroism from diverse backgrounds: Ancient Hebrew religion is placed beside details of the Egyptian pantheon. This would seem to be part of her effort to obtain comparative positives; the underlying resemblances between diverse human events, traditions and actions. This Notebook also contains, between pages 75 and 85, quotations from J.H. Bridges's first volume Discours Préliminaire, (1875) of the translation of Comte's Système de politique positive. These quotations, which I examine below, give some indication of the kind of material George Eliot decided to use during the preparation of her last novel.

On page 73 after writing "Comte pos. Pol. I. 333 Eng. Tr." the following is quoted from Comte with an added question of George Eliot's in brackets,

-
1. L., I, lxii. Richard Congreve to Sophia Edgar, 10 May, 1880. For a discussion of George Eliot's attitude to positivism and to Comte, see Biography, pp. 301-302.
 2. Translated by J. H. Bridges, F. Harrison and others as The System of Positive polity, 4 Vols. (1875-77).

We regard Humanity as composed essentially of the dead; them alone being fully amenable to our judgementIf the living are admitted it is, except in rare instances only provisionally. (If our duties are toward 'Humanity' how are the living and those who are to come to be excluded?)

Despite Comte's dogmatism, his conception of 'Humanity' attracts George Eliot. She writes out his definition of the word, "The continuous whole formed by the Beings which converge" (p.82) and she is careful to stress the sense of community implicit in such an explanation. The human being is not alone, he lives with and for other beings in a community. George Eliot notes Comte's explanation:

supposing we knew that the Earth were destined to be shortly destroyed by collision with a star, yet none the less to live for others, to subordinate personal to social feeling would remain to the last the highest good and the highest duty. Those who can turn such thoughts to good account, from the deepest thinker to the most ordinary workman, will always regard these as tending not to decrease but to consolidate man's true happiness. (p.76)¹

Not only is to live for others, to subordinate personal to social feeling the "highest good and the highest ~~duty~~," man is motivated towards achievement and this motivation is a driving force of survival. Mordecai Lapidoth desires to achieve, to fulfil his life by transmitting his vision. He is sustained by a belief in a second soul to whom he will pass on his vision of a Jewish homeland, and refuses to give way to his physical debility and die until he discovers the soul to whom he is able to pass on his beliefs, and thereby guarantee that his worldly existence has been

1. Pforzheimer, MS 429, Cf. Spinoza Epist. XLIX, and Ethics part V.

fruitful. In her Pforzheimer extracts, George Eliot noted Comte's remarks on the necessity of the individual to communicate his innermost thoughts to another being and thereby become part of the wider world outside his own ego,

To minds influenced by the existing anarchy,¹ every collective being tends to present itself as a mere entity, yet none the less it is true that no coherence, no dignity have been or are possible for the individual unless in subordination to some larger composite existence. It is only in dependence on some such existence that we can satisfy our desire to perpetuate this transitory life,² for we thus link it to an imperishable being.

Mordecai finds "coherence" and "dignity" in his relationship to the totality of Jewish thinking, traditions and history when he is able to communicate his knowledge to another sympathetic individual and hence to the world. The individual alone is transitory, in a community he is "imperishable"³ and becomes at one with his past and the future.

Comte emphasises the comparative relations of the sciences, and the close relationship of the individual to the society, past and present, to which he belongs. Herbert Spencer,⁴ on the other hand,

-
1. i.e. a society where there are no shared opinions. Comte sees the France of his own period as a society where opinion is in a state of flux whereas in the medieval period there had been a stable society based on shared opinions. The early Victorians had a similar sense of isolation and of living in a state of flux: See T. Arnold to A.H. Clough (16th April, 1847) in K. Allot (Ed.) The Poems of Matthew Arnold, p.289. Cf. George Eliot to S.S. Hennell. L., I. 264. [4th June 1848].
 2. Cf. Spinoza's ideas of the Conatus: the preservation of being; and the conception of the individual in his idea of a "rational society." Ethics,^{part} III, prop. IV-X.
 3. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.82.
 4. Of his influence upon George Eliot, G. S. Haight wrote: "As his Synthetic Philosophy took form the difference between their merits grew more apparent. He was always seeking a simple formula to explain the multiform complexities of human life". L., I. lxxvi.

holds that all branches of knowledge, religion and morals, have an intellectual foundation; Comte by the mind means the sciences, Spencer is preoccupied with epistemology. In his theory of knowledge, chiefly to be found in his The Principles of Psychology (1855)¹ and his First Principles (1862), Spencer insists (i) that all knowledge is empirical and is based upon sensory experience; (ii) our knowledge is the result of the interaction between the external world and ourselves; (iii) it is impossible to explain individual consciousness merely by reference to the individual himself; therefore, (iv) to understand how the individual mind works it is necessary to study society and social development. Intelligence is the set of tendencies and behaviour-patterns by which human beings attempt to adjust themselves to their environment.

Spencer attempts to demonstrate how all branches of knowledge, how every state of being, mental and physical, are characterised by the evolutionary principle. Everything develops from a primitive stage to a more complicated one. Intelligence is a product of man's continuous struggle with his environment. Man in his social communities adopts acquired, inherited physical and mental characteristics. So Spencer writes in his Principles of Biology (1864-7), "the Jew bequeathes to his offspring the features which have so long characterised Jews".² Spencer believes that everything is continually evolving, dying and evolving. The inherited characteristics, the products of generations of communal experience are constantly developing. He writes to John Stuart Mill,

-
1. The basis of Spencer's psychological ideas are to be found in his article on the "Genesis of Science" in the British Quarterly Review, ~~XX~~ (July 1854), 108-162, an article which George Eliot praised. She wrote to S.S. Hennell that it gave "a new impulse to psychology." L., II, 165. [10~~th~~ July, 1854].
 2. Principles of Biology, 1, 241.

there have been and still are, developing in the race, certain fundamental moral intuitions; and that, though these moral intuitions are the results of accumulated experiences of Utility, gradually organised and inherited, they have come to be quite independent of conscious experience.... I believe that the experiences of utility organised and consolidated through all past generations of the human race, have been producing ... nervous modifications, which, by continued transmission and accumulation, have become in us certain faculties of moral intuition - certain emotions responding to right and wrong conduct, which have no apparent basis in the individual experiences of utility.¹

The working of the moral intuitions independent of conscious experience have an important role to play in D.D. as the actions of Mordecai Lapidoth and Joseph Kalonymous in one way, and Daniel Deronda and Gwendolen Harleth in another, prove witness.

It would be impossible to assess precisely what George Eliot learnt in the field of philosophy from George Henry Lewes as their mutual indebtedness was great. George Henry Lewes would have kept George Eliot informed of the latest philosophical developments. He read Comte's works soon after they appeared and before he met George Eliot had already introduced Comte's work to the English public.² George Henry Lewes like Spencer, is an evolutionist but differs from him in placing greater emphasis upon man's social environment rather than upon his mental development. G.W. Cooke precisely states the difference between the philosophies of Lewes and Spencer. The former

not only held with Spencer and other evolutionists

-
1. 24th February 1863. Quoted by Spencer in his Autobiography, II, p.89, and see J. Rumney, Herbert Spencer's Sociology. Ch. iv "Woman, Family Race", pp. 100-130, for discussion of Spencer's theory of the development of continuous Characteristics.
 2. His Leader articles on Comte of 1852 were expanded into his Comte's Philosophy of the Sciences (1853).

that the human mind is the product of experience in contact with the outer world, that experience transmitted by heredity and built up into mental processes and conclusions; but he maintained that the social medium is a much greater and more important factor. The past makes the present, the social life develops the individual. Our language, our thought, as individuals, are the product of the collective life of the race.¹

Man is a creature of the past as well as the present. Accordingly, the sense data which man experiences are intimately related to the past as well as the present. If we wish to know whether a given sense-datum is really what we think it is, we must reinstate the sensations that accompanied the occurrence of the given sense-datum in the past. Thus Joseph Kalonymos has to remember Deronda's father before he is certain that Daniel is a Jew and the grandson of Daniel Charisi, his intuitive awareness of Daniel in the Frankfurt synagogue being uncertain.²

Lewes refers to the sense-datum as the basic element of experience and finds its origin in external stimuli so that the foundations of mental life are based upon the influences and experiences of the external non-mental world. What a man thinks is the necessary product of his organism and external condition; the organism itself is the product of history and has become part of the history of the race. Experience includes for Lewes "not only the individual experiences, slowly acquired, but the accumulated Experience of the race, organised in Language, condensed in Instruments and Axioms, and in that may be called the inherited Intuitions."³ Lewes places a high premium upon Imagination, second-

1. G.W. Cooke, George Eliot, p.187.

2. D.D., IV, xxxii, 302: VII, li, 40-43.

3. Problems of Life and Mind, 1st Series (1875-5) 1, p.29.
Lewes's emphasis.

sight and intuition, and regards these as positive moral qualities.

The ideas of Feuerbach, Comte, Spencer and Lewes coalesce. Their ideas place primary importance on man's intuitive power and involvement with his total community, the product of the "accumulated experience of the race," his response to the past, and man and societies continuous evolution. Emphasis is placed upon relativism, the examination of the nature of conditions and the type of certainty supposed to occur under particular conditions in the material universe. Ideas of final causes are rejected, as they are in Spinoza, and replaced with the analysis of man's response to the actual universe in which he lives. Most of these preoccupations and influences upon George Eliot may be seen in her July 1856 review of two works by the German sociologist Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl (1823-97), Die burgerliche Gesellschaft (1855) and Land und Leute (1856). In George Eliot's review, "The National History of German Life,"¹ is to be found the basis of George Eliot's ideas on the inter-relation of society, history and people which she uses in her novels as well as her theory of the high function of realistic Art. Her review synthesises philosophical thought and speaks, as Joseph Jacobs put it, "of one of her favourite themes, the appeal of the circle in which one is born even if one has in certain ways grown beyond or outside it"².

Comte believes, as does George Henry Lewes, that scientific truth is arrived at through the description of individual phenomena.

-
1. W.R., LXVI, July 1856, 51-79.
 2. Essays and Reviews, (1891) p.xvi.

Continuous observation of these phenomena will yield similarities which with collation will become valid natural laws. Riehl has undertaken this kind of observation in his study of German History to analyse the "innumerable special phenomena" which constitute the life of a nation. George Eliot believes that such an empirical analysis would be valuable for English society. Her own exclusively English novels, concluding with the appropriately titled Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life,¹ are a fictional attempt at, amongst other things, the study of what Riehl calls "the natural history of our social classes, especially of the small shopkeepers, artisans and peasantry - the degree in which they are influenced by local conditions, their maxims and habits [and]... the interaction of the various classes on each other".²

George Eliot begins her review by exhibiting her readers' ignorance of the real details, as opposed to the mythical ones, of social life. The reading public is accustomed to generalisations and images, as for instance to be found in John Ruskin's discussion of "opera peasants" in his Modern Painters, (Vol. III, Chapter 5, section 13). But to use G.H. Lewes's terminology, the actual sensations accompanying sense-datum in the past must be re-created. For George Eliot "The greatest benefit we owe to the artist, whether painter, poet or novelist, is the extension of our sympathies" and hence

Art is the nearest thing to life; it is a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot. All the more sacred in the task

1. For natural history of Middlemarch see J. Beaty "History by Indirection: the Era of Reform in Middlemarch.", V.S., 1 December 1957, pp.173-179.
2. W.R., July 1856, p. 56.

of the artist when he undertakes to paint the life of the People.

George Eliot insists upon the moral duties implicit in being an artist: his function is "sacred"! This, therefore, explains the theoretical foundation for George Eliot's obsession with accuracy of detail in her presentation of Jewish life in D.D. particularly, and with accuracy of detail in her novels generally. It places in perspective her explanation to Harriet Beecher Stowe on ~~29th~~ October 1876 that her intention in treating the Jews "with such sympathy and understanding as my nature and knowledge could attain to"² was to broaden the horizons and extend the sympathies of the English public with regard to their fellow men. And the ideas underlying such an intention, the moral function of the artist and reverence for humanity, remain unchanged from July 1856 to October 1876 and beyond.³

Strictures as to realism of presentation are followed by a summary of Riehl's description of the German peasants, their various habits, physique and dialects. Riehl finds in his analysis a constant factor, the German peasants "capability of a settled existence." For George Eliot and Riehl this factor is negative as well as positive. It results in adherence to custom rather than "sentiment, ... and in many cases of affection." Like Feuerbach and George Henry Lewes, George Eliot stresses the importance of "sentiment" and "affection"⁴ in human life rather than custom. Riehl observes that in the case of many peasants "general custom holds the place of individual feeling" and must be adapted to the present, though he believes that too great

1. W.R., July 1856, p. 54.

2. L., VI, 301.

3. L. H. Kriefall argues on the other hand that George Eliot's attitude to Judaism before the mid-1860's was hostile and that only when George Eliot's attitude changed did she wish to communicate her ideas, pp 47-56.

4. W.R., July 1856, p. 61. *George Eliot's emphasis.*

an "emotional susceptibility"¹ may be a damaging, specifically urban, phenomenon. This leads George Eliot, following Riehl, to discuss first the disintegrating forces working on a peasant life - the growth of towns and adoption of a monetary system; and second, the relationship of the German peasantry to the revolutionary ideas and movements of Communism with its idea of "Systematic co-operation" which to George Eliot and Riehl² fails to appreciate the egoism of the peasants or of the town artisans. Communism theorises too much, it is not "founded on the special study of the people as they are - on the natural history of the various social ranks," as Riehl's two studies, but concentrates exclusively on a "small group of Parisian proletaires or English factory-workers" which it substitutes for "the society of all Europe - nay, of the whole world."³

As an alternative to ideas of revolutionary social change based upon concepts of perpetual class warfare, George Eliot and Riehl adopt a position of "social-political-conservatism".⁴ George Eliot clearly states her position as to the way in which she understands history and society to develop.

What has grown up historically can only die out historically by the gradual operation of necessary laws. The external conditions which society has inherited from the past are but the manifestation of inherited internal conditions in the human beings who compose it; the internal conditions and the external are related to each other as the organism and its medium, and development can take place only by the gradual consentaneous development of both.⁵

-
1. W.R., July, 1856, p.63.
 2. George Eliot states: "Throughout this article, in our statement of Riehl's opinions, we must be understood not as quoting Riehl, but as interpreting and illustrating him." W.R., July, 1856, pp. 69, 68.
 3. W.R., July, 1856, p.71.
 4. W.R., July, p.68, George Eliot's emphasis.
 5. W.R., July, 1856, p.69.

Her conception of social development has affinities with the ideas of Riehl, Comte, Spencer and Lewes: there is a similar stressing of evolutionary development, and of the close interaction between the individual and his environment; a similar belief in inherited conditions socially and individually evolved; and also in George Eliot the later Comteian synthesis of society and humanity consisting of "The continuous whole formed by the Beings which converge."¹

In her review of Riehl, George Eliot states her fundamental awareness of the importance of the past in the life of man and society and differentiates between English and Continental development:

The nature of European men has its roots intertwined with the past, and can only be developed by allowing those roots to remain undisturbed while the process of development is going on, until that perfect ripeness of the seed which carries with it a life independent of the root. This vital connexion with the past is much more vividly felt on the Continent than in England, where we have to recall it by an effort of memory and reflection; for though our English life is in its core intensely traditional, Protestantism and commerce have modernised the face of the land and the aspects of society in a far greater degree than in any Continental country.²

To Riehl the advancing material and moral power of the middle classes in Germany constitutes a decomposing force in society for their development coincides with "The tendency ... to do away with the distinctive historical character"³ of society. Unlike the peasantry and nobility, the middle classes and a group whose "elements are derived alike from the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the peasantry" - Riehl's "second" and "fourth" estates - are

-
1. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.82.
 2. W.R., July 1856, p.70.
 3. Ibid, p.75.

in perpetual motion. The middle classes live by competition, the fourth estate "by the perpetual abrasion of the other great social group".¹ Consequently Riehl extols the settled peasantry and sees in the nobility a peasantry on a higher level.

This extolling of the peasantry and nobility is akin to the concept of volk. George L. Mosse who analyses the origins of volk ideas in The Crisis of German Ideology writes in The Culture of Western Europe that Riehl's work is "close to the roots of the volk through their unchanging customs. The romantic worship of those who lived closest to it, and this attitude fused with a longing for security in an age of rapid change".² The genius peculiar to a nation or folk, the consciousness or spirit of a specific people, is not the result of a cultural process but the distinctive psychic root of a particular people which gives that people unity as a nation and seeks cultural expression. The origins of such an ideology are to be found in the beliefs of the German Romantic metaphysician Friedrich von Schlegel that history is national self-consciousness and that only those people with lengthy national memories survive, and in the work of Friedrich Ludwig Jahn. His Volkstum (1817) advocates the glory of an exclusive German Volk; those who live close to the soil and whose function it is to teach the rest of the world to recognise the superiority of the German Volk existence. Such ideas gain ground through the development of Germanic nationalism reacting to the Napoleonic occupation of the Rhineland and the rapid expansion

1. W.R., July 1856, p. 75.

2. The Culture of Western Europe, p. 44.

of urban centres consisting of shifting cosmopolitan populations eroding the countryside.¹

At the conclusion of her review, George Eliot is careful to indicate that "Riehl's conservatism is not in the least tinged ... with a poetic fanaticism for the past"² which she recognises is prevalent amongst "the German aristocracy of the present day" who attempt to sustain their vitality "by romantic attempts to revive mediaeval forms and sentiments."³ These attempts consist of revivals of a mythical glamorous Germanic past and are present at Weimar in Wagner's lengthy operas, such as Tannhäuser, celebrating the birth of the German nation, and prevalent in "pure" German student fraternities such as the Turnerschaft, practising ancient rituals and excluding Jews.⁴ George Eliot shows herself aware of the parochialism inherent in Riehl's work and his milieu by reference to his use of the work "Philister" for which the English language in her day has no equivalent. George Eliot describes "Philister" as

the personification of the spirit which judges everything from lower point of view than the subject demands - which judges the affairs of the parish from the egotistic or purely personal point of view - which judges the affairs of the nation from the parochial point of view, and does not hesitate to measure the merits of the universe from the human point of view.⁵

-
1. See F. Schnabel, Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, which traces the development of the volk ideology in Germany.
 2. W.R., July, 1856, p.79.
 3. Ibid., p. 76.
 4. G.L. Mosse analyses such phenomena as the Turnerschaft on p.45 of the Culture of Western Europe and at length in the opening two chapters of his The Crisis of German Ideology. George Eliot describes the story of three Wagnerian operas in Liszt, Wagner and Weimar, "Fraser's Magazine, July 1855, pp.48-61.
 5. W.R., July, 1856, p.77.

This is in opposition to a less restrictive cosmopolitan view which George Eliot finds represented in Goethe's ideas and works. To George Eliot the ideas of the volk have so much replaced those of Goethe that it is to Goethe that we must return "so that we may see things in their relative proportions," although George Eliot observes that Riehl is aware that Goethe freed the Germans "from the nets of the Philister"¹.

Goethe in spite of living during the period of the French occupation of the Rhineland is still unable to single out a particular people in preference to another. He withdraws from politics to Arts and Science "for they belong to the world at large, and before them vanish all the limits of nationality."² And he tells his friend Peter Eckermann, "I am more and more convinced,... that poetry is the universal possession of mankind, (... we Germans are very likely to fall too easily into this pendantic conceit, when we do not look beyond the narrow circle which surrounds us.) I therefore like to look about me in foreign nations the epoch of world literature is at hand, and every one must strive to hasten its approach."³ There are, however, difficulties inherent in Goethe's universalism and these are to be found in his novel Die Wahlverwandtschaften (1809)⁴. The title Die Wahlverwandtschaften or The Elective Affinities, refers to a chemical term used to denote the involuntary affinities of people with kindred natures but differing circumstances and traditions. In the novel, common intuitive elements within people's personalities and their acquired characteristics, affect their relationships with one another and

1. W.R., July 1856. p. 77.

2. Quoted George Henry Lewes. The Life and Works of Goethe, p. 530.

3. Conversations with Goethe with Eckermann and Soret, pp. 212-213.

George Eliot met Eckermann at Weimar in October 1854. Of Eckermann's Conversations, George Eliot comments, "Eckermann's is a wonderful book". L., II, 204. George Eliot to S.S.Hennell, 23 June 1857.
George Eliot shows evidence of having read this earlier than January 1856, as she begins her W.R., article "German Wit: Heinrich Heine", by quoting from Part II, chapter 4.

come into conflict with their environment. The tragedy of Goethe's novel, as George Henry Lewes points out, lies in "the consequent collision of Passion with Duty - of Impulse with Social Law."¹ Despite the tragedy, Goethe asserts that affinity between people irrespective of background and tradition is natural and inescapable and that the ideal in society is that of self-integration between differing peoples.

Goethe does not in his novel under-estimate the ties of Duty and Social Law, yet his ideal remains one of fraternity not restricted to any exclusive group of people, race or country. The difference between his ideal² and that of the volk is that Goethe stresses the common elements of humanity irrespective of national barriers; volk on the other hand is a political nationalistic ideology based upon uniting people with similar interests into one nation. George Eliot and Riehl follow Goethe³ in belief. The realistic portrayal in depth of a particular social grouping is universalistic because it tells us something about man in particular circumstances. The volk attitude by idealising a particular way of life involves the make-believe that a whole nation lives or has its roots in a way of life - an agrarian one - and is superior to other nations.

George Eliot sees Scott as the British novelist who realistically

-
1. George Henry Lewes, Goethe p. 521. Cf. George Eliot on Heine's tragedy Almansor, "The tragic collision lies in the conflict between natural affection and the deadly hatred of religion and of race", W.R., January 1856, p.11, and Geraldine Jewsbury's Constance Herbert reviewed by George Eliot. W.R., LXIV, July 1855, pp.288-296, see my observations on S.G. Ch. 4, pp.129-131.
 2. For discussion of Goethe's concept of Humanity see Goethe and the Modern Age. Ed. A. Bergstrasser, pp.227-362.
 3. For George Eliot and Goethe see S. Pfeiffer, pp.191-200.

portrays social groupings in depth. In his novels¹ she finds exhibited that high criteria which she demands of art: as she explains in her review of Riehl, "a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot".² Three months after writing this she is similarly praising Harriet Beecher Stowe's Dred: A Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp in her regular "Belles Lettres" section of the W.R.,

Mrs. Stowe's novels have not only that grand element - conflict of races; they have another element equally grand which she also shares with Scott and in which she has, in some respects greatly surpassed him. This is the exhibition of a people to whom what we may call Hebraic Christianity is still a reality, still an animating belief, and by whom the theocratic conceptions of the Old Testament are literally applied to their daily life.

George Eliot is interested in the history of the Negro and what her English public are able to learn from a people outside the range of their experience. She criticises Mrs. Stowe for being too indulgent and unrealistic in the presentation of the Negro character. Mrs. Stowe's artistic defect is "the absence of any proportionate exhibition of the Negro character in its less amiable phases.... [Mrs. Stowe] alludes to demoralisation among the slaves, but she does not depict it".³ George Eliot as she explains in her regular Belles Lettres column of the W.R. during a review of Dr. Ernst Meier's, Geschichte der Poetischen

-
1. George Eliot had admired Scott since childhood, see especially George Eliot to Sara Hennell, 19th February, 1859, L., III, 15, 16. George Eliot thought that an understanding of Balfour of Burley in Old Morality would help John Blackwood to appreciate Mordecai Lapidoth, L., VI, 223.
 2. W.R., July 1856, p.14.
 3. W.R., LXVI, October 1856, pp. 572-573.

National-Literature der Hebräer, has "Certain theoretic differences with Dr. Meier as to the primitive character of the Hebrew monotheism", and consequently disagrees with the fundamentalist views of some of Harriet Beecher Stowe's and Walter Scott's characters. However, this disagreement does not prevent her from praising their novels or recommending Dr. Meier's work to the English public as "a very serviceable companion to the study of the Old Testament."¹

Unfortunately some of George Eliot's contemporaries are not as tolerant to opposing views and not as prepared to learn from other peoples. The late 1840's and 1850's in England witness the development of an English chauvinism which is to degenerate into a racism that preaches superiority over other peoples, provides an Imperial ideology, and finds the basis of its teachings in certain Old Testament interpretations.² For instance, Charles Kingsley's Westward Ho! which George Eliot reviews in the "Leader", (19 May 1855), as well as in the W.R., mingles Protestantism and nationalism.

1. W.R., LXVI, October 1856, p. 582.

The concluding pages of Meier mention Ibn Gabirol, Jehuda Halevi and other Spanish Jewish poets. They contain a reference to M. Sach's Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, Berlin 1845, which George Eliot was to use in the preparation of D.D. see Ch. 6 p. 157 and to Franz Julius Delitzch's Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Poësie vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften des Alten Bundes bis auf die Aeueste Zeit, Leipzig, 1836, (Meier p.575 fn2)

2. For the development of English racist theory and the extension of the Empire see the first part of R. Koebner and H.D.R. Schmidt, Imperialism. The Story and Significance of a Political word, 1840-1960. W.E. Houghton's The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870, contains a summary of the attitudes of such writers as Carlyle and Kingsley and the use of Darwinism and the Old Testament to support racial theories: pp. 209-213. George Eliot generally applied "race" to either, a group of people with a similar background and history, or to the whole of humanity.

In her W.R., article George Eliot resists Kingsley's tone and method. She is particularly incensed by what she regards as his misuse of "scientific data" and "Bible doctrine" in order to classify a group of Indians as inferior."¹ Kingsley's approach is unartistic and unrealistic as it fails to bring "home to our coarser sense what would otherwise be unperceived by us."²

George Eliot's breadth of vision is clearly seen in a specific context - a theological one - in other reviews of the 1850's. In an 1851 W.R., review of William Mackay's The Progress of the Intellect, she agreed with Mackay's thesis that "divine revelation is not contained ... pre-eminently in the facts and inspirations of any one age or nation, but is co-extensive with the history of human development,"³ and in her review of James Heywood's Introduction to the Book of Genesis, she summarises succinctly the grounds for the rejection of fundamentalist religion. Although unwilling to find in the Hebrew writings anything "which cannot be accounted for on grounds purely human", George Eliot is ready to acknowledge the value of myth of whatever epoch and tradition. Her review of Heywood's volume concludes with a quotation "from ... an admirable Hebrew myth which has arisen since the Christian era." In this Talmudic "parable against intolerance" Abraham shelters a non-believing friend from the rigours of a desert night and thus exhibits great tolerance.⁴

It is the lack of breadth of sympathy for another's misfortune which George Eliot condemns in her assessment of the Scottish

-
1. W.R., LXIV, July 1855, p.293.
 2. Ibid., p.289.
 3. W.R., LIV, January 1851, p.355.
 4. Leader, VII, 12th January 1856, pp.41-42. For a summary of presuppositions George Eliot had in common with German Higher Critics see L.H. Kriefall, pp.57-58.

evangelical, Dr. John Cummings. In her review of his work in the W.R. she balances Dr. Cumming's evangelical fanaticism and narrowness of vision with actual Judaic and Christian moral precepts. She attacks in his teaching the "absence of genuine charity"¹ and she states her idea of an entirely human God. This God "a God who not only sympathises with all we feel and endure for our fellow men, but who will pour new life into our too languid love, and give firmness to our vacillating purpose, is an extension and multiplication of the effects produced by human sympathy".² And such a statement of belief is akin to Feuerbach's idea of man's basic emotional need for a God!

George Eliot's reading of Feuerbach, Comte, Spencer, Lewes and Riehl develops her awareness of humanity as a totality, the comparative empirical basis of knowledge, and the close evolving relationship of the individual and society embodied in the recorded historical experiences of differing peoples. As Harriet Martineau writes in her introduction to Comte's Positive Philosophy "We find ourselves living, not under capricious and arbitrary conditions, unconnected with the constitution and movements of the whole, but under greater, invariable laws which operate on us as a part of the whole".³ Social evolution shows that in the natural history of nations the operation of these necessary laws makes a reality of the "fellowship of race", of our intuitive inward association with other human beings who have historical, environmental or inherited intuitive affinities with us.

-
1. W.R., LXIV, October 1855, p.453. George Eliot's emphasis.
 2. Ibid., p. 461.
 3. Comte's Positive Philosophy, p xiv.

George Eliot's initial reading of these philosophers takes place during the late 1840's and in the 1850's. We find her writing to her friend François D'Albert-Durade on 6 December 1859 of the changes in attitude that she has been experiencing since rebelling against Evangelical Christianity, leaving the Midlands for London and since expressing the sentiments of her letter of February 1848 to John Sibree in which she denounced "Everything specifically Jewish [as] of a low grade" and the "fellowship of race" as an "inferior impulse". She writes to Madam D'Albert-Durade,

Ten years of experience have wrought great changes in that inward self: I have no longer any antagonism towards any faith in which human sorrow and human longing for purity have expressed themselves; on the contrary, I have a sympathy with it that predominates over all argumentative tendencies....Many things that I should have argued against ten years ago, I now feel myself too ignorant and too limited in moral sensibility to speak of with confident disapprobation: on many points where I used to delight in expressing intellectual difference, I now delight in feeling an emotional agreement. On that question of our future existence, to which you allude, ... my most rooted conviction is, that the immediate object and the proper sphere of all our highest emotions are our struggling fellow-men and this earthly existence.

George Eliot finds "an emotional agreement", the embodiment of many of these ideas in Judaism and the Jewish people. It is to George Eliot's Jewish interests in the last two years of the 1850's and in the 1860's, to her attempts to make her fellow Englishmen aware of other "struggling fellow-men",¹ that I wish to direct my attention.

1. L., III, 231.

CHAPTER 4

JEWISH MATERIAL IN THE LIFTED VEIL, ROMOLA, THE SPANISH GYPSY.

Much of the thematic material of D.D. has affinities with George Eliot's previous work. Graham Handley in Chapter III, and IV, of his unpublished University of London doctoral thesis, A Critical Study of 'Daniel Deronda': Its relation to George Eliot's Fiction and to its Time (1962), makes "comparisons in usage, plot, situation, character and ethical direction: between"¹ George Eliot's earlier fiction and Daniel Deronda. My objective is to demonstrate that George Eliot's interest in Judaism can be traced in some of her earlier creative work and that themes relating to certain aspects of the human spirit - in particular the need for tradition, "human fellowship"² and community, which in D.D. are associated with Judaism - can also be found in a Jewish context before D.D. In the process of my examination, and by analysing some of the Jewish sources of her earlier work, I hope to illuminate the treatment of Jewish themes and characters in D.D.

The Lifted Veil³

This early short story contains the first explicit Jewish reference I have come across in George Eliot's fiction. In L.V.,

-
1. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, p.2.
 2. L.V., 380, George Eliot to John Blackwood, 28 February, 1873.
 3. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, July 1859, pp.24-48.

George Eliot draws upon the experiences of her 1858 European visit. She and George Henry Lewes, in a similar way to Latimer, the central protagonist and narrator of the story, make a brief stop at Prague on their journey from Vienna to Dresden. In George Eliot and George Henry Lewes's Journals there is a description of the Prague Ghetto that prefigures that in LV. She and Lewes toured the adjoining burial ground, the Alter-Friedhof, before entering the twelfth-century synagogue.¹ George Eliot wrote in her Journal,

The Friedhof is unique - with a wild growth of grass and shrubs and trees, and a multitude of quaint tombs in all sorts of positions, looking like the fragments of a great building, or as if they had been shaken by an earthquake. We saw a lovely dark-eyed Jewish child here, which we were glad to kiss in all its dirt. Then came the sombre old synagogue, with its smoked groins, and lamp for ever burning. An intelligent Jew was our cicerone, and read us some Hebrew out of the precious old book of the law.²

And George Henry Lewes in his Journal for 16 July 1858 comments that the cicerone " was a very decent quiet man for whom I felt quite a liking"³

Latimer pays a visit to this same synagogue, and he describes his visit,

as I stood under the blackened, groined arches of that old synagogue, made dimly visible by the seven thin candles in the sacred lamp, while our Jewish cicerone reached down the Book of the Law, and read to us in its ancient

-
1. This was not George Eliot's only visit to a synagogue during this period. On her Italian visit of 1860 after a drive by the water at Leghorn her Journal records that "On our way back we passed the Hebrew synagogue, and were glad of our coachman's suggestion that we should enter, seeing it was the Jews' Sabbath" J.W. Cross, II,171.
 2. J.W. Cross, II, 56.
 3. L., II, 469.

tongue, - I felt a shuddering impression that this strange building, with its shrunken lights, this surviving withered remnant of mediaeval Judaism, was of a piece with my vision. Those darkened dusty Christian saints, with their loftier arches and their larger candles, needed the consolatory scorn with which they might point to a more shrivelled death in life than their own.

He has neither Lewes's sense of affection for the guide, George Eliot's awareness of his intelligence, nor their sense of the historical continuity conveyed by the ancient synagogue.

The Prague Jewish Ghetto was a heavily populated enclave divorced from all but business contact with the rest of Prague. In D.D. the sun doesn't rise until Mirah has left Prague for Dresden. Prague is described as a city of lamps, and darkened faces and figures,² and if Prague itself was sombre other writers found the Ghetto area even more so. A. Trollope's Nina Balatka³ is a finely graded study of Jewish - Gentile relationships. Trollope not only gives a moving portrait of Prague but of the restricted nature of the Ghetto. Anton Trendellsohn, the central protagonist, dreams of leaving Prague with his non-Jewish wife Nina Balatka - he eventually settles in Frankfurt -

He had heard of Jews in Vienna, in Paris, and in London, who were as true to their religion as any Jew of Prague, but who did not live immured in a Jews' quarter, like lepers separate and alone in some loathed corner of a city otherwise clean ...

-
1. Blackwoods, July 1859, p.36.
 2. D.D., III, xx, 31.
 3. Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine, July, 1866 - January 1867.

the Jews of Prague ... were still bound to their old narrow streets, to their dark houses, to their mean modes of living, and ... worst of all, were still subject to the isolated ignominy of Judaism. In Prague a Jew was still a Pariah.¹

The vision George Eliot allows Latimer anticipates that of Trollope. Latimer has the sense of being an alien in the world, as the Prague Jews were, in grim reality, yet he not only lacks the compensating religious faith and the strong consciousness of tradition that enabled them to survive, but is unable to recognise these things when he comes in contact with them. His is a darkened world, he explains that "continual suffering had annihilated religious faith within me: to the utterly miserable - the unloving and the unloved - there is no religion possible, no worship, but a worship of devils."²

In December, six months after the appearance of her story in Blackwoods, George Eliot wrote to her friend Madame D'Albert-Durade that she had "no longer any antagonism towards any faith in which human sorrow and human longing for purity have expressed themselves."³ George Eliot believed, as I indicated in my last chapter, that suffering could be a humanizing force and that for her, God "not only sympathises with all we feel and endure for our fellow-men, but ... will pour new life into our too languid love, and give firmness to our vacillating purpose." Such a God is a product of "human sympathy."⁴ In a passage, which Oscar Browning cites in his Life of George Eliot (1890), as "perhaps ... a quotation from a notebook," George Eliot wrote of "our souls

-
1. Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine, September, 1866, p.347.
 2. Blackwoods, July, 1859 p.44.
 3. L., III, 231, 6 December, 1859.
 4. W.R., Vol. LXIV, 1855, p.461.

need of something hidden and uncertain for the maintenance of that doubt and hope and effort which are the breath of its life."

Luther Harry Kriefall in his dissertation on D.D. argues that "George Eliot's jaundiced views of the Jewish people and their faith continues to be evident in her journal writing of the fifties and up to the time of her short story, 'The Lifted Veil'". In chapters two and three I have shown that such a view oversimplifies the complexity of George Eliot's attitudes to religion in general, and in particular, to the Jews.

L.H. Kriefall comments on L.V. that it "reflects an ... unsympathetic attitude toward Judaism as a world religion" and that George Eliot's "thought is probably less distaste for things Jewish than the notion that Judaism has failed to move with advancing knowledge."² There would seem to be a confusion in Kriefall's mind between the characters and George Eliot's opinions in the story. He fails to see that George Eliot is using Judaism in L.V. as an example, apart from its intrinsic interest, for her ideas concerning outcastness, the crucial importance of community and community tradition, and of a human need for sustaining hope and vision. The Jews are outsiders in the society within which and for whom she is writing, and to achieve sympathy or understanding for them is a step toward a universal sympathy and understanding.

Latimer has no sustaining assistance from society, from religion, or from other individuals, and discovers that the one person to whom he has offered love, Bertha Grant, is evil. His desire is "to die" for he is "weary of incessant insight and foresight

-
1. Life of George Eliot, p. 67.
 2. L.H. Kriefall, pp. 54, 56, 57.

without hope".¹ He is unable, to quote George Eliot's motto for L.V., composed for its later edition which she prepared as she began to write D.D., to turn "To energy of human fellowship".² Eliot L. Rubinstein, in one of the few critical accounts of L.V., which has yet appeared, 'A Forgotten Tale by George Eliot', discusses Latimer's reaction to his environment, especially his hostility to his father, and analyses what Latimer refers to as his "poet's sensibility without his voice"³. Rubinstein points out that Latimer's great insight is combined with an inability - apart from acting as the narrator for L.V. - to put this insight into useful rather than self-destructive channels.⁴ Latimer can foresee yet cannot prevent his own disintegration and he describes his state as "insight at war with passion."⁵ He is unable to communicate with Bertha whom he feels "helpless before ... as if she clutched my bleeding heart, and would clutch it till the last drop of life-blood ebbed away."⁶

Rubinstein, drawing parallels between L.V. and D.D. argues that Latimer "is an even more extreme instance" than Gwendolen or Daniel Deronda "of what happens to those deprived in early years of

-
1. Blackwoods, July, 1859. p.24.
 2. L.V., 380 George Eliot to John Blackwood, 28 February 1873.
 3. Blackwoods, July 1859, p.26.
 4. Nineteenth Century Fiction, September 1962, p.179.
 5. Blackwoods, July 1859, p.35.
 6. Ibid, p.34. Of Bertha, G.S. Haight has written that she is "a beautiful but evil blonde, the earliest version of the sylph-like, water-nixie female, whose serpentine traits George Eliot traced more subtly in Rosamond Vincy and Gwendolen Harleth," Biography, p.296. D.D., V.xxxv, 43 shows however that it is Grandcourt who is more akin to Bertha than Gwendolen in the possession of "serpentine traits".

intelligent sympathy and of an encompassing society. In Latimer's case, the two closely related results of an abnormal childhood are the supernatural perversion of his native powers and his inability to enjoy human relationship."¹ The two people with whom Latimer attempts to have any kind of relationship are both orphans, Charles Meunier, the Physician, and Bertha. Neither has had a stable home life and in this respect are like Gwendolen and Daniel. However, Rubinstein ignores the dispossessed nature of the orphans Meunier and Bertha, as he does the affinities between Latimer and Mordecai Lapidoth. They are similarly gifted with visions, handicapped by illness, and with differing degrees of success struggle against hostile forces to direct their visionary gifts. Their prototype is to be found in the character of Heinrich Heine or Baruch Spinoza, each of them a solitary dispossessed visionary struggling to leave their ideas to posterity, or in the person of Jehuda Halevi, wandering across Europe to the Middle East in pursuit of his vision.²

1. Nineteenth Century Fiction, September, 1962, p.178.
2. The idea for Latimer may owe something to a meeting George Eliot had during her 1858 trip. Lord Acton in his review of Cross's Life records that "at Munich, a Moldavian Jew came with introductions to her friends, intent on the same vague errand of national redemption upon which Deronda disappears from sight." The Nineteenth Century, March 1885, p.483. Without corroborating evidence Lord Acton must not be relied upon for accuracy, as G.S. Haight has shown in his "George Eliot's Klesmer". George Eliot's Journal for May 10 1858, records that at the home of Bodenstedt, a poet and journalist, she met "Melchior Meyr, a maker of novels and tragedies, otherwise an ineffectual personage." J.W. Cross, II, 34. It is tempting to speculate that Meyr may have been the Moldavian Jew to whom Lord Acton refers, and that he may have given George Eliot the idea for the ineffectual Latimer, especially when the high respect George Eliot generally accorded to the creative artist is considered. His description of Meyr as a "maker" and "ineffectual" is decidedly odd.

The difference between these figures and Latimer, apart from their being Jewish, is in their creative achievement as opposed to his failure. His life, like Mordecai Lapidoth's, becomes dominated by second sight. Mordecai knows he is shortly to die but his desires are concentrated upon "the yearning for" some young ear into which he could pour his mind as a testament, some soul kindred enough to accept the spiritual product of his own brief, painful life, as a mission to be executed.¹ He will find his salvation in transmitting his vision to another human being, Daniel. It is particularly fitting, as I shall show, that Daniel is without mother and father,^{and} that he has been deprived of a sustaining tradition as a child and that he provides for two orphans, Mordecai and Mirah, as well as spiritually for Gwendolen. Latimer however, is unable to find human comradeship, and his only consolation is death.

Rubinstein describes the narrative method of L.V. as "unique", it being George Eliot's "only published attempt at the first-person singular technique."² G.S. Haight in his Biography writes that "Except for Theophrastus Such it is the only one of George Eliot's narratives in the first person."³ It is interesting that these opinions neglect L.V. as a stylistic precursor of the first-person singular frequently used in D.D. The short story is in the form of a memoir written before a person dies, it is both present commenting on the past and placing it in perspective. Thus Latimer, reflecting upon his life and his visit to Prague, associates his weariness of spirit with the vision "that I had had of Prague".⁴ Mordecai, Mirah and Princess Halm-Eberstein tell of their past lives in the presence of others, in the first person form. Sometimes they forget to whom they are speaking, enact their past, judge it

1. D.D., V, xxxviii, 133.

2. Nineteenth Century Fiction, September 1962, p.177.

3. Biography, p.296.

4. Blackwoods, July, 1859, p.43.

from the viewpoint of the present, and in effect are engaged, as Latimer is, in lengthy soliloquies. The difference is in the greater maturity of technique of D.D. where the virtues of soliloquy, as I shall discuss, are achieved within a wider context of monologue within a framework of dialogue.

Romola:¹

Adam Bede, Silas Marner, The Mill on the Floss contain no explicit Jewish references and their thematic affinity with D.D. has been discussed by Graham Handley in chapters three and four of his doctorate. On the other hand in R., written between October 1861 and June 1863, George Eliot uses her knowledge of Jewish life and its history more extensively than in L.V., and in a historical rather than in a contemporary context.

F.R. Salter in his essay, "The Jews in Fifteenth Century Florence and Savonarola's Establishment of a Mons Pietatis"² explains the basis for anti-Jewish sentiment in Renaissance Florence. It was obviously not only religious and economic but political. The Medici family had largely depended upon Jewish loans and with the foundation of a new Florentine Republic there was intense public pressure for anti-Jewish legislation. The Jewish population in the Florentine area had rapidly increased after 1492 owing to an influx of refugees from Spain or Naples and on 9 March 1493 orders were proclaimed for the expulsion of

1. The Cornhill Magazine, Vols. VI-VIII, July 1862 - August 1863.

2. The Cambridge Historical Journal, Vol. V, 1936-7 pp.193-211.

all immigrant Jews. The expulsion order did not apply to Jews of long residence, most of whom were bankers and these remained in Florence. In R., when Tito Melema first appears in Florence, he is mistaken by the pedlar Bratti for a Jew, "You're not a Hebrew, eh? - come from Spain or Naples, eh." Bratti's next words reveal their creator's perception of the dual nature of Florentine anti-semitism and the complex factional nature of the city's political actions. Bratti says to Tito, "Let me tell you the Frati Minori are trying to make Florence as hot as Spain for those dogs of hell that want to get all the profit of usury to themselves and leave none for Christians."¹ The historian Salter informs us that the Frati Minori - the Franciscans - not only preached against the Jews, but were opposed to Savonarola - a Dominican - and continually attempted to remove him from power. In fact Savonarola himself was only too aware of the value of Jewish capital and resisted anti-Jewish pressure.

G.S. Haight tells us in his Biography, that George Eliot immersed herself in literature dealing with late fifteenth-century Florentine history.² But Savonarola's defence of the Jews does not appear in R., and neither do extreme manifestations of

Florentine anti-semitism, such as mob lynching of Jews which Salter relates. (He describes how in 1493 a young Spanish Jew was lynched by a mob outside the Church of Or San Michele where an inscription records the event).³ Dr. Guido Biagi in his

1. Cornhill, July 1862, p.10.

2. Biography, pp. 349-354.

3. Cambridge Historical Journal, p.207. George Eliot's Commonplace Book, Y.U.L., pp 122 - 123, records from "Tribaldo d'Amerigo de 'Rossi, Ricordanze di, Published in the Delizie degli Eruditi Toscani," how in the Florence of 1493, "a certain person was stoned and torn to pieces by the people for mutilating images."

introduction to Romola, (2 vols. 1907), uses George Eliot's diary entries from her 1860 Florentine visit. Biagi describes her many Church visits and relates that "After the Laurentian Library came Or San michele, the Ufizi, the Palazzo Pitti"¹. George Eliot shows the Florentine mob in all its intrinsic ugliness and stupidity by not having it directed against any group to which the reading public might not feel much sympathy. When the crowd, which has been a seething potential threat, does act in R., it does so to expel Tito, though even here the crowd is in reality powerless, for Tito using his intelligence outwits what he refers to as "the idiot mob"². George Eliot comments in the novel that "all things except reason and order are possible with a mob."³ This seems to reinforce the truthfulness of her comment to Richard Holt Hutton, that it was difficult for an outsider to judge "how strict a self-control and selection were exercised in the presentation of details"⁴ during the composition of the novel.

The most interesting use of Jewish material in R., occurs, I think, at the novel's climax and throws some light upon her sources and original conception of the novel. In August 1863 she wrote to Sarah Hennell that the "Drifting away" and the Village with the Plague belonged to my earliest version of the story."⁵ Jewish material is indissolubly associated with these elements of R., and possibly the ideas surrounding their use belong to the late 1850's, for the earliest reference to R., that I have come across, refers to an

1. Romola, Ed. Biagi, 1, p xxiv. Cf. Biography, p.345.

2. Cornhill, July 1863, p.32.

3. Ibid., p. 31.

4. L., IV, 97. 8 August 1863.

5. L., IV, 104.

"Italian story", and is to be found in a letter from John Blackwood to George Eliot on 7th June 1858.¹ At the novel's climax, after an abortive attempt to commit suicide, Romola drifts along the Mediterranean coast where she encounters people in a far worse plight than her own. The boat in which Romola intended to die, "Instead of bring her to death ... had been the gently lulling cradle of a new life."² The first human sound that she hears in her "new life" is "the cry of a little child in distress ... [whom] no one came to help." Romola discovers that the child's family are dead, Jews, victims of the old world and the plague.

George Eliot describes the first human sights that Romola comes across - a Jewish family,

The strongly marked type of race in their features and their peculiar garb made her [Romola] conjecture that they were Spanish or Portuguese Jews, who had perhaps been put ashore and abandoned there by rapacious sailors, to whom their property remained as a prey. Such things were happening to Jews compelled to abandon their homes by the Inquisition: the cruelty of greed thrust them from the sea, and the cruelty of superstition thrust them back to it.³

In her letter to Richard Holt Hutton discussing this novel, George Eliot tells how "great, great facts have struggled to find a voice through me,"⁴ and some of these facts can be found in her description of the plight of Jewish refugees. The source of her information is probably the second volume of W.H. Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella.¹

-
1. See L., II, 463.
 2. Cornhill, VIII, July 1863, p.130. Given the similarity in total moral treatment and use of Jewish material between R. & D.D., and the nature of George Eliot's original ideas for R., L.H. Kriefall's view that George Eliot "changed her mind about Judaism sometime in the late sixties... [and] took it upon herself to communicate her convictions" p.92 is unsound.
 3. Cornhill, July 1863, p.131.
 4. L., IV, 97.

Prescott relating the events of the exodus from Spain tells how

Many of the emigrants took the direction of Italy. Those who landed at Naples brought with them an infectious disorder, contracted by long confinement in small, crowded, and ill-provided vessels. The disorder was so malignant, and spread with such frightful celerity, as to sweep off more than twenty thousand inhabitants of the city in the course of the year, whence it extended its devastation over the whole Italian peninsula.

And he quotes from the Genoese historian, Senarega, who will not enlarge on the cruelty and avarice which they [the Jews] frequently experienced from the masters of the ships which transported them from Spain. Some were murdered to gratify their cupidity, others forced to sell their children for the expense of the passage.²

Romola's discovery of the Jewish child allows her a new lease of life, she has found an outward-directed compassion for another human life away from her own immediate concerns. The process of this discovery reinforces the morality of R., which is conveyed when Romola confesses that

We can only have the highest happiness ... by having wide thoughts, and much feeling for the rest of the world, as well as ourselves; and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it, that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good.³

-
1. All references to 3rd Edition (1842). Prescott's work is an important source for S.G. George Eliot in her Journal recorded, a year after the completion of R., "I read Prescott again and made notes", 14-18 November 1864, see L., IV, 168 and Biography, p.378. I have found no reference to the date of her initial reading of the work.
 2. Ferdinand and Isabella, pp. 132, 133. Prescott's reference is to "Rerum Ital. Scrip tom. XXIV. pp 531, 532."
 3. Cornhill, August 1863, p.152.

And writing to Hutton George Eliot describes her "main artistic object" in R., and hopes that her work

has been seen to have some true significance by minds prepared not simply by instruction, but by that religious and moral sympathy with the historical life of man which is the larger half of culture.¹

Such sentiments are closely akin to those which George Eliot expresses in her explanation to Harriet Beecher Stowe in October 1876 of the Jewish element in D.D.;

There is nothing I should care more to do, if it were possible, than to rouse the imagination of men and women to a vision of human claims in those races of their fellow men who most differ from them in customs and beliefs.²

In R., "the rest of the world"³ specifically means with regard to Florence, on the one hand a primitive community outside the city, and on the other the lives of the refugees.

George Eliot wrote to Frederic Harrison that she "took unspeakable pains in preparing to write Romola" and she felt that "the necessary idealisation could only be attained by adopting the clothing of the past."⁴ Her reasons for choosing a particular history period - one far removed from her readers - of internal Florentine upheaval were complex. G.A. Santangelo, in his unpublished University of North Carolina doctoral thesis, The Background of George Eliot's Romola, has suggested that the change from Medieval to Renaissance thought to be found in late fifteenth-century Florentine society, allowed George Eliot to "place her characters in situations that would demonstrate the effects of moral choices on the development of the individual personality."

-
1. L., IV, 97, 8th August 1863.
 2. L., VI, 301, 29 October 1876.
 3. Cornhill, August 1863, p. 152.
 4. L., IV, 301, 15 August [1866].

He argues that the character of Romola "moves from the morally stagnant paganism of the Renaissance through the guidance of Savonarola and then goes beyond him to discover a Religion of Humanity."¹ Carole Robinson, another recent commentator on R., in her article "Romola: A Reading of the Noyel" argues that "the Florentine scene provides ... both an analogy of, - and a criterion for, George Eliot's own society."² This argument had been anticipated by R.H. Hutton in reviewing R. when it first appeared. He dwells on the analogies that can be drawn between Victorian society and that of Florence during that "strange era".³ He believed that his society can be placed in perspective and judged by comparison with another society similarly undergoing a period of internal instability.

R. deals primarily with Florentine rather than with Jewish life and while Jewish references occur at the beginning and at the climax of the story, it would be incorrect to exaggerate their importance. There are, however, certain respects in which R. is illuminating as a predecessor of D.D. In D.D. history is used to assess the present, as Santangelo, Robinson and Hutton have argued it is in R. In the case of D.D. however, history is not that of judiciously selected events and characters from a specific period but of general Jewish history. The action of D.D. uses nearly contemporary events rather than those of a comparatively distant historical period. George Eliot brings the whole range of Jewish historical experience to bear upon the actions of the protagonists and this range of experience forms a judgement upon the actions of the characters.

-
1. D and A. Vol. xxiv, Nos 4 - 6, 2485, (1962).
 2. Victorian Studies, September 1962, p.34.
 3. Spectator, July 1863, p.2265.

There is a further difference in George Eliot's use of history in the two works. R., demonstrates none of the interest in nationalist ideology to be found in D.D. R. is set in the period between 1492 and 1498, one of continual war and invasions in Italy. In 1494 the French entered Florence, the "foreign" Medicis were expelled and with French assistance an independent republic proclaimed. The late 1850's and early 1860's witnessed an important phase in the perennial contest between France and the Papacy for supremacy in Italian hinterland. During the French occupation of Rome in 1860, George Eliot writing from that city expresses "stirrings of the insurrectionary spirit ... when (she sees) the red pantaloons at every turn in the streets of Rome."¹ George Eliot had met, and was sympathetic towards Mazzini, the leading advocate of Italian nationalist aspirations, who lived in exile in London.² Her concern in R. is not with the development of Italian nationalism but with increasing her reader's vision of the life of others, and with tracing the heroine's knowledge of her limitations. Savonarola, for instance, is presented not as a nationalist demanding Florentine liberty, but as a politician and religious visionary attacking a ruling élite which he wishes to see removed from power.³ In spite of his reforming zeal and his

-
1. L., III, 288. George Eliot to Mrs. Richard Congreve, Rome, 4-6 April 1860. The period also witnessed the 1860 Damascus Incident, a reintensification of the British, French and Russian struggle for supremacy in the Near East, and the beginnings of the movement of East European Jewry to Great Britain and America.
 2. Mazzini contributed to The Westminster Review when George Eliot was on its staff. Her Journal for 18 April 1864 records that she and Lewes "went to the Crystal Palace to see Garibaldi." J.W. Cross II, 382, Cf. Biography, p.395.
 3. Donald L. Hill in a paper "Pater's Debt to Romola", Nineteenth Century Fiction, March 1968, argues that George Eliot's and Walter Pater's attitude to Savonarola "was the mixed one taken by ... educated people generally." p.375. He points to George Eliot's portrait of the ruthless rather than the idealistic side of the Florentine's character.

being the heir of a long tradition of Catholic visionaries, Savonarola is entrapped within himself. His death is lamentable and cruel, but not shown to be a national disaster. Mordecai Lapidoth on the other hand, is a visionary whose dreams are articulated in D.D., but he is not a seeker for political power and has no hope of seeing his visions come to fruition, desiring only to keep them alive by passing them on to another sympathetic soul.

Graham Handley has observed that "Romola and Daniel Deronda both show the author's compulsive interest in second-sight and prophecy."¹ The treatment of the visionary Savonarola should be considered as an example of this interest. Mordecai is an isolated dreamer without political power. Savonarola has political power but during his interview with Romola rejects all human comfort and at his end, like Latimer, is completely alone. George Eliot in R. records that in the Florentine Republic, "The idea of prophetic gifts was not a remote one." The Victorians, as I shall point out, were sceptical about visionaries. In Savonarola's time "to some of the soberest minds the supernatural character of his [Savonarola's] insight into the future gathered a strong attestation from the peculiar conditions of the age."²

But if there are obvious differences between R. and D.D. in their respective portrayals of visionaries, then there are similarities. Romola's brother, Dino, receives a fate similar to that of Mordecai Lapidoth. Dino, an orphan, leaves his home and travels alone to the East from whence he returns home to die, though not before giving Romola a prophetic account of what is

1. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, p. 191
2. Cornhill, November 1862, pp. 579-580.

to happen to her in the future. In the literal sense that he has travelled to the East, Dino is much closer to the Jewish archetype, the visionary Jehuda Halevi, and to George Eliot's friend, Emanuel Deutsch, than is Mordecai.

Dino leaves his scholarly step-father, Bardo, and becomes a mystic instead of a scholar. R.H. Hutton praises George Eliot's "subtle skill" in her "delineation" of "the pictures of Bardo and Baldassare", Tito's step-father. Hutton's description of Bardo is applicable to Mordecai Lapidoth. He writes, "In [Bardo] you get something like a glimpse of the stately passion for learning which, in a later age ... took so vital a hold of the intellect of Milton, and overlaid his powerful imagination with all its rich fretwork of elaborate classical allusion." Mordecai's "powerful imagination" is "overlaid" with "elaborate ... allusion" to Jewish historical experience and tradition rather than towards the traditions of classical Greece and Rome. For Hutton, the scholar Baldassare combines "intermittent flashes of intellectual power in a scholar's failing memory and its alternations with an almost animal passion of revenge". Hutton argues that in the portraying of Bardo and Baldassare George Eliot is "reproducing one great feature in the age of the revival of learning", the sense of scholarship being felt as "a passion, while with us it has almost relapsed into an antiquarian dry as dust pursuit."¹ To Mordecai, the revival of past knowledge is important in influencing the future and plays a large role in preserving Judaism. He compares, unfavourably, the talkers at the "Hand and Banner" with a long line of distinguished Rabbis, "the great Transmitters, who laboured

1. Spectator, July 1863, p.2265. Hutton's emphasis.

with their hands for scant bread, but preserved and enlarged for us the heritage of memory, and saved the soul of Israel alive as a seed among the tombs." Later on in the same scene he comments, "The native spirit of our tradition was not to stand still, but to use records as a seed, and draw out the compressed virtues of law and prophecy".¹

There are further similarities between character and situation in R. and D.D. Hutton finds in the former "strife between the keen definite knowledge of the reviving Greek learning, and the turbid visionary mysticism of the reviving Dominican piety."² In Mordecai's character there is a dichotomy between scholarship and mysticism: a struggle between reviving Hebrew scholarship and the visionary mysticism of the kabbala. And there are affinities between Tito Melema, Mordecai's father, and Daniel Deronda's mother. They represent Judaism and Renaissance Florence "cut adrift from all vestige of moral or religious faith", and, as Henry James explains during his discussion of Tito, "we have a picture of that depression of the moral tone by falsity and self-indulgence, which gradually evokes on every side of the subject some implacable claim, to be avoided or propitiated."³

The Spanish Gypsy

R. provides some evidence of the development of George Eliot's Jewish interests and knowledge of history, and her increasing

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 222, 241.
 2. Spectator, July 1863, p.2266.
 3. Henry James 'The Novels of George Eliot', Atlantic Monthly, October 1866, p.491.

readiness (by comparison with L.V.) to put them to fictional use. Her dramatic poem S.G. on which she began work in 1864¹, a year after finishing her Italian novel, shows these developments at a further stage, and, in addition, provides evidence of a thorough pre-occupation with values and desires which were to find their fictional fruition in D.D. An examination of the sources of S.G. helps in an assessment of George Eliot's Jewish knowledge after 1864, and illuminates the poem as well as providing background material for a discussion of her last novel.

The philosophical and moral bases of the poem have not gone unnoticed. G.W. Cooke argues that George Eliot's "faith in tradition, as giving the basis of all our best life, is perhaps nowhere so expressively set forth ... as in The Spanish Gypsy." He points to the works of Comte as important sources for George Eliot's ideas and believes that in the poem George Eliot shows her awareness that "true wisdom is always social, always grows out of the experience of the race, and not out of any personal inspiration or enlightenment."² In a similar way, B.J. Paris in his account of S.G., stresses its moral elements. To Paris the tragedy in the poem is a result of "Don Silva's rebellion against the unalterable conditions of his lot,.... [he] feels that love and reason are superior to hereditary bonds."³ Alfred Abraham Möller also concentrates upon the poem as representing "den Konflikt zwischen Egoismus und Altruismus, Recht des Individuums und der Gemeinschaft".⁴ However, Möller is the only critic to my knowledge who does indicate the firm psychological and sociological

-
1. The chronology of composition is complicated; briefly, S.G. was begun as a drama, 29 June 1864, which George Henry Lewes took away from George Eliot, 21 February 1865. George Eliot soon afterwards worked on Felix Holt which she finished at the end of May 1866. In August 1866 she began S.G. as a poem which was completed 29 April 1868. See Biography, pp 376, 378.
 2. J.W. Cooke, pp. 209, 211.
 3. B.J. Paris, p. 212.
 4. A.A. Möller, p. 30.

basis of George Eliot's presentation of her characters in S.G.

Henry James, reviewing the poem, praises George Eliot's humour, and considers that Juan ranks "with Tito Melema and Hetty Sorrel, as one of [George Eliot's] very best conceptions." He has, however, the sense that George Eliot's "primary intention ... her wish to present a struggle between nature and culture, between education and the instinct of race" result in her overlooking realistic details of presentation. S.G., he believes, "is emphatically a romance"¹ and its two central characters, Fedalma and Zarca, are unreal. "Fedalma is not a real Gypsy maiden" and Zarca is "very far ... from being a genuine Gypsy chieftain."² This kind of criticism has found a modern adherent in F.R. Leavis, who in The Great Tradition has written of S.G. that "the essential function of the quasi-historical setting is one with that of the verse form: it is to evade any serious test for reality".³ Discussion of some of the literary and historical sources of S.G. will not only show that George Eliot paid close attention to problems of historical veracity but that she placed her characters and chosen historical environment upon sound foundations.

Literary Antecedents of S.G.:

There are literary parallels in setting, structure, theme and general intention to S.G. which George Eliot would have known, and which point forward to D.D. I have shown that by 1856 George Eliot knew Heinrich Heine's tragic play Almansor which is set at the time of the conflict between the Moors and the Spanish in

1. Henry James's emphasis. See, L., IV, 354. George Eliot to John Blackwood, 21 March 1867, "The work connected with Spain is not a Romance."
2. The North American Review, October 1868, p.624.
3. The Great Tradition, p.81.

fifteenth-century Spain. Both lovers in Almansor are Moors although the heroine Zuleima has been converted to Christianity. Heine's play ends tragically with Zuleima and her lover Almansor flinging themselves from a rock in defiance of their Spanish pursuers. George Eliot's summary of the preoccupations of Heine's play would serve equally well for her own poem. Of Almansor she wrote in her review "German Wit: Heinrich Heine":

The tragic collision lies in the conflict between natural affection and the deadly hatred of religion and of race in the sacrifice of youthful lovers to the strife between Moor and Spaniard, Moslem and Christian.¹

It would seem that George Eliot had Almansor in mind during the composition of S.G. In a letter to John Blackwood of 21 April 1868, George Eliot tells him that "The Poem will be less tragic than I threatened"², and G.S. Haight writes that "At one time [George Eliot] apparently contemplated the death of both Fedalma and Silva."³

Another play which prefigures S.G. is Augustin Daly's adaptation of S.H. Mosenthal's Deborah, - Leah the Forsaken, which George Henry Lewes and George Eliot saw performed at the Adelphi Theatre on 10 February 1864. Lewes wonders "at the badness of the piece and success it has".⁴ Daly's drama is set in an Austro-Hungarian border village in the early eighteenth century. However, like Almansor and S.G. it deals with love and conflict between members of different religions and races. A Jewish maiden, Leah, is rescued from death by a Christian

1. W.R., January 1856, p.11.

2. L., IV, 431.

3. Ibid, fn.4.

4. L., IV, 132, G.H.L. - J. 10 February 1864. For the differences between Daly's version and S.H. Mosenthal's Deborah and suggested reasons for Leah's popularity see L.H. Klein, MA pp.73,74.

youth, Rudolf, who immediately falls in love with her. Their relationship and mistrust of one another, a result of their different backgrounds, forms the material for the dramatic action.

Daly's intention is to impress upon his audience his sense of a common humanity. Leah treats Rudolf as a rescuer and as a saviour. She is no longer merely a persecuted animal but a human worthy of attention and love. She says to Rudolf,

Had you not stopped by the brink - not looked down
in pity on my wistful eyes, but gone your way and
heeded me no more - perchance you might have been
happy and I contentYou placed me in the
revivifying sunlight of loveYou have shown me
the sun, and it has fired me with pride.

Daly suggests that outside of Europe the Jew will be able to regain his pride. In Act II Leah and Rudolf plot to escape from a Europe of suffering. Leah pleads with her lover, "Let us leave this old Mizriam, and wander through the desert into the promised land." Rudolf and Leah "will plough the soil, and on it rear the altar of a new religion, that shall teach love and brotherhood to all men."¹ Leah concludes with a description of "an emigrant Jewish tribe with all their goods on their way to America."² And in the final words of the drama Leah says that she "shall wander into the far-off-the promised land!" - America.³

The Sources of S.G.⁴

George Eliot in her Journal 14-18 November 1864, recorded that she "read Prescott again and made notes."⁵ W.H. Prescott in his

1. Lacy's Acting Edition, (1874), I, i, 15,13,14.

2. Ibid., V, i, 38.

3. Ibid., V, i, 44.

4. All references unless otherwise stated to the first edition, 1868.

5. L., IV, 168.

History of Ferdinand and Isabella lays the blame for the initiation of, and the excesses of, the Inquisition, upon Queen Isabella's confessor, the Dominican Monk, Thomas de Torquemada. Prescott wrote of Torquemada that he

concealed more pride under his monastic weeds than might have furnished forth a convent of his order, was one of that class with whom zeal passes for religion, and who testify their zeal by a fiery persecution of those whose creed differs from their own; who compensate for their abstinence from sensual indulgence, by giving scope to those deadlier vices of the heart, pride, bigotry and intolerance, which are no less opposed to virtue, and are far more extensively mischievous to society.¹

In S.G., George Eliot's Prior² is not the Grand Inquisitor but a relatively minor member of the Inquisition, a state functionary enacting a prescribed task at a border town. The Host describes the "monk within our city walls," as "A holy, high born, stern Dominican,"³ According to Juan's description which compliments Prescott's.

... he seems less a man
With struggling aims, than pure incarnate Will,
Fit to subdue rebellious nations, nay,
That human flesh he breathes in, charged with passion
Which quivers in his nostril and his lip,
But disciplined by long-indwelling will
To silent labour in the yoke of law.⁴

During his lengthy soliloquies the Prior admits to temptations and that he has had human desires. However, in his function as Inquisitor enacting holy orders he must not give way to pity. Hence

-
1. Ferdinand and Isabella, I, p.317.
 2. G.S. Haight in his Biography writes that in her "Notes on The Spanish Gypsy" "It is curious that George Eliot does not mention Bulwer-Lytton's Leila, or the Siege of Granada (1838), in which the heroine, a Jewish maiden, faces a similar conflict of loyalties" (p.376 fn3). There are many affinities between the two, in setting, structure and particularly in George Eliot's and Bulwer-Lytton's presentation of their respective fanatics, the Prior and in Leila, Torquemada and Almanen.
 3. S.G., p.28.
 4. S.G., pp.28-29.

mercy

Sees that to save is greatly to destroy.
'Tis so the Holy Inquisition sees; its wrath
Is fed from the strong heart of wisest love
For love must needs make hatred.

The background George Eliot chose for S.G. was "that moment in Spanish history when the struggle within the Moors was attaining its climax".² Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella not only contains a "Review of the Political and Intellectual Condition of the Spanish Arabs Previous to the War of Granada,"³ but in his second volume a detailed account of Ferdinand's Granada campaign. Prescott relates how in order to defend the frontier of Eaja from Moorish attack, one Don Alonso de Cardena, an entrusted servant of Ferdinand, levies local support from

the principal chiefs on the borders; amongst others, ... Don Pedro Henriquez, adelantado of Andalusia, Don Juan de Silva, count of Cifuentes, Don Alonso de Aguilar, and the Marquis of Cadiz.⁴

In S.G. George Eliot retains the name of the Moorish leader El Zagal. She transforms an insignificant border potentate, Don Juan de Silva, into the tragic protagonist of her poetic drama. She uses this technique of populating her work with actual human beings to great effect, as I shall show in D.D. ~~and~~ J.C. Pratt in his introduction to his unpublished Princeton University doctoral thesis, June 1965: A Middlemarch Miscellany: An Edition, with introduction and notes, of George Eliot's 1868-1871 Notebook, after a discussion of the impact upon George Eliot of the ideas of the German historian Wilhelm Becker, writes that

-
1. S.G., p.125.
 2. "Notes on The Spanish Gypsy and Tragedy in General", J.W. Cross, III, 43.
 3. Ferdinand and Isabella, I, pp.338-379.
 4. Ibid, I, p.419.

Perhaps refusing to depend completely even on fictional antiquity, she created her novel's Middlemarch's people as composites of literary, historical, contemporary and mythical persons, striving always to echo the lesser known, the lower ranked, the patently unheroic. It was not the Byronic hero which appealed to her, but the Bekkerian, a figure whose insignificant actions assured his historical obscurity.¹

The Jewish background of S.G.

Prescott gives information on Spanish Hebrew culture in his section "a general survey of the History of the Jews in Spain, their institutions, customs, poetry, achievements, etc.,"² and in this section he refers to "the golden age of modern Jewish literature", (p.308), in Medieval Spain. However, for Jewish information George Eliot would also have made use of George Ticknor's, History of Spanish Literature, which according to her journal she was reading on 20th November, 1866.³ Ticknor emphasises Jewish cultural attainments in Spain and it is these achievements which are presented in S.G. I quote Ticknor's summary of the

-
1. A Middlemarch Miscellany, pp lv, lvi.
 2. Ferdinand and Isabella, I, pp.306-320.
 3. J.W. Cross, II, 446. George Eliot's copy of Ticknor's History, now in Dr. William's Library: A.I.52 has on the end back papers of Vol. I. notes in George Eliot's hand on Spanish poetic techniques, also heavy marginal markings throughout Vol. I. For example, Ticknor's observation that both the **Moor**s and the **Jew**s "were hated by the mass of the Spanish people with a bitter hatred: the first as their conquerors; the last for the oppressive claims their wealth had given them on great numbers of the Christian inhabitants." I. 406.

Jewish Spanish cultural heritage:

The Jews ... down to the time of their expulsion from Spain, in 1492, and even later, often appear in the history of Spanish Literature. This was natural, for the Jews of Spain, from the appearance in 962 of four learned Talmudists, who were carried there by pirates, down to the fifteenth century, were more strongly marked by elegant culture than were their countrymen at the same period in any other part of Europe. Of Hebrew poetry in the Hebrew language, - which begins in Spain with the Rabbi Salomo ben Jehudah Gabirol, who died in 1064, - a history has been written entitled Die Religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, von Dr. Michael Sachs (Berlin, 1845). But the great repository of everything relating to the culture of the Spanish Jews is the Biblioteca of Rodriquez de Castro, Tom. I.,...It may be worthwhile to add that during the Moorish occupation of Spain, the Jews partook often of the Arabic culture, then so prevalent and brilliant, - a striking instance of which may be found in the case of the Castilian Jew, Juda ha-Levi, who took also the Arabic cognomen of Abu'l'z Hussan, and whose poems were translated into German, and published by A. Geiger, at Breslau, in a very small, neat volume, in 1851. Juda was born about 1080, and died, probably, soon after 1140.¹

George Eliot's knowledge of Spanish Jewish life in the poem is presented through the differing responses of Gentiles to Jews and through the reaction of Jews to their own situation and both these methods of presentation cohere in her finely drawn study of the astronomer Salomo Sephardo. Young Don Silva confides his secrets to his teacher Sephardo whom he begs not to betray him:

Kings of Spain
Like me have found their refuge in a Jew,
And trusted in his counsel. You will help me?²

1. History of Spanish Literature, I, p.78 fn.22.

2. S.G., p.196.

Don Silva's appeal demonstrates George Eliot's awareness of the high position Jewish advisers had in Spanish Court Life, Prescott informs us that

We find eminent Jews residing in the courts of the Christian princes, directing their studies, attending them as physicians, or more frequently administering their finances.... Their astronomical science recommended them in a special manner to Alfonso the Wise.¹

Ticknor tells us that it was not only in King Alfonso's court that Jews held high positions. He cites the example of Salomo Halevi, - who "in 1390, when he was forty years old, was baptised as Pablo da Santa Maria, and rose subsequently ... to ... highest places in the Spanish church."²

It is noticeable that Salomo Sephardo ('Sephardo' literally meaning Spanish Jew) refuses to become a Christian and asserts his Judaism. His apparel reveals the practising orthodox Jew. He is dressed "In skullcap bordered close with crisp grey curls".³ When Dona Silva appeals to him in very personal terms:

I have a double want
First a confessor - not a Catholic;
A heart without a livery - naked manhood.⁴

Sephardo's reply,

there's no such thing
As naked manhood
While my heart beats, it shall wear livery -

-
1. Ferdinand and Isabella, I, p.309. Young Arias comments on Don Amador, a courtier, that "King Alfonso, they say was a heretic", S.G., p.210. Prescott mentions that three converted Jews were private secretaries to Isabella (II, p.123) George Eliot according to her journal, 21 December 1861 (J.W. Cross, III, 28), was reading E. Carmoly's Histoire des Médecins Juifs Anciens et Modernes (1844) in which we learn that the Castillian and Argonese royal houses were medically served by Jewish doctors (p.210). George Eliot's copy of Carmoly at Dr. Williams' A.I, 61. with her markings. For a more recent account of the Jewish contribution to Spanish civilisation see S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, Vol.VII
 2. History of Spanish Literature, I, 360.
 3. S.G., p.177. 4. S.G., p.183.

My people's livery, whose yellow badge
Marks them for Christian scorn.¹

reinforces the moral of the drama. The claims of race, memory and tradition are stronger than those of affection. Sephardo clearly states his uncompromising position,

I am no Catholic
But Salomo Sephardo, a born Jew,
Willing to serve Don Silva.²

Sephardo is, of course, fortunate in receiving the protection of an influential person - Don Silva. Others were not so fortunate. Sephardo tells Don Silva that he will not adopt the position of "the rich marranos" or converted Jews who take the attitude that "Man is first man" to them rather than "Jew or Gentile".³ But George Eliot presents her readers not with a wealthy convert but with a man who wants to survive. Her host, unlike Sephardo, has no access to the court. His motives are shown with sly humour,

His father was a convert, chose the chrism
As men choose physic, kept his chimney warm
With smokiest wood upon a Saturday,
Counted his gains and grudges on a chaplet,
And crossed himself asleep for fear of spies;
Trusting the Gods of Israel would see
'Twas Christian tyranny that made him base.⁴

George Eliot's portrait of Sephardo is a complicated one. The dichotomies in Sephardo's views represent not only his own

1. S.G., p.183.

2. S.G., p.183.

3. S.G., p.183. In a note to her readers George Eliot explains that the term "marranos" was one of contempt used by the Spanish for Jewish converts "new Christians". However, George Eliot tells us that "many marranos held the highest secular and ecclesiastical prizes in Spain, and were respected accordingly." S.G. pp. 355-356.

4. S.G., p.12.

internal struggles but wider ones. Sephardo's concern is whether man is capable of controlling his own destiny? This question obsessed Jewish and Arabic medieval metaphysicians, for if man had some control over his future then God was not completely in command.¹ The area in which this problem was most debated was that of astrology. If by reading the stars man could foresee his future, God's omnipotence was in question. Don Silva believes in a fate told by the stars. His tutor cannot be as certain as his pupil, and tells Don Silva that he believes that the stars "are not absolute, And tell no fortunes."² Sephardo relies on tradition and reason rather than the results of man's discoveries:

we walk evermore
To higher paths, by brightening Reason's lamp.
Still we are purblind, tottering.³

Sephardo explains the basis of his belief by an appeal to traditional Judaic discussion. He tells Don Silva that

Two angels guide
The path of man, both aged and yet young,
As angels are, ripening through endless years.
On one he leans: some call her Memory,
And some, Tradition; ...⁴

In order to place Sephardo's difficulties within a specific historical context George Eliot deliberately introduces the name of

-
1. See E.M.O. Deutsch, "Judaeo-Arabic Metaphysics", in Memoirs, p.194.
 2. S.G., p.199.
 3. S.G., p.202.
 4. S.G., pp.201,202. In his lecture on "The Talmud" (October 1867) Deutsch explained that according to Talmudic discussion on the subject of guardian angels "two of them accompany every man, and for every new good deed man acquires a new guardian angel, who always watches over his steps." Memoirs, p.50.

"the best known and most admired Jewish author in the [medieval] Christian world,"¹ Rabbi Abraham Aben-Ezra (c.1092 - c.1167). Sephardo tells Don Silva,

I hold less
Than Aben-Ezra, of that aged lore
Brought by long centuries from Chaldaean plains;²
The Jew-taught Florentine rejects it all.
For still the light is measured by the eye,
And the weak organ fails. I may see ill;
But over all belief is faithfulness,
Which fulfils vision with obedience.³

Long before nineteenth-century Biblical scholarship and the work of Spinoza,⁴ the wandering scholar and poet Aben-Ezra in his Biblical Exegesis questioned the authenticity of the Old Testament texts, showing that many verses in the Torah had originated at a period later than the Mosaic events which they described. Aben-Ezra wrote several works of an astrological nature and argues that the influence of the stars on human destiny was unalterable.⁵

Sephardo's affirmation of belief in memory and tradition and his rejection of Aben-Ezra's philosophy has affinities with the response of some Victorian thinkers to their own spiritual doubts and uncertainties when confronted with Biblical criticism and the results of scientific and biological research. As George Eliot writes to John Blackwood on 21 March 1867, her poem "is not historic, but has merely historic connections."⁶ For instance, Matthew Arnold in

-
1. S.W. Baron, VIII, 160.
 2. i.e. astrology.
 3. S.G., p.202.
 4. Spinoza in T.T.P. frequently refers to Aben-Ezra's life and work as does C.C. Hennell in his Inquiry.
 5. See M. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, I, especially, pp.197-201.
 6. L., IV, 355.

Literature and Dogma (1873), found some relief from his overwhelming sense of isolation in the universe by arguing that science and art, the domain that constitutes "Hellenism", make up between them but one-fourth of life, the remaining three-fourths allotted to conduct, Arnold emphasised ethical behaviour - "Hebraism"¹ - and like Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, and G.H. Lewes, based his attitudes upon a belief in man's relationship with past wisdom, memory and tradition. For Arnold, as for the younger Samuel Butler and many Victorians, the past irrevocably shaped a man's present and affected his attitudes and conduct. Butler went as far as to write in his Unconscious Memory (1880) that all life is "the being possessed of a memory - the life of a thing at any moment is the memories which at the moment it retains".²

In S.G. Sepharo continually appeals to his sense of a long Judaic tradition and affirms his belief in the traditional Judaic conception of God. His pupil Don Silva believes not only in the results of star-gazing but in the permanence of his passion for Fedalma for whom he is prepared to sacrifice home, religion and throne and to become a fellow-gypsy. The past is too great for Fedalma who returns to her people to seek an ancestral home, the ancient centre of Gypsy civilisation. Don Silva, at the conclusion of the poem, when he realises that his passion is no longer a reality, undertakes a pilgrimage to Rome in order to return to the centre of wisdom, memory and tradition of his Spanish European

-
1. See "Hebraism and Hellenism" section of Culture and Anarchy and the conclusion of Literature and Dogma.
 2. S. Butler, Unconscious Memory, p.272. Quoted by J.H. Buckley in The Triumph of Time - A Study of the Victorian Concepts of Time, History, Progress and Decadence, p.103. Although citing many literary illustrations of the Victorian's concern with spiritual questions and attitudes to the past, Buckley ignores completely S.G. as a relevant document.

world.

The Gypsies and the Jews:

In her Notes on "The Spanish Gypsy and Tragedy in General" George Eliot wrote that she "could not use the Jews ... because the facts of their history were too conspicuously opposed to the working out of my catastrophe."¹ George Eliot chose the Gypsies, a nomadic oppressed race who had rarely intermingled within the countries in which they lived. They had little in the way of sophisticated cultural traditions and highly developed institutions as cohering communal focal points. One of the main sources for George Eliot's knowledge of the Gypsies was, according to her "Commonplace Book",² George Borrow's, The Zincali; or, An Account of the Gypsies of Spain. Borrow relates how the Inquisition and the Spanish treated the Gypsy as "Gente burrata y despreciable".³ George Eliot noted how,

Jews and even Moorish families - could much less have any scruples [than the Spanish monarchs] in laying hands on the Gypsy. The edict for their extermination was published in the year 1492. But, instead of passing the boundaries, they slunk into hiding-places, and shortly⁴ after appeared everywhere in as great numbers as before.

Borrow stressed how as a result of persecution, despite their internal differences, there was a highly developed feeling of racial affinity amongst Gypsies. He found in Spain of the 1830s

-
1. J.W. Cross, III, p.43.
 2. Y.U.L. George Eliot's notes on the Gypsies, pp.213-221, 158. In these notes she indicates three sources, G. Borrow, A.F. Pott, Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien, 2 Vols., Halle, 1844-45. See ib., V, 32, and H.M.G. Grellmann, Die Zigeuner, Ein historischer Versuch uber die Lebensart und Verfassung Sitten und Schicksahle dieses Volks in Europa, nebstihrem Ursprunge, Leipzig, 1783.
 3. The Zincali, p.172.
 4. "Commonplace Book", p.216. George Eliot's underlining.

"much of that fellow-feeling which springs from a consciousness of proceeding from one common origin, or, as they love to term it, 'blood'."¹

Borrow's explanation of the differences between the Jews and the Gypsies, illustrates George Eliot's choice of the Gypsies for her poem. Borrow writes "Both have had an exodus, both as exiles and dispersed among the Gentiles ... both, though speaking the language of the Gentiles, possess a peculiar tongue ... and both possess a peculiar cast of countenance".² Fedalma looking at the captured Gypsy leader - whom she does not know to be her father - seems to see in his eyes

the sadness of the world
Rebuking her, the great bell's hidden thought
Now first unveiled - the sorrows unredeemed
Of races outcast, scorned, and wandering.³

Borrow develops his comparison between the Gypsies and the Jews. For Borrow the Gypsies have no real religion whilst the Jews have one "to which they are fanatically attached." The Jews, unlike the Gypsies, possess a great tradition of learning and historical memory rooted in an actual and historical homeland.⁴ The Gypsies do not really "know the name of their original country, and the only tradition which they possess, that of their Egyptian origin.

-
1. The Zinicali, p.271.
 2. Ibid., p.159.
 3. S.G., p.66.
 4. George Eliot was reading G.B.Depping's Histoire Générale de L'Espagne, (2 Vols., 1814), during the composition of S.G., 15 September 1866, L., IV, 301. George Henry Lewes's copy now at Dr. Williams's B.9.8-9. Above Depping's description of Vespasian's conquest of Jerusalem, George Eliot has written that the Jews "Went in Captivity cling to return." (Vol.2. p.28).

is a false one."¹ George Eliot noted in her "Commonplace Book" that "One story (said to be told by the Gypsies themselves) was that their wandering from Egypt was inflicted on them as a punishment for the sin of their ancestors in refusing an asylum to the Infant Jesus."²

Zarca tells his daughter Fedalma of his dream of leading a return of his people to Africa,

They have a promised land beyond the sea:
There I may lead them, raise my standard, call
The wandering Zincali to that home,
And make a nation - bring light, order, law,
Instead of chaos.³

He informs her that the Gypsies are

A people with no home in memory
No dimmest lore of giant ancestors,
To make a common hearth for piety.⁴

Fedalma, in Graham Handley's words, finds "herself deeply moved by Zarca's conception of his mission" and Handley argues that Fedalma "willingly and unhesitatingly embraces her destiny."⁵ Handley follows the lead set by Henry James in regarding Fedalma as a thoroughly oversimplified creation. Fedalma's reaction to her father indicates a fierce struggle within her between the claims of race and duty, and her Spanish upbringing. Fedalma has few illusions and initially a negative attitude to the Gypsies. She speaks of them as

A race that lives on prey as foxes do
With stealthy, petty rapine: so despised,

-
1. The Zincali, p.160.
 2. Commonplace Book, p.217.
 3. S.G., p.151. The 5th Edition of the Poem (1875) extends the third line to read "The wandering Zincali to that new home," p160.
 4. S.G. p 135. The 5th Edition changes the first line to read "Who have no Whence or Whither in their souls" and "giant" in the second line to "glorious" p.142.
 5. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, p.349.

It is not persecuted, only spurned.
Crushed underfoot, warred on by chance life rats.¹

At the conclusion of the poem she understands her renunciation of her past life and her lover in terms of duty to her father rather than as the product of a blind passionate ideal. Fedalma tells Don Silva in their final interview that she will "plant" her father's "sacred hope within the sanctuary and die its priestess".²

Although I think that Graham Handley oversimplifies Fedalma's attitude to her father, he is right to say that "The restoration of her homeless tribe or the claims of another life are made Fedalma's problem."³ She has blood ties which she cannot ignore or deny. In S.G. "race" as applied to a specific group of people who have a strong sense of kinship becomes evident. The use of the idea in the poem differs from its usage by W.G. Riehl and later development of volk ideology. G.L. Mosse explains in The Crisis of German Ideology that "the Volk did not have universal dimensions, but was limited to a particular national unit. "... The term 'rooted' was constantly invoked by Volkish thinkers"⁴ and for Riehl it implied those who had lived in the same rural environment for centuries. The Jews and the Gypsies were neither from the small town, the village or peasants, but were restless and rootless, had no home and occupied no specific territory. It is significant that George Eliot extolled no specific 'rooted' kind of life

1. S.G., p. 135.

2. S.G., p.347.

3. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, p.350.

4. The Crisis of German Ideology, pp.15,-16.

but for this poem dealing with kinship, history and tradition George Eliot used the Gypsies, a group of people without a definite ancestral tradition and cohering communal institutions, and the Jews who possessed tradition and institutions but were a dispersed, exiled people. She did not choose the volk of contemporary and later German thought: the idyllic Medieval volk, or those of the remote Germanic past celebrated for instance in Wagner's opera, Nibelungen, which George Eliot and George Henry Lewes saw in Dresden on 18 September 1867. Lewes commented in his Journal that it "Interested us very much, though it is a subject ill suited to the opera, better left in the twilight of Mythology."¹

In her "Notes on the Spanish Gypsy and Tragedy in general" George Eliot wrote of the universal significance of the local conflict between the Moors, Jews, Gypsies and Christians in late medieval Spain and of the need to renounce "the expectation of marriage". - The subject "might be taken as a symbol of the part which is played in the general human lot by hereditary conditions in the largest sense, and of the fact that what we call duty is entirely made up of such conditions." Individual desires, such as that of wishing to marry a person from a different ethnic background, should be resisted. It is necessary to adjust

our individual needs to the dire necessities of our lot, partly as to our natural constitution, partly as sharers of life with our fellow-beings. Tragedy consist in the terrible difficulty of this adjustment -

"The dire strife

Of poor Humanity's afflicted will,
Struggling in vain with ruthless destiny."

Looking at individual lots, I seemed to see in each the same story, wrought out with more or less of tragedy,...²

-
1. G.H.L. - J. 18 September 1867.
 2. J.W. Cross, III, 43, 44.

Latimer in L.V. has no human companionship or tradition to make his existence tolerable. Romola comes to terms with her life through her discovery of a child who has survived a plague and shipwreck. In S.G., the Gypsies and the Jews gain sustenance in their fight for survival in their awareness of memory and tradition. George Eliot wrote to Clifford Allbutt in [August 1868], two months after the publication of her poem, that

the inspiring principle which alone gives me courage to write is, that of representing our human life as to help my readers in getting a clearer conception and a more active admiration of those vital elements which bind men together and give a higher worthiness to their existence.

In S.G., "those vital elements", are not only the tremendous influence of memory and tradition amongst persecuted people but their belief in better days to come. In the case of the Gypsies and the Jews a return to the country of their origin, an aspiration which gives a "higher worthiness to their existence."¹

The insistence in L.V., R., and S.G., is that the reader can learn from the experiences of the homeless, the maltreated and the oppressed. In D.D. this preoccupation with less fortunate and despised humanity is focused specifically upon the Jews who provide the spiritually enriching and sustaining values in the novel. Sephardo, the defender of memory, tradition and Jewish aspiration in S.G., tells his pupil Don Silva,

1. L., IV, 472.

CHAPTER 5

.....Israel
Is to the nations as the body's heart¹
Thus saith the Book of Light.

In D.D., Israel symbolises universal suffering humanity and teaches it to endure.

works dealing with Jews and reflecting anti-semitism; secondly, historical evidence relating to general anti-semitic prejudice in Europe, the beginnings of the reestablishment of the Jews, specific instances of mass persecution, and including Jewish reactions to them, which George Eliot had included in, and dealt with in her last novel.

D.D. was written at a turning point in Jewish history. Bismark's withdrawal of troops - the withdrawal which encouraged anti-semitic sentiment, which, following the 1871 exchange collapse, caused a panic in 1873 followed a period and officially sanctioned persecution of Jews in Germany. Five years after D.D. appeared the market began to recover in earnest and that the Jews began to leave Germany in search for Western Europe and America. To the distinguished historians of European Jewry, this is today, the most important event in Jewish history during the nineteenth century was not one of

1. S.G., p.196. The "Book of Light" is the mystical work, the Zohar. By the appearance of the Cabinet Edition this line has been changed to the more accurate "Thus writes our poet Jehuda," S.G. p.210. The source is Jehuda Halevi's Chuzari.

1. "The Jewish Question in the 19th Century", Journal of Modern History, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1928, p. 10.

CHAPTER 5

HISTORICAL AND LITERARY SOURCES OF "DANIEL DERONDA".

In this chapter I intend to look at some of the literary and historical sources of D.D. These will be of two kinds: fictional works dealing with Jews and reflecting anti-semitism; secondly, historical evidence relating to general anti-Jewish prejudice in Europe, the beginnings of the resettlement of the Jews, specific instances of both phenomena, and differing Jewish reactions to them, which George Eliot had knowledge of, and dealt with in her last novel.

D.D. was written at a turning point in Jewish history. Bismark's consolidation of Prussia - his Kulturkampf policy - encouraged anti-Jewish sentiments, which, following the 1873 exchange collapses, spread rapidly. 1875/6 witnessed widespread and officially condoned persecution of Rumanian Jewry. It was five years after D.D. appeared that the Czarist Pogroms began in earnest and that the Jews began to leave Eastern Europe en masse for Western Europe and America. To the distinguished historian of European Jewry, Salo W. Baron, the most significant event in Jewish History during the Nineteenth-Century was not one of those anticipating later catastrophes, but the tremendous movement of Jews from one area, country and continent to another, the "gigantic transplantation of a large sector of the people, exceeded in the numbers and the area affected even the renowned migrations of the exiles from Spain and Portugal".¹

1. "The Jewish Question in the Nineteenth Century", The Journal of Modern History, Vol. X, No.1, (March, 1938) p.54.

The growth in the population, and the migrations had their effect upon old modes of life, and these changes on an individual, rather than a general, level are described in D.D.

There was a widespread and gradual break-up of traditional Jewish settlements and occupations. The Jews widened their geographic areas of habitation through migratbns, penetrated into many hitherto restricted professions and became increasingly urbanised, moving from rural areas into the cities. Lapidoth's life and wanderings for example are a reflection of these processes. Lapidoth, who is from an obscure background, in an attempt to earn a living moves from Hamburg to Vienna, to Prague and then to America only to return to Hamburg and thence to London. Continually seeking his fortune, he uses people including his own daughter as objects.

George Eliot had an example of this restlessness readily at hand in Solomon Maimon's Lebensgeschichte, her heavily marked copy of which is now at Dr. Williams's Library. Israel Abrahams analysed George Eliot's marginal jottings in order to assess her Judaic knowledge, and after noting her correction of facts in Maimon concludes that her knowledge was extremely detailed. For instance, after noting that George Eliot translated into English the titles of Hebrew books cited by Maimon, Rabbi Abrahams quotes George Eliot's "correction of an apparently erroneous statement of fact on p.215". Maimon writes as though the Zohar has been published after the period of Sabbatai Zebi, the false messiah

Source: Maimon and Lapidoth and Disillusion, Insecurity

-
1. Lebensgeschichte, p. 215. For Maimon's other jottings see pp. 74, 85, 86, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.
 2. Lebensgeschichte, p. 215.
 3. Lebensgeschichte, p. 215.

of the middle seventeenth-century. George Eliot notes that "Sabbatai Zebi lived long after the production of the Zohar. He was a contemporary of Spinoza. Moses de Lion belonged to the fourteenth century."¹ Abraham concludes from this that George Eliot "knew Graetz's History for it is he who brought the names of Spinoza and Sabbatai Zebi together".²

Although George Eliot's copy of Maimon is heavily marked with comments revealing her Jewish knowledge, and Daniel Deronda meets Mordecai through searching for "something that he wanted - namely, that wonderful bit of autobiography, the life of the Polish Jew, Salomon Maimon;"³ what interests us is the content of Lebensgeschichte. The work is philosophical and also outlines Maimon's life and gives a picture of Polish Jewish Life in the middle period of the eighteenth-century. Maimon, a prodigy, had a very unhappy childhood and had married at the age of eleven. He was dominated by a cruel mother-in-law and the opening chapters of Lebensgeschichte movingly show the effects of a very insecure childhood upon a sensitive brilliant boy who was always being forced to move from one area of Poland to another. Eventually he met Mendelssohn, managed to secure a foothold in Berlin intellectual society and became famous as a philosopher. However, during his travels he had acquired a restless nature, became a sexual profligate, and a spend-thrift.

Common to Maimon and Lapidoth are dissipation, insecurity and dependence, continual restlessness and the attempt to

-
1. Lebensgeschichte, p. 215. for numerous other jottings see pp. 36, 48, 69, etc. Dr. Williams's C, 9, 32.
 2. I. Abrahams, "George Eliot and Salimon Maimon", The Book of Delight and Other Papers, p. 245.
 3. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 334.

integrate into predominantly Gentile society. However, unlike Maimon, Lapidoth was not academically gifted. Maimon was a genius and Kant "testified that of all the critics of his philosophy Maimon was the only one who understood it thoroughly."¹

From Lebensgeschichte George Eliot obtained the name Lapidoth.

In an early episode during his travels, Maimon writes,

In the place where I resided I had a bosom friend, Moses Lapidoth by name....Lapidoth had ... a love of speculation, and also great acuteness and power of judgement, but had no wish to proceed further than he could reach by a mere sound common sense. With this friend I used to hold many a conversation on subjects of mutual interest, especially the question of religion and morals. He had the advantage of a lively imagination, and consequently more talent for eloquence and poetry than I.²

Maimon, the friend of Kant and Mendelssohn, became estranged from his Jewish friends as well as Gentile ones and he received a pauper's burial. His life remains a testimony to Jewish ways of life and to an individual's attempt to eradicate the disadvantages of his early environment.

Lebensgeschichte is but one response to the changing pattern of Jewish life, especially in Germany where the example of Mendelssohn demonstrated that it was possible to merge Jewish and German identity. As the nineteenth-century progressed assimilationist attitudes became more pronounced and were reflected in forms of worship. Deronda, unaware, originally met Kalonymos

-
1. M. Waxman, History of Jewish Literature, III, 83.
 2. S. Maimon, An Autobiography, Translated J. Clark Marray, pp 138, 142. Lebensgeschichte, pp.189, 195.

in the Frankfurt orthodox synagogue, "not the fine new building of the Reformed",¹ in the Rabbinische Schule, in which the service was conducted in Hebrew rather than in the German of the Reform movement. Thus, Deronda, not brought up to read Hebrew had to have recourse to "the German translation of the Hebrew in the book before him",² in order to follow what was going on. The orthodox movement placed great emphasis upon tradition, refusing to divest itself of the mores, manners and attitudes to life peculiar to an autonomous, segregated ghetto group within a community. It was to the orthodox movement that the French thinker of Jewish origin, Ernest Rénan,³ scathingly referred when he argued that "The achievement of the nineteenth-century has been to batter down all the ghettos, and I do not compliment those who elsewhere wish to re-erect them."⁴ Orthodox Judaism was anti-assimilationist, whereas Reform Judaism, a specifically German development, attempted to adapt Jewish religion and its practice to the needs of modern civilisation and to divest it of many of its nationalist and separatist ingredients.

At the Hand and Banner, Mordecai's companions each illustrate different Jewish responses to their conditions. Pash is a watchmaker like Spinoza and derides the concept of nationality as reactionary, "the feeling of nationality is dying, I take the idea to be no better than a ghost, already walking to announce the

-
1. D.D., IV, xxxii, 298.
 2. D.D., IV, xxxii, 300. cf. Heine's description of a visit to the Juden-gasse.
 3. George Eliot referred to him as "a favourite writer of mine".L., IV, 93, George Eliot to Francois D'Albert-Durade, 18 July 1863, and see L. IV, 334, 356.
 4. Quoted S.W. Baron, Religious and Social History of the Jews, 2,300.

death". He believes with the Spinoza of T.T.P. that "in Europe the sentiment of nationality is destined to die out. It will last a little longer in the quarters where oppression lasts, but nowhere else. The whole current of progress is setting against it."¹ Further he believes that materialist concerns are primary in human motivation, and sarcastically tells Mordecai that "If somebody will introduce a brisk trade in watches among the 'Jerusalem wares', he will return to Israel."² And like Spinoza he denies the idea of the exclusiveness of Israel, "I don't see why our rubbish is to be held sacred any more than the rubbish of Brahmanism or Bouddhism."³ But Pash's "our" demonstrates that he still acknowledges that he is a Jew. Miller the bookseller who had "possibly far-away ancestors who denied themselves to be Jews",⁴ is an anti-semite of the "Voltaireian" kind⁵, who is cynical about everything. Gideon, on the other hand, a "Jew of the red-haired, generous-featured type", is genial and rational, the representative of the reformist movement. He is an assimilationist who sees "no reason now why we shouldn't melt gradually into the populations we live among." And "would as soon my children married Christians as Jews." He is for the old maxim, "A man's country is where he is well off".

The fear behind these responses is of anti-semitism, and Gideon's "now"⁶ contains his hope that in England prejudice against the Jews will not be so great as to prevent them for instance merging

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 229.
 2. D.D., VI, xlii, 233.
 3. D.D., VI, xlii, 246.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 224.
 5. D.D., VI, xlii, 237.
 6. D.D., VI, xlii, 225, 232-233.

their identity with the native population. Yet anti-semitism is prevalent in England and is reflected in character attitudes in D.D. Even in the hero, Daniel, his anti-Jewish preconceptions are reflected in his thinking before his discovery of his heredity. After he had rescued Mirah he desires to know more of her life but is "constantly haunted with dread" concerning her Jewish background. "Of learned and accomplished Jews he took it for granted that they had dropped their religion, and wished to be merged in the people of their native lands." Yet while searching for Mirah's family, he saw himself guided by some official scout into a dingy street; he entered through a dim doorway, and saw a hawk-eyed woman, rough-headed, and unwashed, cheapening a hungry girl's last bit of finery; or in some quarter only the more hideous for being smarter, he found himself under the breath of a young Jew talkative and familiar, willing to show his acquaintance with gentlemen's tastes, and not fastidious in any transactions with which they would favour him - and so on through the brief chapter of his experience in this kind.

George Eliot asks her readers to "excuse" Deronda who connects "dread with unknown parentage". She observes that "his forebodings would have been fed with wider knowledge"¹ and hence be replaced. Much later in the novel he finds great difficulty in telling Gwendolen that he is a Jew. His hesitancy is partly a result of his remembering his own prejudices and the consequences of his awareness of his English environment; it is also partly the feeling that he is letting Gwendolen down. When he has told Gwendolen, her response reflects a whole area of inbuilt prejudice: "A Jew!" Gwendolen exclaimed, in a low tone of amazement, with an utterly frustrated look, as if some confusing notion were creeping through her system." The gap between Deronda's and Gwendolen's

1. D.D., III, xix, 58.

two worlds is too great, "he could not go on easily - the distance between her ideas and his acted like a difference of native language, making him uncertain what force his words would carry." Gwendolen's response is appropriate and untrue, "You are just the same as if you were not a Jew."¹

Discrimination against the Jews in Victorian England was never as severe or as open as on the Continent. Although successive legislative enactments, in 1858, 1866 and 1878, had opened the highest government and university offices to Jews, Queen Victoria as late as 1869 objected "to a Jew being made a Peer."² The sociologist Maurice Freedman has attempted a brief explanation of the peculiar nature of prejudice in England. He writes, "There is ... perhaps no great contradiction between the myriad pinpricks and minor exclusions, on the one hand, and the major acceptances on the other." Freedman explains that "the personal prejudices which can operate in private life, ... may tend to be suppressed in deference to the rules of the greater institutions."³

The years 1866-74 saw not only an increased flow of Russian and Polish Jews into England, or, as the editor of The Jewish World wrote, an increase in population "especially among the poorer classes",⁴ but also a widespread outbreak of anti-semitism. The Jews were chosen as the scapegoats for the losses of money by investors that were taking place. Mrs. Davilow informs Gwendolen that "a dreadful calamity has befallen us all. You know nothing about business and will not understand it; but Grapnell

-
1. D.D., VIII, lxix, 349-350. George Eliot's emphasis.
 2. Quoted S.W. Baron, Religious and Social History of the Jews(1937),2,234.
 3. "Jews in the Society of Britain", A Minority in Britain, p.224.
 4. The Jewish World, 27 November 1874, p5.

and Co. have failed for a million and we are totally ruined".¹ Instead of attributing the loss to wider causes inherent in the financial system of the age, Mrs. Davilow's censure actually follows general rumour. An individual is responsible, "it is hard to resign one's self", she informs Gwendolen, "to Mr. Lassman's wicked recklessness, which they say was the cause of the failure."² Grapnell and Co. may be the fictional name for the actual firm of Overend and Gurney Ltd.,³ which in 1866 suspended payment to thousands of small investors and crashed for well over nineteen million pounds.⁴ The failure of this firm was but one of many such débâcles in this period. During the summer of 1873 "collapse, liquidation and the resulting slack trade spread from one business centre to another." The atmosphere of the period can be gauged from the editorial observations of The Jewish World which related that "superstitions" were "hardly dead". It reported "spiteful outbreaks of street gamins, newspaper editors, and other like personages" who seemed "to have an inherited dislike of" the Jews. The writer notes that the police reports in the newspapers had pointedly mentioned that "Moses had been had up for receiving stolen goods or gambling" and explicitly described him as a "Jew!"⁵ Edmund Yates in his novel Kissing the Rod (1869), has as his sympathetic hero the successful Daniel Thacker. Unfortunately he had, Yates informs his readers, "one thing which wrung and chafed him, which he could never shut out from his happiest hour, ... a fact which nothing could hide,

1. D.D., I, ii, 19.

2. D.D., I, ii, 20.

3. See B. Hardy, Daniel Deronda, Penguin Edition, p.886, fn.1.

4. J.H. Clapham, 'Free Trade and Steel 1850-1865,' An Economic History of Modern Britain, p.381.

5. The Jewish World, 7 August 1874, p.3.

a brand which no money could obliterate; - Mr. Daniel Thacker was an unmistakable Jew,"¹ Not only was he a Jew, "no man to whom he had ever rendered a service ... but set him down for a 'd--d Jew'."²

Anti-semitism and reflection of English attitudes to the Jews found its way into fictional characters' reactions not only in Yeats' forgotten novel but also in several of Trollope's late works. Of Trollope's novels Klein observed that Jewish characters were brought to the centre of them and given "a serious role ... to convey an idea of the new forces at work in a society to which the Jews belong more intimately than ever before."³ The Eustace Diamonds (1873) is, in Trollope's words, "the record of a cunning little woman of pseudo-fashion, to whom in her cunning, there came a series of adventures".⁴ This heroine, Lizzie Eustace, will stop at little to obtain wealth and position. She marries the Rev. Joseph Emiluis, one of "the most eloquent of London preachers,"⁵ and for a time, fashionable. We eventually are to discover that Emiluis is as much an upstart as his wife. He originally was Yosef Mealyus, a Bohemian Jew, who is attempting to discard his origins and cut a piece in English society. Emiluis complements Lizzie, both being comparatively uncomplicated charlatans seeking recognition in a world of poseurs. The banker Ferdinand Lopez is a more moving study, I think, than is Emiluis, of a Jew attempting to gain acceptance in an unjust and alien society. Lopez, in The Prime Minister (1876), has an obsession about amassing money in order to

1. Kissing the Rod, I, 90, 91.

2. Id, I, 92.

3. L.C. Klein, Ph.D., p.152.

4. A. Trollope, Autobiography, 344. All references unless otherwise stated to the Oxford Trollope editions.

5. The Eustace Diamonds, I, 327. George Eliot and George Henry Lewes reading in serial form. See G.H.L. - D, 28 September 1875.

gain social recognition. An orphan who has risen from an obscure Portuguese Jewish background, "he was essentially one of those men who are always, in the inner workings of their minds, defending themselves and attacking others."¹ He thus has a great need to be loved. This is conveyed when immediately after the death of a son, his wife chooses to tell him that she does not love him, and once his business founders she wishes to leave him. Trollope appositely comments upon the intense loneliness of the situation in which Lopez now finds himself: "Though this man had lived nearly all his life in England, he had not quite acquired that knowledge of the way in which things are done which is so general among men of a certain class and so rare among those beneath them."² The way out for Lopez is suicide. He jumps from a train.

In The Way We Live Now (1876)³ a Jew is the victim of insidious social anti-semitism. Georgiana Longestaffe's father upon hearing of his daughter's intention to marry a Jew exclaims, "A Jew! an old fat Jew! Heavens and earth! that it should be possible that you should think of it!What have I done that I should be punished by my children in this way?"⁴ Not only are the Jews "scattered about all over the world, so that nobody knows who anybody is", but they are "An accursed race ... expelled from Paradise."⁵ Brehgert, the middle aged banker who wishes to marry Georgiana is snubbed by her friends, chief amongst them being Lady Monogram who continually refers to him as "a butcher".⁶

-
1. The Prime Minister, I, 5. George Eliot and George Henry Lewes read in serial form. See George Henry Lewes - D, 30 November 1875.
 2. Id., II, 24.
 3. Issued in monthly numbers from 4 February 1874, to 6 September 1875., George Eliot and George Henry Lewes read in serial form, see L., IV, 75 n.8.
 4. The Way We Live Now, II, 95 References to First Edition, 1875.
 5. Id., II, 176.
 6. Id., II, 59.

Georgiana's motivation in marrying Brehgert is not love but the wish to obtain money and social position. Even her father, an impoverished squire, depends on Brehgert and thus cannot afford to openly insult him. However, when Brehgert's fortunes are reversed and he can no longer offer Georgiana a town house, she rejects him. A recent critic, Bradford A. Booth, has pointed out that The Way We Live Now is a statement of Trollope's "sense of the loss of ethical and spiritual values in his age and the substitution of the criteria of wealth and power." He further tells us that almost no one at the time of its publication praised the novel. "Most of the critics refused to admit that English people could be so mean, vulgar, tawdry and self-seeking as Trollope had pictured them".¹ Georgiana's thoughts on Brehgert are but a reflection of this selfishness:

The man was absolutely a Jew; - not a Jew that had been, as to whom there might possibly be a doubt whether he or his family of his grandfather had been the last Jew of the family; but a Jew that wasshe was sure that there was at present a general heaving-up of society on this matter, and a change in progress which would soon make it a matter of indifference whether anybody was Jew or Christian Lady Pomona her mother was distressingly old-fashioned, and had so often spoken with horror even of the Jew, and had been so loud in denouncing the iniquity of Christians who had allowed such people into their houses!... And then her father, - if he had ever earned for himself the right to be called a Conservative politician by holding a real opinion of his own - it has been on that matter of admitting the Jews into parliament. When that had been done he was certain that the glory of England was sunk for ever....How could she tell parents such as these that she was engaged to marry a man who at the present moment went to synagogue on a Saturday and carried out every other filthy abomination common to the despised people?²

-
1. Bradford A. Booth, Anthony Trollope, 119, See Tony Tanner, "Trollope's The Way We Live Now," Critical Quarterly, IX, 2. Autumn 1967, 256-257.
 2. The Way We Live Now, II, 61-62.

It would be difficult to locate in any other single passage in Victorian Literature such a catalogue of fears and prejudices.

George Eliot's knowledge of English prejudice would have been reinforced during the early 1870's not only through her reading of Trollope's novels. From 1871 there began a minor Cause célèbre which represented an affront to liberalism. Legislation of 1872/3 threw open all lay posts in the Universities to men of all faiths, who could apply upon equal terms. The letter of the law was implemented before its spirit. The Jewish Chronicle gave an account of the treatment of a mathematician, James Joseph Sylvester, who at Cambridge had been "debarred from receiving the Fellowship which he had gained," because he was a Jew. In 1870 he was dismissed "with a wretched pittance by way of pension" from the Professorship of Mathematics at Woolwich Military Academy "after nearly fifteen years service." The paper commented that "The Treasury economised ... by dismissing Sylvester about six weeks before his fifteen years service would have expired."¹ After the affair had been raised in Parliament, Sylvester was awarded a Cambridge M.A., but in the meantime he had turned to legal studies. George Eliot appropriately observed to her friend Mme. Eugène Bodichon, "poor Mr. Sylvester! It is saddening to think of him beginning anew at 64 - driven from what he is first-rate in One longs helplessly to be of use to such a man."² It was not Sylvester's experience, but the career of her close personal friend the scholar Emanuel Oscar Menahem Deutsch (1829-1873) which brought George Eliot her most revealing confrontation with the plight of the Jewish intelligentsia in England.³

1. The Jewish Chronicle, 18 August, 1871, p.2.

2. L., VI, 162. 13 August 1875.

3. See Ch. 7 pp.216-221.

A reaction to anti-semitism was the desire for a return to Israel, for what has become known as the Zionist movement. As we have seen, F.R. Leavis in The Great Tradition followed Henry James's comments and dismisses the Jewish sections of D.D. as "bad".¹ Underlying the early criticism of Leavis and the comments of Henry James is a refusal to believe in George Eliot's Jews, their characters or beliefs. James's Constantius doubts "whether such a thing as a Jewish revival is at all a possibility." Constantius is unable to "perceive exactly what practical steps could be taken" and believes that the Jews "have other fish to fry" than nationalist ones. She does not "believe that is the way they take themselves."² Daniel's ideas, based mainly upon Mordecai's proposals for the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland, were not so fantastic as they may have seemed. They were genuinely related to a movement for return amongst the diasporal Jews, to proposals and practical measures by the British Government to encourage Jewish settlement in Palestine, and to a measure of rejuvenation in the Palestine Jewish community itself.

The Government of Palmerston had seriously considered plans to bring about an increase in Jewish settlement within the Turkish-ruled Middle East to stabilize it politically and stimulate it economically in order to defend the trade routes to India. Palmerston commented in a dispatch to the British ambassador in Constantinople that

There can be no doubt that very great benefit would accrue to the Turkish Government if any considerable number of opulent Jews could be persuaded to come and settle in the Ottoman Dominions, because their wealth would afford employment to the People and their Intelligence would give an useful direction to Industry.

Not only were immigrant Jews given full official British protection but government policy was to "persuade Jews in a large body to

-
1. The Great Tradition, p.82.
 2. The Atlantic Monthly, December 1876, p.687.
 3. 24 November 1840. Quoted S.W. Baron, "The Jewish Question in the Nineteenth Century," The Journal of Modern History, Op.Cit. p.63.

settle" in Palestine "as agriculturists on the soil".¹ State policy was supplemented by an increasing propaganda campaign by advocates of a Jewish return. Such an idea was widely distributed in pamphlet form and found novelistic expression in, for instance, Mrs. Tonna's Judah's Lion (1843) and Disraeli's Alroy (1833) and Tancred (1847) - highly imaginative romance-fantasy works.²

Most pamphlet advocacy was more concrete and politically oriented than Mrs. Tonna's or Disraeli's fiction. For example, Thomas Clarke in India and Palestine: or, The Restoration of the Jews, viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India, (1861) argued that the restoration of the Jews to Palestine was not only a prophetic but a political necessity. Clarke saw it as a solution to the Eastern Question, as a barrier to Russian and French expansion in the Middle Eastern area. With a flourishing Palestinian commercial centre controlled by "Jewish business connections and acumen"³ a link with India could be developed. Clarke suggested a projected railway line along the Euphrates valley linking India with the Mediterranean. A.H. Layard, speaking in a commons debate on Turkey, stressed that "although Egypt is a high road to India, Syria and the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris form the high road, and any power holding those countries would command India".⁴ Following a visit to the

-
1. James Finn, Consul in Jerusalem, to Clarendon, 15 Sept. 1857. Quoted A.M. Hyamson, The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews of Palestine, 1838-1914, I, 49.
 2. For an account of these novels see references in L.C. Klein, M.A. thesis, and Franz Kobler, The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, pp.71-75.
 3. T. Clarke, India and Palestine, p.14
 4. Times, 17 August 1853, p.5. Layard's emphasis.

the Euphrates complex, Layard asked in Nineveh, which George Eliot had first read in its shortened form in 1848-1849,¹ whether "the waters be again turned into the empty channels, and may not life be again spread over these parched and arid wastes?"² And Clarke concluded his pamphlet by saying that he had "always regarded the revival of the ancient highway of traffic between the East and the West - the valley of the Euphrates - as intimately connected with the return of the Jews."³

Mordecai's words to Deronda are an expression of his ideal, which is,

Looking towards a land and a polity, [where] our dispersed people in all the ends of the earth may share the dignity of a national life which has a voice among the peoples of the East and the West - which will plant the wisdom and skill of our race so that it may be, as of old, a medium of transmission and understanding.⁴

This ideal not only presents a universalistic rather than a narrowly chauvinistic outlook, but echoes contemporary as well as mediæval phraseology and has a pragmatic basis. Much of Mordecai's thinking has its mediæval counterpart: here his sentiments seem close to the words of Yehuda Halevi: "Have we, indeed, in East or in the West, any place of hope, wherein our faith can rest - except that land so rich in sacred ground."⁵

-
1. L., I, 275. fn. 7, and see L., III, 148.
 2. A.H. Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains, II, 636.
 3. T. Clarke, Op. Cit., vi.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 243.
 5. 'For the sake of God's House,' Tr. S.J. Kahn, The Jewish Quarterly, XVI, p.30.

Anarchy in Syria during 1860-1861, and the Crimean War, reinforced the importance of Palestine for British colonial interests. In 1865 the "Palestine Exploration Society" was formed in London in order to explore the Biblical lands. Engineers, surveyors and soldiers, of the calibre of Claude Conder, Charles Warren and Kitchener, were seconded from the British army in order to draw up surveys to prepare the way for the settlement of immigrants from Russia and to decide on Palestine's potential as an industrial producing country. Annual reports were published and widely circulated on the society's activities, especially the side of its work devoted to exploring ancient Biblical sites, rather than to practical survey work. At the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford, in May 1870, George Eliot heard her beloved friend E.O.M. Deutsch lecture¹ on the inscriptions of the recently discovered Moabite Stone. On the same lecture programme George Eliot heard Deutsch's friend, Captain Charles Warren, describe his reconnaissance of Jerusalem and the Jordan Valley for the Exploration Society.

Mordecai's prophesy that "The degraded and scorned of our race will learn to think of their sacred land, not as a place for saintly beggary to await death in loathsome idleness,"² also has a basis in contemporary practical developments. Deutsch, a frequent visitor to the Priory, before and after his journey to the Middle East, would have informed George Eliot of the practical activity in the region, to which Jews were no longer going merely to die. The British Consul in Jerusalem recorded that "A plot of ground of about eight to twelve English acres had been purchased in 1852 That land was set apart ... under the name of 'the Industrial Plantation

1. L., V, 100. George Eliot - J., 27 May 1870.

2. D.D., VI, xlii, 252.

for employment of Jews of Jerusalem', ... to afford daily employment to the residents of the city."¹ By 1870 the Alliance Israélite Universelle, an organisation based in Paris and concerned with the protection of Jewish interests, had begun to take an active interest in Palestinian Jewish development, and agricultural settlements and schools had been established. Settlements sponsored by different associations were operating in Palestine and Jerusalem had a Jewish hospital.² George Eliot noted, from a source which I have been unable to identify, developments in Palestinian colonisation subsequent to 1863, the year in which the Alliance began to take an extensive interest in promoting agricultural foundations. The alliance "endeavoured to found a colony at Jaffa." Agricultural work generally had been hampered, as Mordecai's words implied, by the opposition of Rabbis who had "lent all their energies to inculcate the doctrine that all who return" to Palestine "are Saints and that therefore they and their descendants shall be entirely supported by the alms of the Faithful elsewhere." Consequently, "the Jews who live there, being Saints, are never to work - only to pray and live idle because holy they teach that it is irreligious for a Jew in Jerusalem to work." George Eliot notes from another source, "What is now beginning to happen"³ that there are "8,000 to 9,000 Jews in Jerusalem" and those elsewhere in Palestine are increasingly taking to "agricultural and pastoral"⁴ employment. She also noted, from an unidentified source, an advertisement

1. Stirring Times, or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856, II, 56,57.
2. See I. Elbogen, A Century of Jewish Life, pp.249-250.
3. Pforzheimer, MS. 711, f.46. George Eliot's underlining. And in Pforzheimer, MS. 711 she noted the existence of a "Palestine Colonisation Union 1865" f.1.
4. Ibid., George Eliot indicates this source as The Academy, 25 April, 1874, p.460, from an item on Jerusalem.

announcing "Large and excellent plots of ground for sale close to the Agricultural school at Jaffa."¹ She observed that The Jewish Chronicle carried details of a memorial to the patron of World Jewry, Moses Montefiore. The memorial was to consist of "an undertaking for permanently improving the condition of the Jews in the Holy Land by the promotion of industrial pursuits, the erection of improved dwellings and the acquisition and cultivation of land..."² In February 1879 George Eliot wrote to John Blackwood about a mutual friend, the writer Laurence Oliphant, who was trying to obtain a concession from the Turkish Government to buy land, "There is a great movement now among the Jews towards colonising Palestine, and bringing out the resources of the soil."³ And just over two years earlier following the completion of her novel, George Eliot expressed her "longing to go to the East."⁴

There are two non-English literary sources which provide illustrations of Jews who in spite of great personal sacrifice wished to return to Zion. During their European visit of Autumn 1872, George Eliot acquired a copy of Leopold Kompert's Neue Geschichten aus dem Ghetto⁵ and George Henry Lewes comments that it was bought "for Polly's novel". And before going to the synagogue George Henry Lewes's diary records that he and George Eliot were reading Kompert's stories of life in the Ghetto.⁶ In the first volume of Ghetto stories, Aus dem Ghetto, there is a story called "Die Kinder des Rander". Its central character is Mendel Wilna a travelling schnorrer or beggar who is obsessed with one idea -

-
1. Pforzheimer: MS. 711, f9.
 2. The Jewish Chronicle, 8 January 1875, 649.
 3. L., VII, 109, George Eliot to J. Blackwood, 25 February, 1879.
 4. L., VI, 319, George Eliot to Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, 16 Dec 1876.
 5. L., V, 315, George Henry Lewes - D, 20 September - 21 October 1872.
 6. L., V, 425. 30 July 1873.

that of rebuilding Jerusalem, an idea for which he sacrifices all. Jerusalem had become his idée fixe, "There was nothing else in my head night and day.... my evil spirit.... the idea of rebuilding Jerusalem allowed me no repose."¹ In pursuit of his vision he left his wife and children and Kompert asks,

How can it matter what ideal exists in the mind of a man or of an entire nation, provided it edifies? What though the Jerusalem of the Jew consisted in that beautiful blue flower, full of perfume which he sees beyond so much dirt and vermin, so much ruined masonry and disgusting traffic, bloom above his head in incomparable beauty, and to which nothing would attain! And if the tenderest threads of his thought, the most secret fibres of his soul lived in the midst of its perfumes? Would you deprive him of it? Only children and Mendel Wilna would still believe in a rebuilding of Jerusalem.²

Mendel Wilna often told his hopes to young Moschele Schmull who did not go to Jerusalem but remained in the Bohemian ghetto as a doctor. Moschele told the old Mendel that he "shall never pick up a stone towards rebuilding Jerusalem, while nothing will content you but to be its architect." At his death Mendel is "heard to murmur these words, which were engraved on his soul - "The earth! the earth!" And when he at last takes his leave of his protégé he comments "It seems to me more than ever that Jerusalem ought to be rebuilt."³ Mendel dies alone, poor and in exile, wandering.

Kompert's ghetto tales are compulsive, moving reading and must have had an effect upon George Eliot's imagination. There is also

1. L. Kompert, Scenes from the Ghetto: Studies of Jewish Life, pp. 192-194.

2. Ibid, p. 243.

3. Ibid, pp. 262, 279.

another literary source relating to Jewish aspirations which may have stirred her. In Alexander Dumas fils's play La Femme de Claude, performed in Paris in 1873 and subsequently published by Dumas, the leading character, Daniel, a Jew, wishes to return to Palestine. He has a daughter named Rebecca who renounces her Gentile lover and travels with her father Daniel "towards the east." Daniel tells his audience that

I am perhaps called upon to reconquer our country. We live at a time when each race is determined to reclaim and to possess its own soil, its homeland, its language, its temple We want to be a people ... a nation. The abstract ideal of a homeland does not satisfy us any longer, a definite territory, a country of our own, has become a necessity to us, and I am going to try to establish our claim legally (certificate de naissance).¹

The legal claim may refer to the activities of the Alliance Israélite Universelle who were buying up land and whose activities achieved practical fruition in the opening by Baron Edmond de Rothschild in 1878 of Petah-Tikvah.² However there is no evidence that George Eliot or George Henry Lewes either saw or read Dumas' play which seems not to have been performed during their Paris visits in June 1873 and October 1874. The Athenaeum did publish a notice in its English edition and George Eliot may have seen this.³ L.C. Klein, who first drew attention to the parallels between D.D. and Dumas' drama, remarks that it is not the obvious similarities between the two which are important but "the proof of a current of ideas, an early pre-Jewish Zionism, which has left its imprint on minds so very dissimilar as those of the French playwright and the English novelist." She concludes that

-
1. La Femme de Claude, 11, i. English translation. Quoted Klein M.A. thesis, p.168.
 2. The oldest Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine.
 3. The Athenaeum, May 3, 1873, p.563.

Comte's ideas were instrumental in influencing both towards the idea that "in order to work for the common good, man must first find his place in his own immediate environment of family and nation."¹

Zionism was active in the nineteenth-century and ideas practical and theoretical were under way for the return of the dispersed people. Theoretically, these ideas were advocated in fictional or pamphlet form: practically in agricultural settlement, and hospital schemes. A driving-force behind Zionism has been anti-semitism and the old prophetic promises of return. Fictional as well as personal experience of racial discrimination was available to George Eliot as well as to the European Jews and George Eliot in D.D. showed her characters indulging in anti-semitism.

1. L.C. Klein, M.A. thesis, p.169. editing, restoring, discovering, and making available, neglected Jewish source materials.

CHAPTER 6

JEWISH HISTORIANS, JEWISH MYSTICISM AND JEHUDA HALEVI.

In this Chapter I shall examine the work of some nineteenth-century Jewish historians and demonstrate where necessary that George Eliot read their work, and was influenced by them. I shall also discuss the way in which she used historical scholarship in D.D. I shall begin with a chronological analysis of this scholarship, and conclude the first section of the chapter with a discussion of the work of Heinrich Graetz. Then in the second section George Eliot's usage of material which Graetz neglected will be not only emphasised but will be illustrated. George Eliot heavily drew upon this material, the Kabbalah, and the writings of Jehuda Halevi, in portraying the relationship between Mordecai and Daniel Deronda.

Section 1: Historians and Historiography

The historian Leopold Zunz, a friend of Heinrich Heine in the early 1820's, founded for the purposes of the revival of Jewish learning and cultural heritage, the Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden.¹ He believed that knowledge of Jewish cultural-intellectual traditions would increase the reputation of, and change the attitude of Jews, as well as non-Jews, towards Judaism. Zunz's life's work was devoted to editing, restoring, discovering, and making available, neglected Jewish source materials.

1. See Ch. 2 of this thesis.

His work is especially concentrated upon the medieval period. In his Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters (1855-9), Zunz undertakes the first volume of a trilogy devoted to medieval literature. In Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters he distinguishes between the prophet and the psalmist. The prophet interprets history and looks forward, he is a representative of God admonishing the people to return to Zion. The psalmist is the representative of the nation beseeching God for forgiveness, and composes penitential prayers, selicha, psalms expressing the anguish of the people amid great suffering. The prophet composes piyyut - poetical insertions, exhortations invoking the past as a constant memory.¹

Following his differentiation between piyyut and selicha, Zunz chronologically lists the sufferings of the Jews from the time of the Emperor Constantine to the period of Charles V. He is thus able to give a detailed list of Selicha-psalms of exile. Zunz pays especial attention to the persecutions of the two centuries following the Middle Ages. In his section on eleventh century Selicha - Dichter, he refers to a family of scholars and poets named Kalonymos, foremost amongst them being the poet Jehuda b. Kalonymos from Mainz who lived around 1090, and who not only founded a distinguished dynasty of poets and writers, but edited many of the selicha of the period. Zunz cites a few illustrations from Jehuda Kalonymos's work.² In D.D. Joseph Kalonymos of Mainz is the closest friend of Daniel Deronda's father and returns to Deronda his ancestral possessions.³

-
1. George Eliot's copy of Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters in Dr. Williams's B. 10.28.
 2. Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters, pp. 16ff, 258.
 3. D.D., VIII, lxiii.

George Eliot used the opening paragraph of the second section of Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters for the epigraph and first paragraph of Ch. 42 of D.D. In the novel the epigraph is in German and the first paragraph in English. Zunz' paragraph in Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters opens a catalogue of Jewish suffering, at the hands of Christian Europe and in the name of Christianity. George Eliot's translation is not a literal one. She has added the words "national" to read "Israel takes precedence of all the nations" and "what shall we say to a national tragedy."¹ Literally translated Zunz' passage reads, "If there be an ascending scale of sufferings, Israel reached its highest degree a tragedy which extends over fifteen centuries".² George Eliot has emphasised the idea of Israel as a nation and her selection from the other nations. Zunz on the other hand deals exclusively with the poetry of lament on suffering, rather than ~~with~~ every day life.

Another Jewish historian that George Eliot read was Abraham Geiger whose work she refers to in her note/books and to whom a specific heading is devoted in the Pforzheimer material as "Notes from Abraham Geiger."³ She refers to his three volume Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte which contains his historiography. For Geiger, the Jews have a special spirit for religion and man has a particular gift which only he possesses and which distinguishes him from other animals. Geiger stresses the universality of the Jewish ethic and explains Jewish nationalism as a necessary means for the introduction of the religion, Judaism, to mankind as a whole. In his description of the periods of Jewish history he

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 213
 2. Translation of Zunz, 'Leiden' ii, p.9, by A. Löwy, 'Zunz on the suffering of the Jews during the Middle Ages, Miscellany of Hebrew Literature, (1872), p.167. George Eliot's copy of at Dr. Williams's, A.6.75. See L.H. Kriefall, pp69-70 and A. Möller, p.51.
 3. Pforzheimer, MS.711, f.55-59.

does not lament, as Zunz does, the collapse of Jewish political autonomy. The function of Judaism for Geiger is not a nationalistic one. When the religion reaches a state of maturity, "the national form might be broken." Geiger praises Jewish settlement in the Diaspora as illustrating the ability of the Jews to assimilate with other nations and cultural groupings. In the future, Geiger believes that a new Hillel will arise who will say, "Do not continually keep your eyes on the past - Jerusalem is a tomb. You must draw from the living present and labour in it."¹

Geiger's work was by no means confined to his history. He was, like Zunz, particularly interested in the medieval period of Judaism. He wrote essays on the Provençal poets, the Kimhi family, monographs on Maimonides and Jehuda Halevi, and his Jüdische Dichtungen der Spanischen Schule (1856), is an analysis, with a German translation, of twelfth to fourteenth-century Jewish poets. However Meyer Waxman, the historian of Jewish Literature, observes that in his account of Halevi's work, Geiger "minimises^s the nationalistic side of the poet. Instead, much emphasis is placed on the religious phases of his character." Waxman regards Geiger as the "moving spirit of the Reform movement in Germany".² In his work Geiger praises the values and the work of the epoch of Moses Mendelssohn and the Age of Enlightenment.

Another writer of the reformist cast of mind whom George Eliot studied³ was I.M. Jost. His ten volume Geschichte der Israeliten (1820-47) was, until replaced by the work of Geiger and Zunz, the

1. A. Geiger, Judaism and its History, Quoted Waxman, 111, pp. 511, 518.
2. M. Waxman, History of Jewish Literature, 111, pp. 504, 356.
3. See Pforzheimer, MS. 711, f. 21. where George Eliot refers also to Jost's later work, Geschichte des Judenthums (1857-59).

standard source of Jewish history. The history of the Jews is for Jost not that of a national entity, but of a religious group, struggling to maintain their religious rights and values. The Talmud, the Kabbalistic movement, the poetry and philosophy of the Spanish period, are not interpreted as representations of a national spirit which in Mordecai's works "has never ceased to quiver in millions of human frames."¹ On the contrary, Jost sees these phenomena as a defensive reaction to an alien hostile world and as an escape into the supernatural away from the everyday realities of suffering.²

The anti-nationalist emphasis of Jost was not so evident in the work of other scholars. Michael Sachs in Die Religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, (1845)³ stresses the developing nature of Judaism and depicts the role of the Jewish poets as one of preparing the people for a future return from exile. The first section of his work consists of translations from Gabirol, Halevi, Abraham and Moses Ibn Ezra and other poets. There then follows an historical, analytical account of the development of the poetry, and in his final section Sachs discusses the kinds of poetry written. He deals at length with Halevi's major philosophical work, the Kusari, which had been neglected by Geiger and Jost. Sachs differentiates between the force and constancy of Halevi's longing for return to Palestine and this sentiment in other writers of the period. He finds it much the stronger in Halevi's and regards this as the prominent creative driving force behind all his work.⁴

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 250, 251.

2. See S.W. Baron, "I.M. Jost", Proceedings, American Academy of Jewish Research, (1930).

3. Pforzheimer, MS. 711, f.21.

4. See Die Religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, p.300.

Franz Delitsch is another historian whom George Eliot read and his Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Poesie (1836)¹ deals with the period following the Spanish Expulsion. To Delitsch there is an overwhelming Biblical influence pervading Jewish poetry and he sees little continuity apart from this between the great Spanish poets and later Jewish poets, yet he observes that there is a development of a tradition consisting of a national longing for redemption from dispersion. George Eliot's copy of the work² contains her pencilled notes referring to passages in the works of the thirteenth century composer of songs of return, Judah Alcharizi or Charizi.³ Moritz Steinschneider's Jüdische Literatur, (1850) contains information on the Charizi family, and the Kalonymus family⁴ as well as monographs on more well known writers. Steinschneider's intention in much of his work was to describe and determine the extent of the participation by the Jews in cultural activity during the medieval period. His work consequently at times reads like a catalogue of names. However it is to Zunz's work on poetry, rather than to Steinschneider's catalogue or Delitsch's volume, that it is necessary to go to find the name of an obscure poet of Selicha, "Elia Mordechai" and the name next to his, "Mose B. Ezra"⁵. I suggest that it was by putting the two together that George Eliot got the name Ezra Mordecai.

-
1. See Pforzheimer, MS. 711, f21.
 2. Dr. Williams's, A.5.12. The copy is well marked in pencil. At bottom p.224. "Poetical character of the Targums, 27 Midrash 36."
 3. See pp. 47, 48 and especially p.55.
 4. M. Steinschneider, Jewish Literature from the eighth to the eighteenth century with an Introduction on Talmud and Midrash, (1857), pp.137, 139, 140 ff.
 5. Zunz, Synagogale Poesie, pp.81, 82. Zunz' emphasis.

George Eliot in her copy of Delitzsch, by his section dealing with the poetry of return wrote the phrase, "Earth of Palestine, efficacy".¹ Material dealing with the soil of Palestine she found not in this work but in Solomon Munk's Palestine (1845), a book which is in her library and extensively marked with her notes.² Munk's work is a detailed and comprehensive description of the history, geography and demography of Palestine from Biblical times to the nineteenth-century. He assesses material as wide ranging as that of Josephus and the itineraries of Jewish travellers. The history of all the towns in the area are given, their population changes, events, situation, economic function and role, post, as well as pre-Biblical, thoroughly described. The latter half of the work describes nineteenth century settlements and the beginnings of the activities of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. Munk, after his description of Safed the town on Lake Tiberius where Kabbalistic doctrines developed, gives an account of these doctrines. In Munk's other major work, Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe (1857) which George Eliot was reading on New Year's Day 1868,³ there is a discussion of part of the Kabbala, the Zohar. The discussion is in the context of showing the relationship between the Zohar and the mystical work of the Jewish philosopher Solomon Ibn Gabirol or Avicbron, whose Fons Vitae occupies most of Munk's attention in his mélanges. There is, in conclusion, a chronological, bibliographical and biographical list of Jewish thinkers rather after the catalogue-index model of Steinschneider.

1. Zur Geschichte, p.224.

2. Dr. Williams's A.9.26, and see Pforzheimer, MS.711, f.21.

3. George Eliot - J. 1 January, 1868.

The work of Zunz, Geiger, Jost, Sachs, Delitzsch, Steinschneider, Munk and others was synthesised in the great product of nineteenth-century Jewish scholarship, Heinrich Graetz' Geschichte der Juden which appeared from Leipzig between 1863 and 1875 in eleven volumes. From this work George Eliot took detailed notes as her copies of Graetz¹ and notebooks² testify. Geschichte is not merely a comprehensive survey of the material unearthed by other historians but in addition a detailed account of Jewish history from the time of Jerobum I, to the middle of Graetz' own nineteenth-century.

An example of George Eliot's use of Graetz is to be seen in her notes in purple ink on the front and endback papers of her copy of volume three, which deals with the period of the Maccabees to the destruction of the second temple, and her notes in the subsequent volume, which goes up to the Talmudic period of the first century C.E. She lists respectively twenty six and twenty seven items. These range from the names of such a Rabbi as "R. Josua b. Chanaja", who is mentioned in D.D., to notes on diverse topics such as insurrections, earthquakes and customs. In pencil on the end back paper of volume three George Eliot has written,

- "Berenice, 1. under Gessius Florus, 65-66
2. Appears with Agrippa on the Xystus to warn the people
3. Saves city of Tiberius by her entreaties with Titus
4. Expects to be Empress on Vespasian's Election"³

In D.D. Hans Meyrick paints "Berenice - pictures"⁴ which he presents to Mirah. His object is to demonstrate that an impoverished

1. Now at Dr. Williams's A.9.43-53. See for example Vol. IV, front paper Vol., V. p.512, end back paper.
2. See Pforzheimer, MS 711, ff.21,24.
3. Graetz, Vol III, p.viii, and end back papers.
4. D.D. V, xxxix, 163.

Jewess can marry into the nobility. Mirah however informs him that Berenice saved the city of Tiberias by collaborating with the Roman invaders. Berenice did not retain her national integrity, and was "a Jewess who had not been faithful - who had done what she did and was penitent." ¹ Hans tells Daniel that "There are to be five" in his Berenice series. "The first is Berenice clasping the knees of Gessius Florus and beseeching him to spare ~~the~~ people;" the second is of Berenice "standing on the Xystus with Agrippa, entreating the people not to injure themselves by resistance.... the third sketch in the series is Berenice exulting in the prospect of being Empress of Rome, when the news has come that Vespasian is declared Emperor and her lover Titus his successor." ² He continues telling Berenice's story to Deronda, explaining that "The fourth is, Titus sending Berenice away from Rome after she has shared his palace for ten years.". The last painting is "Berenice seated lonely on the ruins of Jerusalem." He explains, "That is pure imagination.... Nobody knows what became of her." ³ Deronda is annoyed because Hans is using Mirah as the model for Berenice. However, Hans's version of the story is confirmed by Graetz who refuses to speculate whether Berenice returned to Jerusalem to weep. Hans's commentary on the story illustrates his own

-
1. D.D., V. xxxix, 164.
 2. D.D., V. xxxvii, 106.
 3. D.D., V. xxxvii, ~~106~~ 107.

uninvolvement in Berenice's dilemma. For him, Mirah's version is but a "ladies' edition." He tells Deronda that "Berenice was a fervid patriot, but was beguiled by love and ambition into attaching herself to the arch enemy of her people." Mirah, on the other hand, "Takes the story as a tragic parable," she "cries to think what the penitent Berenice suffered as she wandered back to Jerusalem and sat desolate amidst desolation."¹

At the beginning of volume four Graetz tells the story of the Rabbis who maintained Judaism under the Roman occupation. The leading Rabbi of the period,² Hillel, laid down three forms of interpretation as a means of preserving Judaism. The three forms were: Halacha, which communicated traditional enactments, simply and briefly in the name of the Sanhedrin; Midrash, in which tradition was conveyed by a hint contained in a particle or word; and the third method was the application of old rules to new cases. By Graetz' explanation of these methods of preservation, George Eliot wrote in the margin, "Transmitters". In D.D. Mordecai cites examples of men whom he regards as preservers of the Jewish heritage. He refers to Hillel, Ben Azai and Josua b. Chananja.³ Graetz refers also to the poets of the Spanish period. Mordecai sees a "likeness" between the people talking in the Philosophers' Club and "the Masters who handed down the thought of our race." He explains that these "Masters" were "the great Transmitters, who laboured with their hands for scant bread, but preserved and enlarged

1. D.D., V. xxxvii, 109. Cf. Pforzheimer, MS, 711, f66.

2. Graetz, IV, 17.

3. All belong to the Roman Talmudic period. For George Eliot's knowledge of Chananja see Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f22,23.

for us the heritage of memory and saved the soul of Israel alive as a seed among the tombs."¹

The idea of "Transmitters" is important to both Graetz and Mordecai. Graetz tends to look at Jewish history as consisting of the history of powerful personalities who have been keeping Jewish history alive. Graetz might be called a Hegelian in his approach to history. For Graetz, Jewish history is dominated by central ideas and of these there are two conflicting ones - the religious and the political. By religious he means the knowledge of God and the maintenance of laws which safeguard ethical conduct, Israel, the political national state is the factual embodiment of the religious monotheistic idea. The idea of God is supreme, the achievement of political sovereignty being but a means to the realisation of this end. In exile, the spirit of the people is represented by the wish to return home, and this spirit is a cohering force against the pressures of the disintegration of the population amongst the Gentiles. Spiritual forces are dominant and run as structures in Graetz' work, which tends to concentrate upon charismatic figures - leaders who in their writing or prophesy are continuers of tradition. Mordecai constantly refers to and praises "the spirit"², and refers to the idea of a spiritual store."³ The illustrations which he gives of this are from the "Masters",⁴ Hillel, Ben Azai, Chananjja, Halevi, the Spanish Hebrew poets and others. Mordecai avoids references to the periods of the Miracles or to the Five Books of Moses. When he does refer to Moses or the prophet Ezra they are referred to as charismatic leaders. He says, "We will lift

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 236.222.
 2. D.D., VI, xlii, 236.
 3. D.D., VI, xlii, 240.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 222.

up a standard, we will unite in a labour hard but glorious like that of Moses and Ezra, a labour which shall be worthy fruit of the long anguish whereby our fathers maintained their separateness, refusing the ease of falsehood."¹ Mordecai's arguments for the restoration of Israel are not based upon divine promises but on practical feasibility and the existence of a national consciousness: apart from his use of the Kabbalah and Halevi they are rational arguments. He defends his views, not by citing religious chapter and verse, but by developing political and historical analogies with which his audience, and George Eliot's readers, would be familiar.

If we look back to the history of efforts which have made great changes, it is astonishing how many of them seemed hopeless to those who looked on in the beginning. Take what we have all heard and seen something of - the effort after the unity of Italy, which we are sure soon to see accomplished to the very last boundary. Look into Mazzini's account of his first yearning when he was a boy, after a restored greatness and a new freedom to Italy, and of his first efforts as a young man to rouse the same feelings in other young men, and get them to work towards a united nationality.²

It has been observed that Graetz' historical approach can be called Hegelian in the sense that the conflicting ideas of religion and politics were pre-eminent in his work. Religion and politics tended to be emphasised as shapers of history to the detriment of social and economic forces. Graetz, a product of the Enlightenment, as were so many other German Jewish scholars, had little time for miracles and thus gives a naturalistic explanation for the crossing of the Red Sea. Graetz' account of the modern

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 247.

2. D.D., VI, xlii, 249.

period concentrated upon developments in German Jewry and neglected corresponding movements in Russia, Polish and East-European Jewries. For Graetz there were periods of great creative productivity in Jewish culture. One of these was the Spanish period and consequently that period received much more emphasis in his Geschichte than other historical periods.

Section 2: The Kabbah and Jehuda Halevi.

An important source of Mordecai's beliefs and visions is the Kabbalistic mystical movement which, being non-rationalistic and chiefly developing in Poland and Galicia, is negatively treated by Graetz. As much Kabbalistic thought is obscure it is necessary to trace its origins and development as explained by a twentieth century scholar. I will then examine George Eliot's knowledge of ^{the} Kabbalah, the sources of that knowledge and the use which she makes of it in D.D.

Gershon Scholem explains in his Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism that historically there are two main periods of Kabbalistic thought. The first is that of thirteenth-century Spain and the years preceeding the expulsion. The chief product of these years is the Sefer Ha-Zohar, or "Book of Splendour."¹ Its contents were ascribed by Graetz and others to one man, the Spanish mystic Moses de Leon, and from her notebook - references George Eliot agreed with this judgement.² Scholem comments that he agrees with Graetz in asserting that "Moses de Leon wrote the Zohar in order to stem the

-
1. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, p.156.
 2. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f24.

growth of the radical rationalistic mood which was widespread amongst his educated contemporaries". Leon's work is highly non-rationalist. For instance, the Zohar teaches the pre-existence of all souls since the beginning of creation. "God, the universe and the soul do not lead separate lives, each on its own plane," and, "Taken altogether, the spiritual outlook of the Zohar might well be defined as a mixture of theosophic theology, mythical cosmogony and mystical psychology and anthropology."

From notebook evidence it is evident that George Eliot had knowledge of the Zohar, yet it is to later developments in Kabbalah, to its second main period, that she directed her attention. Kabbalism underwent a transformation after the Exodus from Spain. The older Kabbalists neutralised all messianic tendencies. They were more interested in the beginnings of the world, "with creation than with redemption." For the Spanish Jews, "Redemption was to be achieved not by storming onward in an attempt to hasten historic crises and catastrophes, but rather by retracing the path that leads to the primordial beginnings of creation and revelation." Yet "The pathos of Messianism pervaded the new Kabbalah"¹ which originally centred around the figure of Isaac Luria who lived in the town of Safed on Lake Tiberius during the early sixteenth-century. His ideas were developed by his students and found their main source of support in the Polish Jewish communities crushed by the devastating mid-seventeenth-century pogroms.

1. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, pp.203, 243, 245, 246.

The new thought was exceptionally non-rational, and was therefore treated negatively by the nineteenth-century sources available to George Eliot. Her use of the later Kabbalah consequently shows her awareness of the limitations of her source materials and of the realities of Jewish life in her time. During the nineteenth-century Eastern European Jewry was heavily under the spell of the Hassidic movement.¹

Scholem writes that for the generations following the Exile from Spain "Life was conceived as Existence in Exile ... and the sufferings of Exile were linked up with the central Kabbalistic doctrines about God and man." He develops these,

The horrors of Exile were mirrored in the Kabbalistic doctrine of metempsychosis, which now won immense popularity by stressing the various stages of the soul's exile. The most terrible fate that could befall any soul - far more ghastly than the torments of hell - was to be "outcast" or "naked", a state precluding either rebirth or even admission to hell. Such absolute exile was the worst nightmare of the soul which envisaged its personal drama in terms of the tragic destiny of the whole people. Absolute homelessness was the sinister symbol of absolute Godlessness, of utter moral and spiritual degradation. Union with God or utter banishment were the two poles between which a system had to be devised in which the Jews could live under the domination of Law, which seeks to destroy the forces of Exile.

This new Kabbalism stands and falls with its programme of bringing its doctrines home to the community, and preparing it for the coming of the Messiah.²

1. See Major Trends, "Hasidism: the latest phase" p325 ff. For a nineteenth-century reference to the mystical ferment in Eastern Europe see "The state of the Jews in Poland", The Foreign Quarterly Review, Vol. ~~XXVII~~, 1841, pp.241-264.

Professor Scholem observes that "The historical process and its innermost soul, the religious act of the Jew, prepare the way for the final restitution of all the scattered and exiled lights and sparks....The redemption of Israel concludes the redemption of all things". The question which remains therefore is, how is Israel to be restored? This was answered by the Kabbalists in terms of the restoration of souls to their original states of being. Outside Israel the soul was inevitably in a state of exile. How could souls be released from the state of being in exile? For the answer the Kabbalistic theory of the transmigration of souls has to be examined.

Scholem explains that "all transmigrations of souls are in the last resort only migrations of the one soul", that is Adam's "whose exile atones for its fall." But, "every individual provides, by his behaviour, countless occasions for ever renewed exile." An individual soul can redeem itself by working out its own spiritual restoration. Transmigration of the soul is the opportunity of fulfilling the commandments. When the individual soul redeems itself by fulfilling the commandments it loses its identity and becomes at one with other redeemed souls. Retribution for sin occurs when the soul is banished "into the prison of strange forms of existence, into wild beasts, into plants and stones", and "this is regarded as a particularly dreadful form of exile." According to the Kabbalah, there are special "relationships between souls, and even families of souls, which somehow constitute a dynamic whole and react upon one another."¹ And "These souls have a special aptitude for assisting each other and supplementing

1. Major Trends, pp. 274, 250 282. According to sixteenth-century Kabbalism, "Adam contained the entire soul of humanity", pp.281-282.

each other's actions... and can enable them to start on the return journey to higher forms of existence."¹

Kabbalah: George Eliot's knowledge

George Eliot could not have read Scholem's work which is a product of this century. Her notebooks indicate that the main source of her knowledge of Kabbalistic ideas is the work of the Anglo-Jewish scholar Christian David Ginsberg. She writes that she is using the "Kabbalah (from Ginsberg)";² that is The Kabbalah, its Doctrines, Development and Literature (1863). George Eliot carefully notes Ginsberg's analysis of what he calls the "Neo-Platonism" of the Kabbalah. George Eliot wrote that "The very expression En Soph ... which the Kabbalah uses to designate the Incomprehensible One, is foreign, 'tis evidently an imitation of the Greek".³ After noting the various books and traditions of the Kabbalah, George Eliot concentrates particularly upon Ginsberg's explanation of the way in which one soul helps another. He explains that it is "the destiny of the soul to return to the Infinite Source from which it emanated, after developing the germs of perfection implanted in it" that is forms of righteousness. If however the soul is unable to develop these qualities, if it, "fails to acquire that experience for which it descends from heaven, and becomes contaminated by that which is polluting, it must re-inhabit a body again and again till it is able to ascend"⁴. During this process of the transmigration of the soul into another body

It sometimes, however, happens that it is the isolation of the soul which is the source of her weakness, and she requires help to pass through her

1. Major Trends, 282-283

2. Pforzheimer, MS.429, f2

3. Ibid, f.18. The passage is to be found in C.D. Ginsberg, p.187.

4. Ibid, f.20. See C.D. Ginsberg, p.124.

probation. In that case she chooses a companion a soul of better fortune and more strength. The stronger of the two then becomes as it were the mother; and she carries the sickly one in her bosom, and nurses her as a woman her child.

There will come a time when all souls will be restored and George Eliot notes Ginsberg's explanation that

Even the archangel of wickedness Samuel will be restored to his angelic nature. This will take place at the advent of the Messiah. Which advent however is retarded by the new few souls that enter the world - so many old ones having to be born over again; and the soul of the Messiah cannot be born until the rest have been born. Then the great Jubilee year will begin when all souls will return into the bosom of the Infinite Source - in the Palace of Love, where the Heavenly King is united with all the souls by a kiss. Then hell shall disappear. In that state the creature will not be distinguished from the Creator. The same idea will illuminate both.¹

Her notes are completed by listing the contents of the Zohar.² The notes on transmigration directly relate to the action of D.D., and are probably in George Eliot's notebook as preparatory material for her novel.

Use of material in D.D.

Mordecai explains the doctrines of transmigration to Deronda and to George Eliot's readers.³

In the doctrines of the Kabbala, souls are born again and again in new bodies till they are perfected and purified, and a soul liberated from a worn-out body may join the fellow-soul that needs it, that they may be perfected together, and their earthly work accomplished. They they will depart from the mortal region, and leave place for new souls to be born out of the store in the eternal bosom. It is the lingering imperfection of the

-
1. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.21. Cf. C.D. Ginsberg, pp.126-127.
 2. Ibid, f.23,24.
 3. C.H. Ginsberg comments in his preface, "no treatise exists in English on this esoteric doctrine," p.i.

souls already born into the mortal region that hinders the birth of new souls and the preparation of the Messianic time: - thus the mind has given shape to what is hidden, as the shadow of what is known, and has spoken truth, though it were only in parable. When my long wandering soul is liberated from this weary body, it will join yours, and its work will be perfected.¹

The relationship between Mordecai and Daniel Deronda is based fundamentally upon the Kabbalistic doctrine. In introducing Mordecai, George Eliot is careful to indicate that he is a visionary, that "Second-sight is a flag over disputed ground." She explains that "it is a matter of knowledge that there are persons whose yearnings, conceptions ... continually take the form of images which have a forshadowing power". And these persons "are not always the less capable of the argumentative process, nor less sane than the commonplace calculators of the market".² In fact their visions belong to a long tradition of thought.

Mordecai says that he is "a man bound and imprisoned through long years"³ and that he has been "in the wilderness" as a "beast", who has yet attempted to find his "pathways".⁴ Psychologically, he is "yearning for some young ear into which he could pour his mind as a testament, some soul kindred enough to accept the spiritual product of his own brief, painful life, as a mission to be executed."⁵ In looking for "inevitable kinship",⁶ for the special relationship between souls, he has rejected any prospect of bodily recovery", and everything is "carried into the current of this yearning for transmission."⁷ Mordecai's isolation

1. D.D., VI, xliii, 256, 257.

2. D.D., V, xxxviii, 131.

3. D.D., VI, xlii, 220.

4. D.D., V, xl, 189.

5. D.D., V, xxxviii, 133.

6. D.D., V, xxxviii, 132.

7. D.D., V, xxxviii, 133.

restricts his ability to be able to communicate his ideas, which will ensure his return to the "eternal store", and "certain incapacities of his own had made the sentence of exclusion" unsuitable. Consequently, "his imagination had constructed another man who would be something more ample than the second soul bestowed, according to the notion of the Cabbalists, to help out the insufficient first." This man would be "ready to incorporate all that was worthiest in an existence whose visible, palpable part was burning itself fast away."¹ Further, the second soul must be wealthy, "have strength and better fortune"² and "his face and frame must be beautiful and strong, he must have been used to all the refinements of social life, his voice must flow with a full and easy current, his circumstances be free from sordid need". In addition, "he must glorify the possibilities of the Jew, not sit and wander as Mordecai did, bearing the stamp of his people amid the signs of poverty and waning breath."³ Mordecai sees Deronda as fulfilling these requirements. After he has first seen Deronda, Mordecai is "possessed by the new inrush of belief" and when Deronda has told him that he is not a Jew, Mordecai "went through days of a deep discouragement, like that of men on a doomed ship who, having strained their eyes after a sail, and beheld it with a rejoicing, behold it never advance, and say, 'Our sick eyes make it.'"⁴ In this way the reasons for Mordecai's need for Deronda become clarified. They can be classified according to the Kabbalistic doctrines of the banishment of the soul, its exile to strange forms of existence, and the possibility of the soul's return from exile through the special relationships

-
1. D.D., V, xxxviii, 135.
 2. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.21.
 3. D.D., V, xxxiii, 134.
 4. D.D., V, xxxviii, 146, 147.

between souls. A soul because of its separateness, which is a cause of its weakness, requires assistance. The choice of companion revolves around the weaker being fortuitous enough to discover the stronger, more advantageously placed, soul.

Mordecai's belief in the immortality of the soul is to be found in his last words. He tells Deronda,

Death is coming to me as the divine kiss which is both parting and reunion - which takes me from your bodily eyes and gives me full presence in your soul. Where thou goest, Daniel, I shall go. Is it not begun? Have I not breathed my soul into you? We shall live together.¹

This is very close to the Kabbalistic doctrine as explained by Ginsberg. Not only are the ideas akin but in some cases George Eliot has adopted the terminology of the Kabbalah and put this into her character's words and thoughts. The kiss is "divine" for as the Zohar, says, quoted by Ginsberg, "This kiss is the union of the soul with the substance from which it emanated (Zohar, 1, 168a)" and "Then the soul will rule the universe like God, and what she shall command he will execute."²

Use of Jehuda Halevi

So far I have been analysing Mordecai's and Daniel's relationship and its foundation in the Kabbalistic doctrine relating to the transmigration of souls. The Kabbalah however is not the only influence at work in the relationship and Jehuda Halevi's work is important too. Mordecai explained to Daniel that there was a soul "fully born within me, and it came in my boyhood." The soul "brought its own world - a medieval world where there were men who made the ancient language live again in new psalm of exile", and "One of

1. D.D., VIII, lxx, 366.

2. C. H. Ginsberg, p. 127.

their souls was born again within me". That soul "took ship with Jehuda ha-Levi; it heard the roar of the Crusaders and the shrieks of tortured Israel."¹

The Kuzari

George Eliot noted, during the period in which she was writing D.D., that she was using "Cassel's German version of Khuzzari work with learned connotations:"² that is, David Cassel's edition of Judah ben Samuel Halevi's Kusari (1853). Rabbi Cassel's edition contains a German translation and a Spanish-Hebraic parallel text, detailed footnotes and an extensive introduction.³ The Kuzari was Halevi's major philosophical work and has as its subtitle, "A Book of Arguments and Demonstrations in Aid of the Despised Faith."⁴

The work takes the form of a debate. According to legend, during the eighth-century, the Kuzari, the ruler of a Volga tribe, in search of religious faith asks a Christian and a Mohammanadan to state their religious beliefs. Their answers do not satisfy the Kuzari who then seeks out a Rabbi. The Rabbi in his explanation of Judaism so convinces the Kuzari that the Kuzari and his tribe convert to Judaism. Halevi's work consists of a dialogue between the Rabbi and the Kuzari. The Rabbi explains various aspects of his faith to his willing and able listener. He argues that a religious life is to be represented in the first place as a fact of experience and its terms must be sought for in experience with the help of information which biology and

-
1. D.D., V. xl, 180, 181.
 2. Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.23.
 3. I was unable to locate George Eliot's copy.
 4. My references are to the English translation by Isaak Heinemann. Scholem points to a "direct connection between Jehuda Halevi and the Kabbalists," See Major Trends, p.24.

accumulated wisdom have established. The fundamental laws by which all life is influenced are heredity, environment and nurture. Consequently the Rabbi's language is pervaded with metaphors from biology, growth, the body, roots and organic development.

The Rabbi tells the Kuzari that the basis of his beliefs is "nurture, growth, and propagation with their powers and all conditions attached thereto."¹ For the Rabbi, God "has a secret and wise design" concerning the Jewish people in spite of the Jews' state of oblivion. This design "should be compared to the wisdom hidden in the seed which falls into the ground and apparently is transformed into earth, water and dung without leaving a trace.". Continuing, by use of analogy of a seed to Israel, the Rabbi argues,

But really this seed transforms earth and water into its own substance, carrying them from one degree to another, until it refines the elements and makes them like unto itself, casting off husks, leaves, etc., in order that the 'heart' (of the plant) may appear in purity and become fit to receive this power and the form of the first seed.

At this point "the tree bears fruit resembling that from which it has been produced", and the children of Israel will return from exile. The Rabbi continues,

concerning the religion of Moses all later religions are transformed into it, though externally they may reject it. They merely serve to introduce and pave the way for the expected messiah; he is the fruit; all will be his fruit, if they acknowledge him, and will become one tree. Then they will revere the root they formerly despised. (and) my servant shall prosper.²

1. Kuzari, I, 31, p.36.

2. Kuzari, IV, 23, p.121. Quoting Jesaiiah, lii, 13ff.

Mordecai too uses biological metaphors, he believes "in a growth, a passage, and a new unfolding of life whereof the seed is more perfect, more charged with the elements that are pregnant with diviner form." He argues that

The life of a people grows, it is knit together and yet expanded, in joy and sorrow, in thought and action; it absorbs the thought of other nations into its own forms, and gives back the thought as new wealth to the world; it is a power and an organ in the great body of the nations.¹

In reply to Gideon's belief that "We must wait patiently for prejudices to die out" and then become as other people, Mordecai asks, using Halevi's metaphors, whether it is rational for the Jews "to drain away the sap of special kindred that makes the families of man rich in interchanged wealth, and various as the forests are various with the glory of the cedar and the palm?"² Tradition and inheritance are Israel's hope, and a "special kindred", which Mordecai is part of. Deronda learns from Mordecai that England is "the native land of "Mordecai's "body, which is but~~x~~ as a breaking pot of earth around the fruit-bearing tree, whose seed might make the desert rejoice."³ In Deronda the tree will grow again. Mordecai informs Deronda, "You will be my life: it will be planted afresh; it will grow. You shall take the inheritance; it has been gathering for ages".⁴

Mordecai's explanation of the idea of Israel's unique role in the world is based upon Halevi's. Mordecai quotes Halevi to his tavern audience. He tells Pash that it "is a vain question"

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 231.
 2. D.D., VI, xlii, 235.
 3. D.D., V, xl, 179.
 4. D.D., V, xl, 184.

whether the Jews "would beat the rest of the world" and explains that

Each nation has its own work, and is a member of the world, enriched by the work of each. But it is true, as Jehuda-ha-Levi first said, that Israel is the heart of mankind, if we mean by heart the core of affection which binds a race and its families in dutiful love, and the reverence for the human body which lifts the needs of our animal life into religion, and the tenderness which is merciful to the poor and weak and to the dumb creature that wears the yoke for us.¹

In the Kuzari, the Rabbi is asked how can Israel, "a person sick unto death," hope either for recovery, or because it is so weak as a nation and rejected, hope to revitalise and sustain the world?"

The Rabbi replies,

Israel amidst the nations is like the heart amidst the organs: it is the most sick and the most healthy of them all....The heart is visited without interruption by all sorts of diseases, as sadness, anxiety, envy, wrath, enmity, love, hate and fear. Its constitution changes continually according to the vigour and weakness of respiration, inappropriate meat and drink, movement, exertion, sleep or wakefulness. These all affect the heart, whilst the limbs rest uninjured.²

And he goes on to explain that "The relation of the Divine power" to the Jews, "is the same as that of the soul to the heart."

Although the Jews "now ... are oppressed, whilst the whole world enjoys rest and prosperity the trials which meet [the Jews] serve to purify, to cleanse ... and to remove all taint from" them.³

The dispersion, the preservation and the hope of Israel's future, rest on peculiar foundations. Whilst the history of other

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 239. cf. S.G., p.196.

2. Kuzari, II, 36, 38, p74.

3. Ibid, II, 44, p.75.

nations is affected by natural non-divine laws, Israel's national life is bound up with its heart and God. The Rabbi explains that "We ... since our heart, the Holy House was destroyed, were also lost; if it be restored, we, too, will be restored, be we few or many and whatever be our status." The reason is that, "our leader is the living God; He is our King, who keeps us in our present status of dispersion and exile."¹ The enigma of Israel's preservation testifies to the effect of a divine life giving power within the Jews which is lacking in other nations.² In D.D. Mordecai refers to the Holy House as "a heart and brain". He asks "where else is there a nation of whom it may be as truly said that their religion and law and moral life mingled as the stream of blood in the heart and made one growth."³ Mordecai has utilised Halevi's physiological metaphors. Heart means the centre and 'heart' is also used by Mordecai as "the core of affection which binds a race."⁴ The heart is affected by diseases of the body. According to Halevi and Mordecai only when the centre, the heart, Israel, is well and restored, can health be brought to the whole body, to Israel and to the world.

At the conclusion of the Kuzari, the Rabbi decides to leave the land of the Kuzars and go to Jerusalem, for "Palestine has a special relation to the Lord of Israel."⁵ During the book it has become clear that the Rabbi has two main reasons for going to Palestine. Firstly, he believes that its soil will influence the

-
1. Kuzari, II, 32, p.73.
 2. Ibid, II, 30-34, and 72-75.
 3. D.D., VI, xlii, 240.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 239.
 5. Kuzari, V, 23, p.126.

quality of Jewish religious observance which will have political implications, and secondly he believes that the Jewish exile will be concluded with Jewish immigration to Israel. He argues that, "the land has ... its part ... and so [have] the religious acts connected with it, which I would compare to the cultivation of the vineyard."¹ His argument for a return of the Jews is both political and religious. At the end of the Kuzari, the Rabbi, after quoting two lines from the Psalms, "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion; for it is time to favour her, the moment is come. For Thy servants love her stones and pity her dust,"² interprets this as meaning, "Jerusalem can only be rebuilt when Israel yearns for it to such an extent that we sympathise even with its stones and its dust."³ Mordecai talks too of the "yearning" of "the seed of fire" to set alight "The heritage of Israel" which "is beating in the pulses of millions."⁴ For him "The Messianic time is the time when Israel shall will the planting of the national ensign."⁵ At that time "its religion" will "be an outward reality",⁶ and Mordecai explicitly identifies its spiritual and its political life, "The spirit of our religious life ... is one with our national life".⁷ Again George Eliot uses Halevi's personification of Israel's condition. Although in exile, Mordecai comments, Israel has not disintegrated: "where else", he asks, "a people who kept and enlarged their spiritual store at the very time when they were hunted with a hatred as fierce as the forest - fires that chase the wild beast from his covert?"⁸ Mordecai's life provides

-
1. Kuzari, II, 12, p.65.
 2. Ibid, V, 27, p.128. Psalms, cii, 14, 15.
 3. Ibid, V, 27, pp.128, 129.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 249-250.
 5. D.D., VI, xlii, 253.
 6. D.D., VI, xlii, 243.
 7. D.D., VI, xlii, 252.
 8. D.D., VI, xlii, 240.

a testimony to this. He was "a poor Jewish workman",¹ with, to use the words Daniel attributes to Sir Hugo, "a more passionate, penetrative speech than was usual with such monomaniacs".²

Mordecai was as one who "saved the soul of Israel alive as a seed among the tombs,"³ and Mordecai is only "yearning for some young ear into which he could pour his mind as a testament."⁴ The Kuzari tells the Rabbi that Israel's wisdom "is so completely extinguished that we can hardly believe in its reappearance; it is lost, and there can be no thought of its return." The Rabbi replies that "It seems only extinguished for him who does not see us with a clear eye, who infers the extinction of our light from our degradation, poverty and dispersion."⁵

Tradition is central in George Eliot's framework of thought, and Halevi's Rabbi places much importance on tradition. He tells the Kuzari that Israel knew of its special place in the universe, "first through personal experience, and afterward through an uninterrupted tradition, which is equal to experience."⁶

According to Daniel, Mordecai told him that "Our religion united us before it divided us - it made us a people before it made Rabbanites and Karaites." Daniel means "to try what can be done with that union - I mean to work in your spirit."⁷ The third book of the Kuzari is devoted to the Rabbi's refutation of the Karaites who insisted upon literal readings of the Biblical texts.⁸ The Rabbi argues that without tradition it would be

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 206.

2. D.D., VI, xlii, 202.

3. D.D., VI, xlii, 222.

4. D.D., V, xxxviii, 133.

5. Kuzari, IV, 20, 21, pp.119, 120.

6. Ibid, I, 25, p.35.

7. D.D., VIII, lxiii, 252.

8. See Pforzheimer, MS 711, f.55.

impossible to read the text of the Bible, to deal with differing interpretations of it, or to appreciate the commands laid down in it. For Rabbanites such as Halevi's Rabbi and Mordecai tradition is a source of comfort and peace of mind.¹ The argument between the Rabbanites and Karaites turns upon the attitudes to the importance of tradition as a continuative building process. Gideon is ~~not~~^{opposed to} both and argues that although he is not a Karaite for he does not hold with the restoration of Judea by miracle, and so on, and that when Judaism is pruned "of few useless rites and literal interpretations of that sort," there will be "no barrier" between the Jews "and the rest of the world." Mordecai's reply emphasises the importance of the Rabbanites, and of developing tradition, "to the history of our people", and he praises "the living fountains of enlarging belief,"

For Mordecai separateness is all important and linked with the return of the Jews,

I say that the effect of our separateness will not be completed and have its highest transformation unless our race takes on again the character of a nationality. That is the fulfilment of the religious trust that moulded them into a people, whose life has made half the inspiration of the world.²

Israel is separate as it is the "pick of mankind."³ The Jews' present remoteness from Israel hinders them from displaying their especially prophetic gifts, "the sun is gone down over the prophets and the day is dark above them: their observances are as nameless relics."⁴ If this handicap of exile is removed the old times will come again, "where the Jewish spirit manifests itself in a

-
1. Kuzari, III, 14, p.66ff.
 2. D.D., VI, xlii, 245, 247.
 3. Kuzari, I, 27, p.35.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 242.

new order founded on the old,"¹ in Palestine, "the centre and Jewel, the land of prophecy."² During the period of exile, the spirit has been "purified, enriched by the experience our greatest sons have gathered from the life of the ages."³

Mordecai's speeches at the 'Hand and Banner' contain many historical references which are to be found in the Kuzari. Here is an illustration of Mordecai's use of one of them. Mordecai refers to the "enlarging and illuminating" of tradition by "our Masters". Under the Romans

the yoke of oppression was a spiked torture as well as a load; the exile was forced afar among brutish people, where the consciousness of his race was no clearer to him that the light of the sun to our fathers in the Roman persecution, who had their hiding-place in a cave, and knew not that it was day save by the dimmer burning of their candles.⁴

Halevi tells the story of Rabbi Akiba who was one of the ten martyrs executed by the Roman government. During his torture Akiba asked his pupils whether the time of reciting the Shema⁵ had arrived and they answered, "O our master, even now?"⁶

Halevi's Rabbi observes that Akiba was one of "our Sages" who was "guarding the traditions."⁷ In these instances the heroism of those who were willing to suffer for the preservation of their faith is shown. George Eliot by making Mordecai's reference more general through her exclusion of the particular name of Akiba and the detail concerning prayer in harsh conditions enforces the immediacy of Mordecai's illustration.

There is an essential difference between Halevi's and Mordecai's presentation of similar arguments. The Rabbi constantly

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 252.
 2. Kuzari, I, 95, p.46.
 3. D.D., VI, xlii, 252.
 4. D.D., VI, xlii, 242.
 5. The expression of the Divine Unity.
 6. Kuzari, III, 65, p.103.
 7. Ibid, III, 67, p.103.

refers to God and the Divine as the final arbiter. Mordecai's emphasis tends at times to be more naturalistic and empirical than Halevi's. Although both use arguments derived from the notions of historical continuity, tradition, racial memory and preservation, the Rabbi continually emphasizes "the Divine power" upon which Israel's fate depends.¹ Mordecai in the 'Hand and Banner' plays this down. He refers, rather, to the non-metaphysical aspects of the Jewish situation. He argues that, "As long as there is a remnant of national consciousness, I suppose nobody will deny that there may be a new stirring of memories and hopes which may inspire arduous action."²

The general tenor of Halevi's ideas would not have been new to George Eliot. During the 1850's she had become familiar with ideas concerning the volk, race, tradition and memory. Halevi's and Mordecai's ideas differ from those of Riehl and his contemporaries. The Jewish philosophers are not exclusionists. According to their beliefs Israel's improvements will lead to a general world improvement. To quote Mordecai, "the world will gain as Israel gains."² However, the dominant impulse underlying Halevi's and Mordecai's thought, the need for the survival of Israel, accords with the theory of Spinoza concerning 'conatus' and as we have seen in Chapter Two, Spinoza's work was well known to George Eliot. 'Conatus' is the desire for self-survival which Spinoza finds strongly present in all human beings. The Rabbi and Mordecai believe that they can only survive if the Jewish people survive. The Jews can only properly survive if Israel is reborn. Further Mordecai's obsession with finding

1. Kuzari, II, 14, 65, 67.

2. D.D., VI, xlii, 248.

another soul to whom he can pass on his ideas, is an expression of 'Conatus'. In this sense George Eliot was familiar with the forces of heritage and the desire for self-preservation before she read the Kuzari.

I have shown in this chapter that the ideas of Jewish historians, the Kabbalah and Jehuda Halevi, illuminate D.D. George Eliot read the historians in their German original, Ginsberg's English explanation of the Kabbalah, an explanation drawn mainly from sources originally published in German and French, and the Kuzari in David Cassel's elaborate and scholarly German translation. It may be that George Eliot's use of these obscure and complicated translated sources - especially their use for the language of a fictional character - Mordecai - leads to a lengthiness of syntax and heaviness of rhythm. Certainly, as Cassel's German and Heinemann's English translation of the Kuzari show, the Kuzari itself consists of interpretation upon interpretation and hence needs lengthy explication. Mordecai's thoughts refer to much in the way of tradition and the interpretation of tradition. Consequently his thoughts need much explication. It is as if George Eliot in D.D. is presenting to her English readers a shorthand version of Jewish history, the Kabbalah and the Kuzari and wishes her audience to leave with an understanding of the heart of their teaching.

CHAPTER 7.

THE JEWISH CHARACTERS OF "DANIEL DERONDA".

In the previous chapter I have discussed the content of the ideas of certain characters, Mordecai and Daniel. In this chapter I intend to examine each of the Jewish characters, their mutual relationships and George Eliot's modes of presentation of them. Daniel, who moves from the English to the Jewish world will be discussed first; then Mordecai, Mirah, the Princess, Lapidoth, the Cohen family, Klesmer and Kalonymos. I hope to show that each character forms an element in a pattern representing different responses to membership of a racial and religious minority.

Daniel Deronda

Deronda is structurally the central character in the novel: through a combination of coincidence and deliberate quest he comes in contact with both of its worlds and is present at most of the significant events. It is through Daniel's role as an outsider, observing, acting only in response to others' actions, and evaluating, that the reader is enabled to witness these events, and to appreciate the development of the contrast between George Eliot's English and Jewish worlds. It is through his open-minded search for values that we encounter Mordecai, through his watching Gwendolen at the gaming table that we are introduced to her, and that the first link between them is created. The main strand of the "Jewish" plot is his progress from one world to the other, which is carefully and

realistically charted, and leads to a final commitment to Judaism that the reader is, accordingly, obliged to respect. As Barbara Hardy has recognized, "his actions and reactions bridge the Gentile and Jewish worlds."¹ In the "English" plot his function is relatively passive. He is an ironical observer who intervenes after the drowning of Grandcourt to act as protector of Gwendolen, yet remains detached. He embodies standards of selfless generosity and integrity, and spiritual resources, which contrast sharply with those of Gwendolen and of the milieu she chose to marry into, and he is instrumental in shaping Gwendolen's moral development.

In discussing the characterisation of Daniel I will confine myself to brief outlines of three topics: the portrayal of his spiritual pilgrimage and psychological development; some of the means by which this portrayal is achieved; and his relationships with other characters.

To give a detailed account of Daniel's psychological and spiritual progress would require analysis of a very substantial part of the total structure of the novel. It is sufficient for present purposes to notice that, on the psychological level, Daniel's is the quest of an individual alienated from the society of his upbringing, who, through the rediscovery of his heritage, is eventually able to develop a commitment to another society. Thus he succeeds in overcoming the "state of social neutrality"² and ^{he} indecision characteristic of his situation, at the time of his rescue of Mirah, in Chapter 17.

-
1. Daniel Deronda, Penguin edition, p. 18.
 2. D.D., II, xvi, 328.

After initial glimpses of him at the Leubronn casino, in Chapters 1 and 15, as an ironical young Englishman with a suggested latent force, we are introduced in Chapter 16 to his childhood and education in terms of his own understanding of them: happy enough, until the sudden realization at the age of thirteen, that his relationship to his beloved "uncle" was not what it seemed.

"Who cannot imagine the bitterness of a first suspicion that something in this object of complete love was not quite right?"¹ From the mystery surrounding his parentage is to grow the sense of not belonging that, as Gardner has noted, by the time he went up to Cambridge had brought him "perilously near to losing the power of action". This critic has compared his indecisiveness at this phase of his life with Hamlet's, and described George Eliot's "analysis of Deronda's neutral state" as "a marvel of insight". Gardner has observed, also, that before he was consciously aware of it Daniel's moral attitude already had Judaic features, citing as an example his dislike of gambling.²

Some critics have questioned whether Daniel's commitment to Judaism is credible. Several late nineteenth-century writers are clearly more concerned with ideology than with the art of the novelist. For example, the reviewer of The Tablet in 1876 wrote: "In our opinion the author commits a literary error when she makes Deronda abandon on learning the fact of his Jewish birth all that a modern English education weaves of Christianity and the results of Christianity into an English gentleman's life!" and observes that "Deronda's

1. D.D., II, xvi, 311, 312. George Eliot's emphasis.

2. Inner Life of George Eliot, pp. 242, 244, 243, 248.

acceptance of Judaism as a religion is revolting!"¹

Even such early critics who found much to interest them in Mordecai considered Daniel insubstantial. Joseph Jacobs admits that "most readers" must "have felt" a "jar ... in the omission of any explanation of the easy transition of Deronda from the Christianity in which he was bred to the Judaism in which he had been born."² After a perceptive analysis, Kaufmann argues that Deronda is more a functional representative than a realistic character. Daniel might be regarded "as typical of mankind in its relation to Judaism, for his story teaches us how the world is beginning to take notice of and admire that system more and more, after having for ages misapprehended and neglected it." He finishes his account of Deronda by admitting that "George Eliot has omitted to bring him near to us as a human being and has preserved him in a certain stately inaccessibility", and warns us against trying to find a model "concerning the original from which Deronda is drawn."³

As a result of Kaufmann's comments several important questions are raised: to what extent is Deronda as an individual a formalised rather than a wholly realistic character? To the degree that Deronda and his "conversion" were apparently intended to be realistic,

-
1. The Tablet, 4 November 1876, p.587.
 2. Macmillan's Magazine, June 1877, p.101.
 3. George Eliot and Judaism, pp.65. George Henry Lewes wrote in his Diary that "Polly walked with me in Park discussing De Ronda." (G.H.L. - D, 28 February 1875). Ronda is in Andalusia near the centres of medieval Spanish Jewish life, Granada, Cordoba and Malaga. Deronda has a legitimate claim to be the descendant of Mordecai's medieval world. The town of Ronda is dominated by a fragile bridge crossing a vast chasm between two halves of the town. Deronda too traverses two worlds, the Jewish and the Gentile.

are they convincing? Thirdly, what is the nature of Deronda's functional role? Adequate answers to these questions are beyond the scope of this chapter, but the comments of several critics may be recorded.

Graham Handley has argued in favour of a degree of realism in the characterisation of Daniel. He has noted that the reason for the antipathy toward Deronda is that "George Eliot's voice is used possessively on his account before it merges with his consciousness". For Handley, "Daniel is as thoroughly integrated in character as Gwendolen, though his author's possessive commentary sometimes tends to establish him as a descendant ... of Felix Holt and Will Ladislaw", and he stresses what he calls Deronda's "human qualities". He writes that Deronda

With no knowledge of his parents ... broods long and sensitively over his origins; he is irritable with his best friend, Hans Meyrick, when he discovers that the latter is in love with Mirah; he is compassionate and apprehensive in his care of Gwendolen, and overwhelmed when he meets his mother. His development over the course of the novel is profound.

Barbara Hardy acknowledges that "It is possible to list various qualities in Daniel's make-up which show that George Eliot was trying to make him complicated, moving, changing, aware of the problems of being a model and a 'hero'.... Like Goethe's Wilhelm Meister, he serves an apprenticeship and searches for relationship and a vocation." However, "we object to an absence of personality," and "Deronda" is not really seen from any but the author's admiring point of view". When George Eliot does criticize him "it is only for very noble faults". He "is a character we are told all about in one long breath of exposition."²

-
1. A Critical study of Daniel Deronda, pp. 231, 301.
 2. Daniel Deronda, Penguin edition, pp. 18, 19, 20.

L.H.Kriefall has seen him not as real, but as an apocalyptic figure. "Unlike most of Eliot's characters which are realistically drawn", and "moving in an understandable world, Deronda is highly theoretical and lacks real relation with the book's other characters, with the exception of Mordecai. His life is truly outside the book". The significance of Deronda is two-fold. Kriefall sees a difference between George Eliot's earlier novels and D.D. in the way in which Deronda's "vocation is thought of in terms of the highest vocation; i.e. messianic destiny." Secondly, "given the centrality of vocation", in D.D., George Eliot "wishes ... to summarise what has gone before in her work and to state it in the clearest possible way". Kriefall more explicitly states his suppositions:

It is our belief, that in the 1870's and 1880's, during the decades when many eminent Victorians were having second thoughts about the prospects of science to order the world aright, and the quest of the historical Jesus had touched the entire reading public to some degree, George Eliot, for her part, set out to re-establish by her novel the true ground of religious faith by reconceiving the Christ. Daniel Deronda is her idea of the true Christ.¹

Kriefall has examined in detail the events leading up to Deronda's decision for messiahship. Before the long discussions with Mordecai, there have been events which have already had cumulative effects upon his frame of mind: his visit to the Frankfort Synagogue, his initial encounter with Mordecai at Ram's Bookshop, the Blackfriars Bridge meeting, and the "Hand and Banner" discussions. Kriefall concludes that Deronda's conversion is realistic.

Harold Fisch in The Dual Image: A Study of the Figure of the Jew in English Literature, adopts the existentialist terminology of

1. A Victorian Apocalypse, pp. ^{94, 81}79, 83.

Jean Paul Sartre in order to explain the significance of George Eliot's presentation of Deronda. Fisch argues that "the duality which confronts the serious students of Jewry is formed by the Jew who accepts and acknowledges his Jewish identity on the one hand, and the Jew who tries to escape from it on the other". The "authentic" Jew is the former, whilst the latter is the "inauthentic" Jew. Professor Fisch applies this distinction to Daniel:

The inauthentic Jew yields a psychology marked by evasiveness, selfcontempt, and weakness; the authentic Jew bears the burden of the exile with a certain pride, nourishes the promises of the past and the hope of the future, and lives his real life inwardly rather than in a vain attempt to "normalise" his status in the gentile world. Deronda who discovers his Jewish parentage in the course of the book is such a person: † the discovery leads to new self-respect, new and galvanising life-aims, and¹ a sense of high purpose shared with the collectivity of Israel.

In this sense Mordecai is an authentic Jew, Daniel becomes one, and in this they are contasted with the Princess and to some degree with the Cohen family.

George Eliot's methods as novelist in portraying the developing character of Daniel are of considerable interest, and have some bearing upon the above questions. In accordance with his complex role of observer, confessor and spiritual pilgrim, it can be seen that, while we are told a good deal about the progress of his thought, George Eliot allows Deronda remarkably little direct speech and what there is is carefully orchestrated. One of the ways in which his progress is made evident is in the increasing complexity and imaginative range of these speeches, and their rarity emphasizes the significance of their content. Apart from a few comments in Chapter

1. The Dual Image, p. 62.

15, we first hear his voice, and are told that it is "one of those thrilling boy voices",¹ when he is a thirteen-year-old in the following chapter. His first sentence is a series of questions, and is followed by a short, emphatic defiance of his uncle. This kind of pattern is continued through Chapter 16. Deronda reacts to Sir Hugo's sending him away to school with a series of questions and a statement. The same is true of his spoken reaction to Cambridge. By the time he leaves Cambridge Deronda has become a man grown physically out of adolescence but still searching for his way in life. The earlier, short, high-pitched questions have developed into the puzzled statements of a socially well-educated but disorientated young man, "I want to be an Englishman, but I want to understand other points of view. And I want to get rid of a merely English attitude. in studies."²

What he says, and the tone in which he says it, differ with his relationships with other characters. The main form of his public utterance remains the short question until he meets Mordecai, and his discovery of his role is almost unconsciously reflected, on his part, in his defence of Mordecai at the tavern. It reads as if he has suddenly discovered his own public voice, which is but a reflection of his private voice. And the tavern speech, hesitant as it is in its use of "I suppose" and the lightness of tone of "Take what we have all heard and seen", reflects a working out in his own mind of Mordecai's arguments. Daniel refers back to his boyhood reading concerning Italy, to "Mazzini's account of his first yearning, when

1. D.D., II, xvi, 305.

2. D.D., II, xvi, 334.

he was a boy," and by the end of his speech he is reflecting Mordecai's words, of "national consciousness" and the "new stirring of memories".¹ Towards the end of the lengthy sequence of Deronda's thoughts which follows the Blackfriars meeting with Mordecai, Deronda speaks his thoughts aloud:


If I had not found Mirah, it is probable that I should not have begun to be specially interested in the Jews, and certainly I should not have gone on that loitering search after an Ezra Cohen which made me pause at Ram's book-shop and ask the price of Maimon. Mordecai, on his side, had his visions of a disciple, and he saw me by their light; I corresponded well enough with the image his longing had created. He took me for one of his race. Suppose that his impression- the elderly Jew at Frankfort seemed to have something like it - suppose, in spite of all presumptions to the contrary, that his impression should somehow be proved true, and that I should come actually to share any of the ideas he is devoted to? - This is the only question which really concerns the effect of our meeting on my life.

But, if the issue should be quite different? - 2

This internal, recollective balance sheet is legalistic in presentation. The speech units are comparatively short, non-metaphorical, and balanced against one another, reflecting the balancing in his mind of the various possibilities. Their tentativeness reflects his openness of mind.

As he becomes more certain of his attitudes his speeches employ more metaphor. In Chapter 65, attempting to reassure Gwendolen, he tells her "You have had a vision of injurious, selfish action - a vision of possible degradation; think that a severe angel, seeing you along the road of error, grasped you by the wrist, and showed you the horror of the life you must avoid."³

In addition to his direct speech and the narrator's reporting

-
1. D.D., VI, xlii, 249.
 2. D.D., VI, xli, 210-211. 
 3. D.D., VIII, lxv, 288.

of his thoughts, George Eliot has at times employed a form of semi-dramatisation that has been discussed by Derek Oldfield in its use in Middlemarch:

In the treatment of her characters' thought, George Eliot has developed a technique which allows her to give both an internal and an external account of their experience We oscillate between an emotional identification with a character and an obliquely judicious response to their situation.

The way in which George Eliot achieves this effect is principally by using what is called erlebte Rede.

This means, translated literally from the German, 'experienced speech,' and Oldfield goes on to explain that "In French it is known as le style indirect libre. It is a form of exposition readily available in German (which may be where George Eliot first became familiar with it), it approaches the immediacy of oratio recta whilst retaining the grammatical form of oratio obliqua."¹ Erlebte Rede moves from a straightforward passage of reported narrative to a partial dramatisation of that narrative. An example occurs in Chapter 16 of D.D., where Daniel is pondering upon his background: "The uncle whom he loved very dearly took the aspect of a father who held secrets about him - who had done him a wrong - yes, a wrong: and what had become of his mother from whom he must have been taken away?"² The verbs, pronouns and phrases 'loved', 'had', 'must have been taken' are those of an indirect style. Deronda's question is preserved as a question instead of being turned into a semi-statement such as, 'He wondered what had happened to his mother'. The 'whom' of the passage maintains the non-dramatic, oratio obliqua of reported speech.

-
1. "The Language of the Novel, The Character of Dorothea," in Middlemarch; Critical Approaches to the Novel, p. 81. George Eliot's use of the erlebte Rede technique was first identified by Liza Glauser in Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten (1948), pp. 118-119.
 2. D.D., II, xvi, 303.

Another device used to trace Deronda's development is the significant external allusion. Daniel's question to his tutor in Chapter 16 about the Pope's nephew, was the direct result of reading from Sismondi's History of the Italian Republics. Those familiar with this book after reading of violence, bloodshed, corruption and a struggle for independence, would not be surprised that it had a strong effect upon a sensitive thirteen year old in a state of unusual emotional susceptibility. For George Eliot herself, if for very few readers, such specific literary or historical references were plainly significant.

Deronda's childhood heroes widen the horizon - ours and his - and anticipate action. When Daniel moved away from his tutor Mr. Fraser to the open grounds, "The first shock of suggestion past, he could remember that he had no certainty how things really had been, and that he had been making conjectures about his own history as he had often made stories about Pericles or Columbus, just to fill up the blanks before they became famous."¹ We learn elsewhere that Deronda "easily forgot his own existence in that of Robert Bruce".² Bruce and Pericles were both successful national liberators, Columbus a great explorer. Daniel's horizons will also move to a broader vision of the restoration of his people's homeland as a place of refuge and a national home. Reference has been made in Chapter 5 to the significance of the book, Maimon's Lebensgeschichte, which Deronda was buying at the time of his first meeting with Mordecai. Other literary

1. D.D., II, xvi, 304.
2. D.D., II, xvi, 307.

references are equally revealing.

George Eliot also uses physical detail to reflect psychological states. The opening sentence of Chapter 16 presents its reader with "a moment full of July sunshine and large pink roses shedding their last petals on a grassy court".¹ When Daniel asks his tutor, "Mr. Fraser, how was it that the popes and cardinals always had so many nephews?"² the "moment full of July sunshine and large pink roses"³ has clouded over. It gives way to the less protected "open grounds"⁴ as Deronda moves away from his comfortable surroundings to cry and recover alone from the thoughts provoked by reading "about the pope's nephews".⁵ Similarly, after Daniel has verbally attacked Sir Hugo in public, then retired to the privacy of his own room, he "could see the rain gradually subsiding with gleams through the parting clouds which lit up a great reach of the park, where the old oaks stood apart from each other, and the bordering wood was pierced with green glade which met the eastern sky."⁶ This reflects the way in which his emotional outburst has led to an extended awareness of the world in which he lives.

Daniel's relationships with other characters are made to play an important part in the portrayal of his realistic as well as of his functional nature. Gwendolen contributes details of his impact

1. D.D., II, xvi, 297.

2. Ibid., 298.

3. Ibid., 297.

4. Ibid., 304.

5. Ibid., 309.

6. Ibid., 306.

upon her. She is attracted by his exotic looks and vitality. The first time she hears his voice Gwendolen thinks of it by comparison with that of "Grandcourt's toneless drawl ... as the deep notes of a violincello".¹ She finds that his eyes "were of a dark yet mild intensity",² and he adds to "the stimulus of a pleasure" which she finds in riding.³ She senses in herself "an uneasy longing to be judged by"⁴ him; and the part he plays in her dream in Chapter 54 (on the night before the death of her husband) testifies to the importance that he has achieved in her mind. "She was waked the next morning by the casting of the anchor in the port of Genoa - waked from a strangely-mixed dream in which she felt herself escaping over the Mont Cenis and wondering to find it warmer even in the moonlight on the snow, till suddenly she met Deronda who told her to go back."⁵ At the conclusion of the novel, deprived of Deronda's advice and support, Gwendolen becomes "solitary and helpless".⁶

Daniel on his part, "liked being near her"⁷ and he acknowledges that "he had never throughout his relations with Gwendolen been free from the nervous consciousness that there was something to guard against not only on her account but on his own ... the manifestation of impulsive feeling".⁸ Daniel has a prophetic insight that he will

1. D.D., IV, xxix, 232.

2. Ibid., 234.

3. Ibid., 241.

4. Ibid., 233.

5. D.D., VII, liv, 114.

6. D.D., VIII, lxix, 353.

7. D.D., VI, xlviii, 341.

8. D.D., VII, 1, 11.

have to choose between Gwendolen and Mirah. In Chapter 45 after Mirah's singing at Lady Mallinger's musical evening "There was a foreshadowing of some painful collision: on the one side the grasp of Mordecai's dying hand on him, with all the ideals and prospects it aroused; on the other this fair creature in silk and gems, with her hidden wound and her self-dread, making a trustful effort to lean and find herself sustained."¹

It is through the response that Deronda evokes in other people, that George Eliot presents his sexuality. Gwendolen and Mirah both respond to him "thrilled as by an electric shock".² On his part, when Deronda has found Mirah, he is unable to sleep or to read, the "events were enough to feed with the warm blood of passionate hope and fear."³ On the other hand Daniel's response is also idyllic and platonic: "Her voice, her accent, her looks - all the sweet purity that clothed her as with a consecrating garment" are as much part of Deronda's thought as are the fact that Mirah is a Jew and that her presence evokes in him an obsession for a mother he has never seen. Deronda's response to Mirah "made him shrink the more from giving her, either ideally or practically, an association with what was hateful or contaminating."⁴ Deronda has "mixed feelings"⁵ toward Mirah. The uncertainty of his background, the uneasy feeling that the mystery of his origin is in some way related to Mirah, his response to the Jews, all contribute to their ~~ir~~ developing relationship.

1. D.D., VI, xlv, 301.

2. D.D., V, xxxvi, 96 and VIII, lxiii, 246.

3. D.D., III, xix, 4.

4. Ibid., 7.

5. Ibid., 5.

Physically she is "delightful to Deronda's eyes."¹ In her presence he feels at ease and speaks well.²

Kalonymos and Mordecai on the other hand proved sudden new light upon Deronda by recognizing in him something that even he himself is not yet aware of; and their certainty helps to bring the mystery of his birth into the open.

Mordecai

Early critical reaction to Mordecai was dominated either by incomprehension and opposition, or partisanship. A contemporary review, for example, comments that readers "are very unlikely to throw themselves with any fervour into the mazes of Mordecai's mystic utterances." This reviewer objects to what he considers to be the obscurity of Mordecai's ideas. George Eliot "must have been fully aware that Mordecai would be caviare to the multitude, an unintelligible idea to all but an inner circle".³ Constantius, the critical authority in Henry James's "Daniel Deronda: A Conversation" observes frankly "I don't understand more than half of Mordecai's rhapsodies"⁴ and she notes that Mordecai and Mirah are "hardly more than a shadows."⁵

Partisan defences were not hard to find. Henry Solomon in an emotional pamphlet pronounced that Mordecai was the centre and moral hero of the novel⁶ whilst, in a far more restrained manner

-
1. D.D., IV, xxxii. 304.
 2. Ibid., 314.
 3. The Saturday Review, 16 September 1876, p.357.
 4. The Atlantic Monthly, December 1876, p.688.
 5. Ibid., p.687.
 6. Daniel Deronda from a Jewish Point of View, p.3.

as befitted a scholar, Joseph Jacobs wrote an essay appropriately entitled "Mordecai: A Protest Against the Critics." In this Jacobs looked at reasons behind the lack of "interest and sympathy" in Mordecai. He argues that there is a resistance on the part of the reading public to George Eliot's "new idea"¹ in D.D. The idea in George Eliot's words is "that Judaism /is/ something still throbbing in human lives, still making for them the only conceivable vesture of the world"² and "that Judaism stands on the same level as Christianity, perhaps even on a higher level"³. Mordecai is the embodiment of the new idea, he is "the Jew par excellence of the book, the embodiment of the inner life of Judaism" and a "grand personality". Jacobs does not find Mordecai "mystic, vague and impossible", but well within the bounds of "historic probability".⁴ Another Jewish source commented, "in the lowly and poetical Mordecai we have the ideal of the highest Jewish associations, the noblest outcome of that lofty teaching, those exalted principles which spring from the deepest root of Judaism". Mordecai is "ethereal" but has a "finely organised mind, strung with heavenly chords, celestial melodies."⁵

Rabbi David Kaufmann in his George Eliot and Judaism agrees with Joseph Jacobs' view of Mordecai as being a realistic presentation,

-
1. Macmillan's Magazine, June 1877, p.101.
 2. D.D., IV, xxxii, 291, 292. quoted Ibid., p.101.
 3. Macmillan's Magazine, June 1877, p.101.
 4. Ibid., p. 103.
 5. Jewish Chronicle, 15 December 1876, p.585.

In Mordecai's speeches "we have the utterance not only of the speaker's soul, but of the very soul of poetry." The speaker, Mordecai, has "accuracy ... a warm heart and a clear head". Mordecai is for Kaufmann "a religious genius" and "in studying him we are introduced into a studio or workshop of the prophetic mind." Kaufmann is so moved by George Eliot's portrayal of Mordecai that he states his belief that Mordecai "is one of the most difficult as well as one of the most successful essays in psychological analysis ever attempted by an author.". In Mordecai the Rabbi sees "glowing enthusiasm united to cabbalistic profundity, and the most morbid tension of the intellectual powers united to clear and well defined hopes." Mordecai is "so true to nature", he is by no means a "hollow enthusiast, and in spite of all cabbalistic leanings, never loses sight of realities." As evidence of this Kaufmann instances Mordecai's breaking off of his Palestinean journey at Trieste in order to search for his sister.¹

Charles Gardner's The Inner Life of George Eliot, (1912), contains a worthwhile discussion of Mordecai whom he regards as "the key to Daniel Deronda." Acknowledging Rabbi Kaufmann's scholarship, Gardner accepts that at the core of the sources of Mordecai's ideas are the Kabbalistic traditions. In addition to finding inspiration in the Kabbalah, Gardner observes that Mordecai "leapt back several centuries" from Spinoza and the European Jewish rationalists such as Moses Mendelssohn and "found his true kinship with the great Mediaeval Spanish Jews - with Aben-Ezra and most of all with Jehudah Halevi."² He notes Mordecai's historical references to the

1. George Eliot and Judaism, pp. 39, 40, 55, 67, 68.

2. The Inner Life of George Eliot, pp. 231, 233.

Rabbanites and Karaites - and acknowledges that Mordecai "gave utterance to the hopes and aspirations that were lying inarticulate in Israel's children." He emphasises the practical side of Mordecai, his insistence, "that Israel must be rooted in earth". He explains his "coercive need for Daniel Deronda" as that of the need of an isolated man in whose mind there "grew up ... an image of one coming to him into whose soul he might pour his own, one who should fulfil his passionate desire for Israel."¹

Modern critics have tended either to view Mordecai as an unrealised and wooden character, or have stressed his functional role in the novel or attempted to strike a balance between these extremes. Edgar Rosenberg, for example, has stated that Mordecai is merely one of George Eliot's "dozen unforgivably wooden Jews" in D.D. and that Mordecai is given to "long-winded lacubrations."² W.J. Harvey has written that Mordecai "is the purest example in George Eliot's work of an almost entirely theoretical character, whose individuality is completely subordinated to his functional purpose."³ Graham Handley has set out to redress the balance. He does acknowledge that Mordecai is a failure in terms of dramatic presentation. The reason for this he attributes to a lack of separation between "commentary and consciousness" in George Eliot's handling of her character. Nevertheless, he does find Mordecai credible as an abnormal character "kept alive mainly by the hope that his dreams -

1. The Inner Life of George Eliot, pp. 234, 237, 238.

2. From Shylock to Svengali: Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction, pp. 184, 69.

3. The Art of George Eliot, p.184.

his belief in the 'second-soul' will be fulfilled" and he finds this belief "not only credible but deeply moving." Something that occurs too often and "is not acceptable is the author's far from impartial voice directing our approval of Mordecai". Handley discerns certain faults in the visionary's personality that "tend to humanise him." Thus he instances Mordecai's failure to teach the young Jacob, and his obsession in the 'Hand and Banner' with hearing the sound of his own voice. Handley furthermore finds Mordecai's treatment of his erring father somewhat "degrading and narrowly self-complacent" in tone, and Handley accuses Mordecai of hardness, "lack of warmth", and an inability to sustain a relationship with any character in the novel except Deronda.¹ These elements, with the exception of the lack of separation of commentary and consciousness contribute to the realisation of the character.

Other critics have been interested in other aspects of Mordecai. L.H. Kriefall, for instance, has been impressed by both content and tone in the description of Mordecai. He sees "the dominant metaphor" of the novel as "the apocalyptic vision of reality, with its cosmic dualism, demonic and angelic figures, bursting optimism and abject pessimism", and he regards Mordecai as the major spokesman for this vision and also as "a character symbol of the suffering, homeless Jew."² Kriefall's discussion of Mordecai is largely limited to a detailed account of the passage in which Mordecai meets Deronda on Blackfriars Bridge. Robert Preyer and U.C. Knoepflamacher, have also found a special interest in Mordecai's heightened prose. Both

1. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, pp. 259-262.
2. A Victorian Apocalypse, pp. 16, 65.

regard the visionary, apocalyptic quality of George Eliot's last novel as the feature most strikingly distinguishing it from her earlier works. Preyer finds George Eliot's presentation of Mordecai as visionary, especially interesting. For Preyer, George Eliot, disillusioned with Victorian values, used Mordecai as her "last effort to break new ground in an effort to persuade readers of the need for moral awareness", the need for the ideal. She found it necessary to break "through the usual accounts of the way we are psychologically determined" by presenting a visionary and his language.¹

Barbara Hardy states the reader's difficulties in a consideration of Mordecai's character. On the one hand, "the language of Mordecai is inflated and visionary," he is "fairly complex in psychological presentation", however "the actual feeling shared by most readers is that" he is "wooden and static and unreal ...his character, for better or for worse, really depends on about three scenes of visionary or political speech".²

There seem to be four main ways in which George Eliot presents Mordecai's character: through the author's commentary (including the use of mottos to head ~~characters~~ ^{chapters}); through what happens to him; through other characters' reactions to him; and through his own thoughts, speeches and actions. The opening of Chapter 38 serves as a good illustration of the first two means of presentation.

-
1. VS, September, 1960. p.54. Preyer comments that "the Jewish mystic who enlightens Deronda is a follower of Ben Jehuda, the fifteenth-century Spanish mystic." p.48. Yehuda Halevi's dates are c1075-c1141.
 2. Daniel Deronda, Penguin edition, pp. 15, 18.

George Eliot directs our response to her chapter by her motto usage in which we learn of a "deeper tragedy" than that of the conventional "Prometheus Bound", in other words, that of a man rendered helpless "before he had well got the celestial fire" into operation so that it "might be conveyed to mortals". This Prometheus is seen in "a solitude of despised ideas, fastened in throbbing helplessness by the fatal pressure of poverty and disease - a solitude where many pass by, but none regard." And the first paragraph is, likewise, preparatory, generalised, present-tense narration. The motto has prepared us for something "celestial". The reader is now introduced to a debate concerning "second-sight", "yearnings" and "images". George Eliot describes in images of growth and development, anticipating Mordecai's later speeches, "the event they hunger for or dread rises into vision with a seed-like growth, feeding itself fast on unnumbered impressions."¹

The paragraph proceeds from the author's commentary concerning visionaries to the discussion of one in particular, and the second paragraph follows on with,

This apology for inevitable kinship is meant to usher in some facts about Mordecai, whose figure had bitten itself into Deronda's mind as a new question which he felt an interest in getting answered. But the interest was no more than a vaguely expectant suspense: the consumptive-looking Jew, apparently a fervid student of some kind, getting his crust by a quiet handicraft, like Spinoza, fitted into none of Deronda's anticipations.²

1. D.D., V, xxxviii, 131.

2. D.D., V, xxxviii, 132.

Here, the first sentence has switched from the story-teller's discussion of her methods of procedure, to a communication of facts about Mordecai. It also introduces Daniel's reactions to Mordecai and the second means of presentation, through other characters reacts to him. Daniel is the character whose reactions to Mordecai are prominent, and unless George Eliot observes otherwise, the reader is meant to ^{concur with} them. Through using Daniel's reliable responses George Eliot is not only able to show what happens to Mordecai but is able to suggest frames of reference by which Mordecai might be judged. In the above passage, for instance, "Spinoza" is mentioned as a possible comparative aid to our understanding.

George Eliot tells us, in the past tense, what Mordecai is thinking. There are, by contrast with her presentations of Daniel and Mirah, few incursions into the erlebte Rede form.¹ Even when it appears that we are being given access to Mordecai's private thoughts George Eliot is usually engaged in reported narrative. The opening of the following, for instance, may appear to be inner thought but turns out otherwise:

Tracing reasons in that self for the rebuffs he had met with and the hindrances that beset him, he imagined a man who would have all the elements necessary for sympathy with him, but in an embodiment unlike his own: he must be a Jew, intellectually cultured, morally fervid - in all this a nature ready to be plished from Mordecai's; but his face and frame must be beautiful and strong, he must have been used to all the refinements of social life, his voice must flow with a full and easy current, his circumstances be free from sordid need: he must glorify: the possibilities of the Jew, not sit and wander as Mordecai did, bearing the stamp of his people amid the signs of poverty and waning breath.

1. See my discussion of George Eliot's methods of presenting the character of Daniel Deronda.

Such an unusually lengthy complex sentence, even for George Eliot and the nineteenth-century, contains much. The first subordinate structure, "he imagined a man", warns us away from interpreting these as direct thoughts in a similar way as does "not sit and wander as Mordecai did".¹ While explaining Mordecai's need for a type like Deronda it brings out Mordecai's dual function in the novel. On the one hand, he is a particular individual, on the other, he is a representative of his people. However, the question has to be asked, why it is that George Eliot should not allow Mordecai's thoughts to flow, but continually interferes in order to tell us what he is thinking?

Much of his thought takes the form of speeches and these speeches are of two kinds. There is, for example, public speech at the "Hand and Banner", and private speech in the company of the Cohen family, especially that addressed to Jacob, to Mirah and Deronda, or, briefly, to Mordecai's father. George Eliot tells us that Mordecai in private "fell into this antique form of speech habitually in talking to his sister and to the Cohen children", and the example given is "Why, what has shaken thee?"² In public, Mordecai had his "sense of enlargement in utterance".³

Mordecai's style of speaking varies considerably. In private conversation his changes of tone are at times directly indicated:

"Nevertheless, you shall judge. For my soul is satisfied." Mordecai paused, and then began in a changed tone, reverting to previous suggestions from Deronda's disclosure: "What moved your parents -?" but he immediately checked himself, and added, "Nay, I ask not that you should tell me aught concerning others, unless it is your pleasure."⁴

1. D.D., V, xxxviii, 133, 134.

2. D.D., VII, lii, 81.

3. D.D., VIII, lxiii, 249.

4. Ibid., 254.

Mordecai tells Lapidoth that Mirah and he "will not cast you out to the mercy of your vices. For you are our father, and though you have broken your bond, we acknowledge ours. But I will never trust you." The comparative contrasting length of the next statement, the balance of the staccato-like phrasing serves to impress the catalogue of misdeeds which Mordecai enumerates, "You absconded with money, leaving your debts unpaid; you forsook my mother; you robbed her of her little child and broke her heart; you have become a gambler, and where shame and conscience were, there sits an insatiable desire; you were ready to sell my sister - you had sold her, but the price was denied you."¹ Mordecai's quick ending gives a sermon-like fatalistic quality to the statement.

At the tavern Mordecai "cared more for the utterance of his faith than for its immediate reception". He spoke "with a fervour which had not temper in it, but seemed rather the rush of feeling in the opportunity of speech".² His tone and movements are usually conveyed through authorial narration followed by exemplifying speech quotation. A typical preliminary description of his tavern manner occurs when George Eliot tells us that "Mordecai, whose seat was next the fireplace, rose and leaned his arm on the little shelf; his excitement had risen, though his voice, which had begun with unusual strength, was getting hoarser."³ His opening sharp questions and interrupted speech illustrate his nervous excitement until he is back to his normal expansive style. Sometimes the sentence

1. D.D., VIII, lxvi, 302.

2. D.D., VI, xlii, 233.

3. Ibid., 242.

structure helps to convey tone. In his answer to Pash's comment, "I don't see why our rubbish is to be held sacred any more than the rubbish of Brahmanism or Bouddhism", Mordecai begins slowly but firmly using a short explanatory sentence in order to indicate Pash's deficiencies,

"No," said Mordecai, "No, Pash, because you have lost the heart of the Jew. Community was felt before it was called good. I praise no superstition. I praise the living fountains of enlarging belief. What is growth, completion, development? You began with that question, I apply it to the history of our people. I say that the effect of our separateness will not be completed and have its highest transformation unless our race takes on again the character of a nationality. That is the fulfilment of the religious trust that moulded them into a people, whose life has made half the inspiration of the world. What is it to me that the ten tribes are lost untraceably, or that multitudes of the children of Judah have mixed themselves with the Gentile populations as a river with rivers? Behold our people still! Their skirts spread afar; they are torn and soiled and trodden on; but there is a jewelled breastplate. Let the wealthy men, the monarchs of commerce, the learned in all knowledge, the skilful in all arts, the speakers, the political counsellors, who carry in their veins the Hebrew blood which has maintained its vigour in all climates, and the pliancy of the Hebrew genius for which difficulty means new device-let them say, 'we will lift up a standard, we will unite in a labour hard but glorious like that of Moses and Ezra, a labour which shall be a worthy fruit of the long anguish whereby our fathers maintained their separateness, refusing the ease of falsehood.' They have wealth enough to redeem the soil from debauched and paupered conquerors; they have the skill of the statesman to devise, the tongue of the orator to persuade. And is there no prophet or poet among us to make the ears of Christian Europe tingle with shame at the hideous obloquy of Christian strife which the Turk gazes at as at the fighting of beasts to which he has lent an arena? There is store of wisdom among us to found a new Jewish polity, grand, simple, just, like the old-republic where there is equality of protection, an equality

which shone like a star on the forehead of our ancient community, and gave it more than the brightness of Western freedom amid the despotisms of the East. Then our race shall have an organic centre, a heart and brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defence in the court of nations, as the outraged Englishman or American. And the world will gain as Israel gains. For there will be a community in the van of the East which carries the culture and the sympathies of every nation in its bosom; there will be a land set for a halting-place of enmities, a neutral ground for the East as Belgium is for the West. Difficulties? I know there are difficulties. But let the spirit of sublime achievement move in the great among our people, and the work will begin.¹

This is began by a generalized statement, "Community was felt before it was called good" and moves into rhetorical questions. Mordecai's sentences increase in length as he and his case gain in confidence until he reaches the point, "Behold our people still", which he wishes to illustrate in the remainder of the paragraph. A count of the number of words in each sentence of the paragraph up to this point, shows a swelling out of speech and tone. Respectively, the sentences contain 14,8,4,8,5,5,9,28,24, and 32 words, the longest sentence being a rhetorical question. A similar pattern is to be found in the succeeding sentences. They open with 4,18 and 99 word sentences, following which Mordecai naturally must pause for breath. His next statement is a split sentence with 29 words, the division coming after the thirteenth word. The structure following the voice again becomes longer, 44,57,36, word sentences, and a shorter expression following two lengthy expostulations. The speech ends with a lengthy idea followed by a single question which is then answered with a hope for the future. The answers fall away as

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 246-248. Add. MS. 34041, f.196,7. "The printers formalized" George Eliot's "punctuation and it is rash to speak about her 'heavy' style without knowing that the heaviness is in part, at least, the result of an imposed style of punctuation." B.Hardy, Daniel Deronda, Penguin Edition, p.903.

Mordecai's voice dries up.

Close analysis shows that Mordecai has a style of his own, at once heightened, rhetorical, elegiac and lively, whilst at the same time being full of allusion. Echoes of the Kuzari are not hard to find in what he has just said.¹ Mordecai follows his own pattern of logic, his own inner voice. One idea or allusion sparks off another. Mordecai's mind moves from the reference to wealthy Jews to an association with burials in Palestine and hence to the Turkish occupation of Palestine.

Mordecai is a poet. The example George Eliot gives us of Mordecai's poetry is, as Barbara Hardy has indicated, "remarkably true to Halevi's poetry", and "much of the imagery is of course from the common source of the Old Testament".² Mordecai's words are a free variation on Halevi's. In "The Poet is Urged to Remain in Spain" Halevi tells how "he is caught" by the Gentiles and "His heart seduced by alien duties", however alone, he goes on,

...weary, hard-driven, oppressed and weak,
And yearns for Carmel and Kiryath-yearim,
To ask for forgiveness by the peaceful graves.
He yearns for the ark and tablets buried there,
Where the cherubim and the engraved stones
Lie under the earth in a hidden place.
I long to pass by them, to breathe my last by their tomb.
My eyes will see them broken, and will be a source of streams.

Isolated in the Diaspora, the poet thinks of Moses's grave and the rejection of God's commandments by the Children of Israel, a rejection which led to Israel's exile. When Israel returns and

-
1. For instance Mordecai's arguments based on "growth, completion, development?"
 2. Daniel Deronda, Penguin edition, p.896.

accepts the commandments then Moses's prophecy of a return to Israel, to "a source of streams",¹ will be fulfilled. Mordecai too thinks "of Mount Nebo", Moses burial place and from where he looked down to Israel,

Solitude is on the sides of Mount Nebo.
In its heart a tomb:
There the buried ark and golden cherubim,
Make hidden light.
There the solemn faces gaze unchanged;
The wings are spread unbroken:
Shut beneath in silent awful speech
The Law lies graven.

Only with the smashing of idolotry and the return to the law, to the commandments, can Israel return and cease to be lonely. In exile mordecai too is in "solitude and darkness," and his "heart a tomb",² until Moses' tomb is reopened.

Up to the point at which he meets Deronda we know of the events of his life, and of the development of his character, mainly through his own account of them to Deronda, or by means of a few brief flashbacks, as in his vision of his mother's needs. We do however witness certain crucial events. Within the main time-span of the novel he passes from utter despair, to expectation, disillusionment, the reinstatement and confirmation of his hopes, the re-discovery of his father and sister, the worsening of his health, and his death, on which note D.D. concludes. And we see him in human relationships with other characters.

The juxtaposition between mordecai's activities as a visionary, and his relationship with young Jacob Cohen. Mordecai is not a visionary day-to-day existence, is cleverly realised in his

1. Hebrew Poems from Spain, p. 107.

2. D.D., V, xxxviii, 143. B.M. Ad. MS. 34041. f. 115.

conscious of Jacob's presence during his "invocation". Mordecai's "terrible" reply to the boy's acrobatics is out of keeping with his usual attitude toward Jacob, for Mordecai is still enwrapped within his visionary state. Jacob's reaction, after his initial shock at Mordecai's response, is to cry, "This sign of childish grief at once recalled Mordecai to his usual gentle self: he was not able to speak again at present, but with a maternal action he drew the curly head towards him and pressed it tenderly against his breast."¹ The young child has returned Mordecai to everyday reality and directed him away from his all-consuming desire, to natural human tenderness. Mordecai's affection for young Jacob is so great that the excitement which he feels at rejoining Mirah is tempered by the loss of Jacob's company, and his one request to the Cohen family and to Deronda on leaving is, "may not Jacob come and visit me?"²

Mordecai has a partly realistic and a partly functional role in D.D. His function is an educative one - to make Daniel and George Eliot's readers aware of Jewish history and aspirations and to widen the readers' imaginative sympathies. There are however gaps between his functional role, his rhetorical force, and his weak physical body. He is a creature of history, the representative of the latent feelings and attitudes of the Jews - and in this sense is a symbolic figure using the language of tradition. The topics he discusses are of great social, political and religious consequence

1. D.D., V, xxxviii, 143-45.

2. D.D., VI, xlvi, 323.

and are by their very nature grandiose. His realistic and functional roles complement one another. As an individual, Mordecai is isolated and has to sustain his beliefs by his own efforts. Without Daniel, derision or at best, the half-comprehension of the "Hand and Banner" crowd, would have been his fate. The contrast between his physical weaknesses, and the strength of his humanity and faith, despite the alien environment, make him representative of the visionary and Zionist elements of Jewish life and thought, recalling Jehuda Halevi's description of Israel as "the most sick and the most healthy of" all the nations.¹

Possible Models for the Character of Mordecai.

Readers who have taken Mordecai as realistic have speculated upon his origins, a common idea being that Mordecai was based upon a German Jewish watchmaker, Albert Cohn, whom Lewes remembered meeting in a tavern in Red Lion Square Holborn. In his article on Spinoza published in the Fortnightly, Lewes describes his meetings with Cohn in the late 1830's when a poor student and the origins of his life-long absorption with the life and philosophy of the great Jewish thinker, Spinoza. In a source of information relating to Lewes' early life, Francis Espinasse's Literary Recollections (1893), there is put forward the statement that Cohn was the model for Mordecai Lapidoth. Perhaps owing to the setting of Mordecai's

1. Kusari, II, 36, p.74.

public statement of his beliefs, in Chapter 42, at the 'Hand and Banner' tavern, this kind of speculation grew into fact, and circulated before George Eliot's death in December 1880. George Eliot, however, went out of her way to discredit any association between Cohn and Mordecai. She wrote to Asher Isaac Myers, the editor of the Jewish Chronicle, a letter which was published shortly after her death, in the fashionable Pall Mall Gazette on 1~~st~~ January 1881. In her letter she commented,

I am not in the habit of reading printed observations on my writings, but my husband informed me¹ that various excellent persons had ... repeated the mistaken statement that the Jew named Cohn, ... bore a resemblance to Mordecai, and was thus a guarantee that the character was not an impossible ideal. Mr. Lewes took several opportunities ~~of~~... of pointing out that no such resemblance existed, Cohn being a keen dialectician and a highly impressive man, but without any specifically Jewish enthusiasm. His type was rather that of Spinoza whose metaphysical system attracted his subtle intellect, and in relation to Judaism Spinoza was in contrast with my conception of Mordecai.²

Close attention to Mordecai's words in D.D. should have rendered George Eliot's letter unnecessary. Mordecai tells his audience at the 'Hand and Banner' that

Baruch Spinoza had not a faithful Jewish heart, though he had sucked the life of his intellect at the breasts of Jewish tradition. He laid bare his father's nakedness and said, 'They who scorn him have the higher wisdom.' Yet Baruch Spinoza confessed, he saw not why Israel should not again be a chosen nation.³

George Eliot, commenting on Mordecai's cast of mind, demonstrates, within the framework of her novel, her own awareness of Spinoza's

-
1. i.e. George Henry Lewes, who died 30 November 1878.
 2. L., VII, 95, 96. 18 January 1879.
 3. D.D., VI, xlii, 250.

limitations as a thinker and the difference in Mordecai's ideas from these of the great philosopher. Wisely she says,

Men may dream in demonstrations, and cut out an illusory world in the shape of axioms, definitions, and propositions, with a final exclusion of fact signed Q.E.D. No formulas for thinking will save us mortals from mistake in our imperfect apprehension of the matter to be thought about. And since the unemotional intellect may carry us into a mathematical dreamland where nothing is but what is not, perhaps an emotional intellect may have absorbed into its passionate vision of possibilities some truth of what will be.

George Eliot's language and thought here differ considerably from that of her presentation of the "emotional intellect"¹ Mordecai, whom critics have tended to look on as an extension of George Eliot's voice. Critics have been unable to separate the author's opinion from that of her creation, and despite the weight of internal evidence, Cohn, the Spinozist, is still taken as a model for Mordecai.²

A probable source in reality for the character of Mordecai was George Eliot's close friend E.O.M.Deutsch and one need look no further than the consumptive scholarly Deutsch to test whether Mordecai's dreams and character have a realistic basis or not. Deutsch reached England from Germany in the years following the abortive 1848 uprisings when many German and Central European Jews moved into North Western Europe.³ He obtained a position in the British Museum initially as a transcriber and became known as serious journalist and scholar.⁴ George Eliot's friendship with Deutsch

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 209.

2. See for instance, H.Goldberg, "G.H.Lewes and Daniel Deronda," Notes and Queries, ccii, (August, 1957), pp. 356-~~58~~, and M.Blumberg's very inaccurate, "The bloke George Eliot lived with," The Times, 30 March, 1968, p.17.

3. See Ch. 2 of this thesis.

4. See for instance L., IV, 390. George Eliot to S.S.Hennell [12 October 1867]. S.L.Poole, Dictionary of National Biography, V, 1921, pp. ~~873-83~~, and Letters to Sir A.Panizzi, B.M. Ad. MS. 36, 717, f.119.

seems to have been particularly close in the years between 1867 and his death in 1873. Her letters show her awareness that Deutsch was, as the Jewish Chronicle expressed it, "being unfairly treated" at the British Museum, when he did not "gain either the recognition or the promotion his work entitled him to."¹ George Eliot wrote him words of reassurance, "we never shall be rosy and comfortable, and our good is to be got by weary struggle, and by that alone." She quickly admitted that "This is not to tell you what you don't know already, O Rabbi," her comments are "simply the discourse of a fellow Houynhym! who is bearing the yoke with you." It is necessary for humans to "tell each other that the day is fine, and that the north-east wind is biting",² although there is, in honesty, little reassurance in such truths. In a letter to his friend Sir A.H.Layard, who had reminded Deutsch of his long forgotten application for the Queen's Librarianship, Deutsch reveals a source of his discontent. His attempt to become Queen's Librarian was "more or less a desperate effort to get away from this place à tout prix... after fifteen year's vain strivings". Layard indeed seemed to have been a protector of the scholars. Layard left London and ended his connections with the British Museum and became British Ambassador in Madrid. Deutsch commented at the time that he feared that his "case is hopeless and becomes irredeemably so on [Layard's] going

-
1. Jewish Chronicle, 15 January 1875, p. 676.
 2. George Eliot to E.D.M.Deutsch. Sotheby's Lot 45. 12 November 1963. George Eliot's emphasis. The letter was bought by F.Edwards, 63, Marlbone High Street, London, for an undisclosed American buyer. Inquiry, T.L.S., 19 October 1967, failed to find owner and complete text of the letter. Extract quoted from Sotheby's Catalogue, 12 November 1963.

away". An idea of Deutsch's was the foundation of a Semitic Department in the British Museum, however "nothing will ever persuade the powers that be of its feasibility". And Deutsch observes, "even if it were to be tomorrow, somebody else would undoubtedly be found to superintend it, forthwith."¹

Apart from illness and prejudice against him, a further reason for Deutsch's unhappiness was the frustration for a long time of his deep wish to visit the Middle East. The main source for his life, Viscountess Strangford's The Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch With a Brief Memoir (1874), quotes the opening of a letter from Deutsch to Lady Strangford, written on his first visit to Palestine in March 1869: "The East", he writes, "all my wild yearnings fulfilled at last."² On his return in May 1869, George Eliot, full of curiosity, invited Deutsch to the Priory, informing the traveller that she and George Henry Lewes, "shall not be satisfied with a small allowance of talk."³ In spite of ill health Deutsch set out again for Palestine in the Autumn of 1872. He obtained six months leave of absence from the Trustees of the Museum and "means were found through the kindness of his many friends, and collected unknown to him,"⁴ for his comfort. But Deutsch died in Alexandria in the spring of 1873 without again seeing the Promised Land. Mordecai too found England his adopted home; he too was ill

-
1. E.O.M.Deutsch to A.H.Layard, 27 October 1869 (Layard Papers, Vol. LXVII), B.M. Ad. MS. 38, 997, f.52. The Department of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts, which includes the semitic field, came into being in 1891.
 2. Memoir, p. xii.
 3. L., V, 39, 40. George Eliot to E.O.M.Deutsch. [24 May, 1869]
 4. Memoir, p.xviii.

from consumption and was deeply frustrated because of lack of interest in his ideas: like Deutsch he died in permanent exile.

Mirah

James's Pulcheria quips, "All we know about Mirah is that she has delicate rings of hair, sits with her feet crossed and talks like a book" and Constantius comments that "Mirah's long narrative of her adventures,..., is arranged, it is artificial, old-fashioned".¹ Another contemporary reviewer of the novel claimed to speak for many "in family circles" for whom "Gwendolen has been as much the heroine - if we may so term the central and most prominent female figure - as if there were no Mirah."² One of the few who did come to a defence of the Jewish heroine was Edward Dowden. Writing in the Contemporary Review, he felt that Mirah's is a "still, yet richly tinted life ... her whole being ... being bright with coherent energy." Dowden recognised that "Sorrow had been a familiar guest with Mirah" and that "in Deronda's love there lay the joy of blessed protectiveness." Mirah was, however, "an artist witnessed by the appalling Klesmer" and praised by him.³ A modern critic, W.J. Harvey, who has drawn attention to the "vein of artistic and especially theatrical imagery in Daniel Deronda", has observed that Mirah "tends to see things in terms of her experience of the theatre", and that "theatrical imagery helps to establish Mirah's innocence."⁴

-
1. The Atlantic Monthly, 31 December 1876, p. 687.
 2. The Saturday Review, 16 September 1876, p. 357.
 3. Contemporary Review, 29 February 1877, p. 365.
 4. The Art of George Eliot, pp. 237, 238.

Möller's sympathetic reading pays special attention to two aspects of her portrayal: Mirah's impact upon Deronda, and her function in the novel. She is the first Jewish person with whom the hero develops a close relationship. She does not conform to the stereotype of the Jewess. Her story shows up the limitation of the knowledge of the Jews which Deronda had shared with his contemporaries. As a result of their meeting Deronda begins to take an active interest in the Jews and to study Jewish life. Moller points out that the Meyrick family do not give up hope of persuading Mirah to convert to Christianity. Mirah defends her religion and regards a break with Judaism as a betrayal of her past. George Eliot, through Mirah, defends religion on the ground of its historical growth, having become so deeply established in human beings that it cannot be modernised by mathematical examples, or reinforced. Its renaissance must be an internal one. Hans Meyrick holds the attitude towards Judaism, that George Eliot had once endorsed: he believes that it is natural that Mirah should renounce her ancestral religion and allow it to be replaced by their love. Meyrick says "Nature designed Mirah to fall in love with me. The amalgamation of races demands it - the mitigation of human ugliness demands it - the affinity of contrasts assures it."¹ In her criticism of Disraeli's Tancred George Eliot had written that "The nations have been always kept apart until they have sufficiently developed their idiosyncracies, and then some great revolutionary

1. D.D., V, xxxvii, 116.

force has been called into action" at which point, "the genius of a particular nation becomes a portion of the common mind of humanity!"¹ Möller takes this as evidence that George Eliot only let the characters of D.D. say things about Judaism which she herself had thought of at different stages in her development.²

George Eliot's main realisation of Mirah is through Mirah's recollection of her past world. This recollection is movingly and effectively presented. The reader is prepared for Mirah's ~~and~~ sad history by the Meyricks' responses to the book Mrs. Meyrick has *been* reading before Mirah's arrival. The work, a history of soldiers conscripted against their will, to suffer and fight for causes far removed from their personal lives, is Émile Erckman's and Pierre Chatrian's Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813. Kate calls it "a bit of history brought near us with a strong telescope", and Mab calls "it a chapter in Revelations."³ History and revelations shortly become reality through Mirah's story which is related in a detailed and precise manner.

Mirah recalls that in her childhood "always there were men and women coming and going, there was loud laughing and disputing, strutting, snapping of fingers, jeering, faces I did not like to look at - though many petted and caressed me. But then I remembered my mother."⁴ This is specific and made moving by the fact that the detail is so precise, the events shown to haunt Mirah's

-
1. L., I, 246, George Eliot to John Sibree, [11 February 1848.]
 2. Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum, pp. 44, 45.
 3. D.D., II, xviii, 360, 361.
 4. D.D., III, xx, 17.

imagination. Such a passage is representative of Mirah's confession as a whole. It is not only particularised but told ⁱⁿ direct speech and from the viewpoint of the present. Her life story contains a subtle, contrapuntal interweaving of the past with the present and reveals the effect experience has had upon the telling of the story. The past, seen from the present, reflects the obsessions of the present, and is a recreation, or reviving, of events best forgotten.¹

No clearer illustration of Mirah's terrible struggle to keep faith and not to lose hope, followed by her loss of faith and utter despair, can be found than in her account where "I lost my trust."² The world seems completely alien to Mirah; unable to ask anybody questions through the fear of being persecuted, belonging to nowhere, she walks by the riverside debating within herself whether to live or die. She describes her "terror of the world."³ And "everywhere there was scorching that make me shrink. The high sunlight made me shrink." In her despair there "was the voice of God telling me to die." She places her plight in general terms and thinks of her people's sufferings, "was I the first?" Mirah remembers the Jews who committed suicide rather than become converted:

"That seemed to make it right for me to put an end to my life, for calamity had closed me in too, and I saw no pathway but evil. But my mind got into war with itself, for there were contrary things in it. I knew that some had held it wrong to hasten their own death though they were in the midst of flames; and while I had some strength left it was a longing to bear if I ought to bear-else where was the good of all my life? It had not been happy since the first years:

-
1. L.P.Hartley's The Go-Between (1953), provides an interesting example of a modern novel written from this point of view.
 2. D.D., III, xx, 34.
 3. Ibid., p 35.

when the light came every morning I used to think, 'I will bear it.'" But always before, I had some hope - now it was gone. With these thoughts I wandered and wandered inwardly crying to the Most High from whom I should not flee in death more than in life - though I had no strong faith that He cared for me. The strength seemed departing from my soul: deep below all my cries was the feeling that I was alone and forsaken. The more I thought, the wearier I got, till it seemed I was not thinking at all, but only the sky and the river and the Eternal God were in my soul. And what was it whether I died or lived? If I lay down to die in the river was it more than lying down to sleep - for there too I committed my soul - I gave myself up. I could not hear memories any more: I could only feel what was present in me - it was all one longing to cease from my weary life which seemed only a pain outside the great peace that I might enter into. That was how it was. When the evening came and the sun was gone, it seemed as if that was all I had to wait for. And a new strength came into me to will what I would do. You know what I did - I was going to die. You know what happened - did he not tell you? Faith came to me again: I was not forsaken. He told you how he found me?"¹

Mirah describes her hesitations, obsessions and self-torture in concrete, everyday language. Presented with much a passage the reader is aware of many antecedents, and George Eliot's early experiences and reading are relevant as the background to discussion. The language is Biblical - we have been told that Mirah as a young girl read much - and there are echoes of Bunyan in, for instance "If I lay down to die".² Language such as "no pathway but to evil", "mind got into war with itself", "the great peace", is full of Biblical allusion and the material of spiritual autobiography in its personification of a spiritual problem using words such as

-
1. D.D., III, xx, 36~~37~~. B.M. Ad. MS. 34034. f.337,338.
 2. Cf. The Pilgrim's Progress, "And I laid me down in that place to sleep," p.146.

"pathway", "war", "peace". Reiteration of "wandered" emphasises the element of pilgrimage, or quest. The rhythms in their rise and fall reflect Mirah's changing psychological situation, "But always before, I had some hope - now it was gone." With "hope" there is a rise in pitch, followed by a fall to "gone." The apocalyptic elegiac note, "When the evening came and the sun was gone,"¹ heralds finality and suicide.

Camus writes in The Myth of Sisyphus that: "There is but one only truly serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide. Judging whether life is or is not worth living amounts to answering the fundamental question of philosophy. All the rest ... comes afterwards."² And H.J.Blackham's description of Kierkegaard's problem as related in Fear and Trembling, reads as a commentary upon Mirah's revelation:

He began with despair, not merely a personal despair but human despair, whether acknowledged or not. When the spontaneity of animal impulse falters and reflection supervenes, will is put in question: whether one wills to be oneself or does not will it, all the possibilities involve one in uncertainties and are dubious in relation to the ground of one's being, a God posited or not posited. To come into reflective existence as a self-conscious being is to despair, for it is a break with the finite, a withdrawal into uncertainty, and yet one has to proceed and without guidance: one is brought to the point of choosing to will absolutely, yet it is impossible³ to will absolutely any finite end without a contradiction.

And so this kind of dialogue continues up to the point where the suicide is rejected or enacted.

1. D.D., III, xx, 36, 37.

2. The Myth of Sisyphus, p.15.

3. Six Existentialist Thinkers, pp.16, 17.

A measure of George Eliot's insight into this, and her ability to convey it fictionally, is conveyed in her simple stroke of concluding with Mrs. Meyrick's silent but physical and spiritual communication, she "gave no audible answer, but pressed her lips against Mirah's forehead."¹ - a "Silence which is communication".² Mirah's dialogue has been with herself, not with God, for "I had no strong faith that He cared for me." She "was alone and forsaken", a sense reinforced by the singular "I". God, who had previously given her comfort, whom in her inner life she had been able to communicate with, to talk and feel kinship with, is no longer accessible. The personal "I" in the passage thus becomes reinforced. And the ending of her speech is additionally moving in that the "I" gives way to a reiteration of "You" and "he", who is not God but a human, Deronda. She concludes on a "me", and a question showing that she is again in communication with others and her personal identify is as one of many.³

Mirah is a committed person, through choice, to a particular belief. She felt completely alienated at the time when this belief was lost. She regards Deronda as her "rescuing angel"⁴ who came from God to reinstate her faith, and her love for Deronda is connected with this. She tells him "I will always be a Jewess. I will love Christians when they are good, like you. But I will always cling to my people."⁵ Prior to this Daniel has to remind

1. D.D., III, ~~xx~~, 37.

2. M. Buber, Between Man and Man, p.3.

3. D.D., III, xx, 37.

4. D.D., VIII, lxx, 362.

5. D.D., IV, xxxii, 316.

her that he

"was not brought up as a Jew."

"Ah, I am always forgetting," said Mirah, with a look of disappointed recollection, and slightly blushing.

In their relationship there is what Buber calls an "I - Thou" relationship, in which there is:

human life, dynamic, twofold, the giver and the receiver, he who does and he who endures, the attacking force and the defending force, the nature which investigates and the nature which supplies information, the request begged ~~X~~ ^{and granted} and always both together, completing one another in mutual contribution, ... the eternal meeting of the One with the Other.²

Mirah has faith; Deronda comes to it through Mirah.

A strong trait in Mirah's character, partly as a response to the loneliness of her youth, is her desire for "protectiveness"³, and during the novel this has taken various forms in the desire for her mother, for the synagogue, books, religious tradition and for Deronda. Mirah is content to be reverential and dependent, and her desire to be submissive finds a reflection in the origin of her name. Haight says, "George Eliot named her Mirah (pronounced My-ra) after a sister of the fifteenth-century chronicler Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua ha-Cohen ben Meir."⁴ She is thus the archetypal Jewish wife and fulfils her desires; those of traditionalist values and the warmth of a family life, which she herself missed as a child.⁵ She is not, and does not wish to be, a liberated woman.

1. D.D., IV, xxxii, 315.

2. Between Man and Man, p.205.

3. D.D., VIII, lxx, 361.

4. George Eliot. A Biography, p.489. Cf. Pforzheimer, MS. 711, f. 60. In the manuscript, Mirah is initially called "Myra" and "Miriam".

5. Cf. the origins of the name Gwendolen, in myth the "British Venus", "an ancient British Goddess" and "a beauty of Arthur's Court", Pforzheimer, MS. 429, f.10.

There is much more at work in the presentation of Mirah. References to Mirah as a hunted "fawn",¹ a "wounded"² animal or "bird"³, add to her symbolic role in the novel as the helpless creature, possibly representing Israel's destiny and plight in despair. Such images are derived from the Kuzari - where Israel is personified as "not even a body, only scattered limbs, like the dry bones Ezekiel saw"⁴, as was shown at the crux of Halevi's argument, the analogy of Israel with a wounded person or animal, is used in order to prove Israel's strength.⁵ When Israel prospers with the revival of its homeland so shall its individual representatives. At the end of D.D., in spite of her brother's impending death, Mirah "was glowing like a dark-tipped yet delicate ivory - tinted flower in the warm sunlight of content". She and Deronda are to fulfil Mordecai's wishes. The motto of the concluding chapter with its fertility imagery, reminiscent of that in Halevi, summarises Mirah's life, and the novel as a whole.

In the chequered area of human experience the seasons are all mingled as in the golden age: fruit and blossom hang together; in the same moment the sickle is reaping and the seed is sprinkled: one tends the green cluster and another treads the wine-press. Nay, in each of our lives harvest and spring-time are continually one, until Death⁶ himself gathers us and sows us anew in his invisible fields.

"the golden age" is not the Horatian one of Latin and most English poetry, but the age Israel's return.

-
1. D.D., II, xvii, 341.
 2. Ibid., 342.
 3. D.D., IV, xxxii, 305.
 4. Kuzari, II, 30, p. 72. Ezekiel, xxxvii.
 5. Ibid., 36, p. 74.
 6. D.D., VIII, lxx, 361.

Despite George Eliot's moving depiction of Mirah's struggle to keep faith, the particularity and vividness of her confession, the firm quality of her commitment, her human need for another to lean upon, George Eliot's portrait of Mirah has its weaknesses. Joseph Jacobs rightly said that Mirah is "tame" and that "tameness, for those who know them, is the last infirmity of Jewish girls." He gives a good reason for Mirah's lack of fire, "the sad experience of Mirah's youth may be held to have somewhat palliated any want of brightness".¹

The Princess.

The characterisation of Deronda's mother, the Princess Halm-Eberstein, otherwise the singer Alcharisi, has received much critical approbation. Henry James's *Constantius* raises one of the few dissenting voices: in the scenes between Deronda and his mother, "one feels that one has been appealed to on rather an artificial ground of interest"; i.e., in order "to make Deronda's reversion to his native faith more dramatic and profound" George Eliot "has given him a mother who on very arbitrary grounds, apparently, has separated herself from this same faith, and who has been kept waiting in the wing, as it were, for many acts, to come on and make her speech and say so. This moral situation of hers we are invited retrospectively to appreciate. But we hardly care to do so."

1. Macmillan's Magazine, June 1877, p.103.

Pulcheria asks, "Why should an actress and prima-donna care so much about religious matters?" Constantius regards her as "one of the unvivified characters" of the book.¹ In a similar vein, W.C. Brownell comments that "Deronda's mother, with her orange dress and black lace and bare arms, is a caricature, a mere postulate of her profession of public singer."²

The Jewish Chronicle found the Princess a very realistic representative of those Jews "who despair of the future because" they are "borne down not by legal persecution ... but by social ostracism" and "are therefore anxious to save their offspring the pangs of the struggle they had to endure themselves,"³ and attempt to reject their heritage.

For Möller, similarly, the Princess stands as an example of the Jew who has withdrawn from Judaism and been able to live a free life within European high society. Judaism seems a fetter to her, yet her attitude to it, as to her father and son, fluctuates between love and hate, or, to use Heine's name, the feeling of "HassLiebe", similar to that which the great actress Rachel Lewin had had towards her origins.⁴ This feeling is revealed in the Princess's behaviour towards her child:⁵ she did all that she could to hide his origins from him, yet, ironically, chose for him the name Deronda, the name of "a branch of the family her father had lost sight of" - ironically, for it was this name that

-
1. The Atlantic Monthly, December 1876, p.691.
 2. Victorian Prose Masters, p.113.
 3. Jewish Chronicle, 15 December 1876, p.585.
 4. For Rachel Lewin, see Ch.2. pp. 47-49.
 5. Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum, pp. 48, 49.

put Kalonymos on his track.¹ (It may be noted that, in real life, the family of Charisi - of which George Eliot makes her a member - contained a succession of writers very conscious of continuing Jewish tradition.)²

Edward Dowden, in accordance with his stress upon "the religious conception" of the book, as "that of a life of mankind over, above, and around the life of the individual man and woman . . . , by which a man's life may become a noble self-surrender", identifies the Princess's fault as that "egoism" to which the artist is particularly susceptible:

As Don Silva, in The Spanish Gypsy, for the love of one maiden would fain renounce the inheritance of honour and duty which his past had imposed upon him, so the daughter of the Jew, Charisi would escape from the will of her father, the traditions of her race, the clinging arms of her babe, and would have a life of freedom in her art alone. That which she resisted proves - as it proved for Don Silva - too strong for her, and in her hour of physical weakness the impersonal forces she had fled from rise within her and rise around her, the dread Erinyes of her crime.³

Henry James emphasized the Princess's functional role, Møller and the Jewish Chronicle, her social role. The Princess is also a realised human being; shadowy she may remain, but not, I believe, "unvivified".⁴ Consider her first meeting with her son:

"You are a beautiful creature!" she said, in a low melodious voice, with syllables which had what might be called a foreign but agreeable outline. "I knew you would be." Then she kissed him on each cheek, and he returned her kisses. But it was something like a greeting between royalties.

She paused for a moment, while the lines were coming back into her face, and then said in a colder tone, "I am your mother. But you can have no love forme."

1. D.D., VII, ii, 42.

2. See Franz Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der Judischen Poësie, p.55.

3. Contemporary Review, 29 February 1877, pp. 365, 366.

4. The Atlantic Monthly, December 1876, p.691.

"I have thought of you more than of any other being in the world," said Deronda, his voice trembling nervously.

"I am not like what you thought I was," said the mother, decisively, withdrawing her hands from his shoulders and folding her arms as before, looking at him as if she invited him to observe her. He had often pictured her face in his imagination as one which had a likeness to his own: he saw some of the likeness now, but amidst more striking differences. She was a remarkable-looking being. What was it that gave her son a painful sense of aloofness? - Her worn beauty had a strangeness in it as if she were not quite a human mother, but a Melusina, who had ties with some world which is independent of ours.

Here even when meeting her long-lost son she is the grande artiste. The kiss on each of Deronda's cheeks is a theatrical gesture compared to "a greeting between royalties." She is observing her son as an actress observes her audience, and inviting his observation, in turn. She dominates her son as she once dominated her audience.¹

We are made to appreciate how stifling she had found her Orthodox Judaistic environment, and how intolerable, within it, the unwilling role of dutiful daughter. The theatre has given her a means of escape and of self-expression. Nonetheless she must now pay the price. Approaching old age has caused her to give up her career, and marry. Away from the theatre, older memories have returned to dominate and entrap her; and she confesses that despite her hatred for her heritage, without it life seems empty and purposeless. She does not willingly reveal her son's origins:

"I don't consent. We only consent to what we love. I obey something tyrannic" - she spread out her hands again - "I am forced to be withered, to feel pain, to be dying slowly.

1. D.D., VII, li, 18, 19.

Do I love that? Well, I have been forced to obey my dead father. I have been forced to tell you that you are¹ a Jew, and deliver to you what he commanded me to deliver."

She is sick and lonely and far away from the surroundings in which she was brought up. The forces of tradition, obligation, duty, and heredity have proved in the end too strong.²

The motto to the chapter in which Deronda meets her mother for a second time is taken from Antony and Cleopatra:

My desolation does begin to make
A better life.³

and relates the isolation of the Princess to that of George Eliot's other egoists, for instance Mrs. Transome, who at the close of her life "was desolate. . . . She . . . looked out into the dim night; but the black boundary of trees and the ^{long} line of the river seemed only part of the loneliness and monotony of her life."⁴ The possibility of hope, contained in the second line of the motto quotation from Chapter 53 of D.D., relates to Gwendolen. She too has acted as if the rest of the world did not require consideration and admits when writing to Deronda that "I only thought of myself, and I made you grieve."⁵ She was "for the first time being dislodged from her supremacy in her own world, and getting a sense that her horizon was but a dipping onward of an existence with which her own was revolving!"⁶ Gwendolen, a young girl with much of her life still ahead, has her

1. D.D., VII, li, 29.

2. The Princess and Gwendolen are prototypes of the "free woman" found in the work of Simone de Beauvoir, and Doris Lessing, in whose The Golden Notebook, Anna, the "free woman", confesses, "Why do our lot never admit failure? . . . we have to admit that the great dream has faded and the truth is something else." p.58.

3. Antony and Cleopatra, V, ii, 1, 2.

4. F.H., III, 1, 269.

5. D.D., VIII, lxx, 365.

6. D.D., VIII, lxxix, 354.

mother to comfort her; Mrs. Transome finds some consolation in Esther's "reverence and devout love";¹ but the Princess has no one. She admits to not being "a loving woman", confesses that she "might have been glad of" the enrichment of Daniel's company "now". Her other children are half-Jews, her husbands "have been subject to" her will but she confesses that:

I was happy - for a few years I was happy. If I had not been afraid of defeat and failure, I might have gone on. I miscalculated. What then? It is all over. Another life! Men talk of 'another life,' as if it only begun on the other side of the grave. I have long entered on another life.²

Deronda and she "shall hear no more of each other"³ and with a final kiss from Deronda she departs alone to return to provincial Russia far from her native Genoa and the Western European opera houses. She is aware that "it is God ... who is punishing me because I deceived my father and did not warn him that I should contradict his trust".⁴ The Princess is like Latimer in L.V., a character who has no hope. With him she is unique in George Eliot's novels, a character living on with no love or close companionship, punished for her individuality and breach of faith.

The Princess is a truly tragic figure, in terms of George Eliot's definition of tragedy as the "terrible difficulty of /the/ adjustment" of "our individual needs to the dire necessities of our lot". Alcharisi's situation "might be taken as a symbol of the part which is played in the general human lot by hereditary

1. F.H., III, 1, 270.

2. D.D., VII, liii, 95, 96. George Eliot's emphasis.

3. Ibid., 97.

4. Ibid., 88.

conditions in the largest sense, and of the fact that what we call duty is entirely made up of such conditions.". Tragedy lies in the "irreparable collision between the individual and the general.... It is the individual with whom we sympathise, and the general of which we recognise the irresistible power."¹ The Princess too late acknowledges this power and so must ~~die~~^{die} in tragic desolation.

Lapidoth

Lapidoth has received little critical attention. He does not find a place in Moller's ideological construct and is only mentioned in passing in Handley's account. When he has ~~xxx~~ claimed attention, however, critics have praised the realism of his creation. The Jewish Chronicle, for example, saw,

in Lapidoth a specimen of that reckless levity which, when it has once quitted the safe moorings of the ancestral faith, has wantonly severed all communal ties and all holy associations that might act as a break upon unbridled appetites, drifts and drifts until sucked down by the whirlpool of the most degrading passions;

and Barbara Hardy has pointed to the symbolic implications of one of these "most degrading passions".² She writes that in Lapidoth "the taste for gambling has turned into a disease. He acts as a grotesque example justifying Daniel's use of gambling as a symbol of egoism."³ The same critic has noted that Lapidoth is obviously an "imperfect" Jew "and a splendid creation he is."⁴ Oliver Elton sees Lapidoth as a "thieving old sponger ...,(Schnorrer is, I

-
1. "Notes on the Spanish Gypsy and Tragedy in General", J.W.Cross, III, 43,44.
 2. The Jewish Chronicle, 15 December, 1876, p.585.
 3. The Novels of George Eliot, p.133.
 4. Daniel Deronda, Penguin edition, p.15.

believe, the correct word)"¹.

Lapidoth is a sad figure, one typical of many Jews in the nineteenth and twentieth-century Western world, who with the development of large cities and improvements in communications has travelled widely in search of a fortune and security. He would do anything, including selling his own daughter, in order to get money, yet when he has it he squanders it. He is a neurotic unable to stay for long in one place.

His appearance in the novel serves as a reminder of the fate of the person without home and country, so restless that he cannot accept security even when it is offered. Mirah tells of his financial exploitation of her, and the chaos of his life, mistresses, quarrels, of his being the victim of anti-semitism and of his love-hate relationship with his religion. This relationship is reflected in his parody of religious rites, his attempt to prevent his daughter from gaining Jewish knowledge at one time and, at another, his finding lodging with an orthodox Jewess.² Mirah tells of his escape from his wife, the ups and downs of his fortunes, his chain-smoking and general lack of self-discipline. His appearance in the novel is appropriately heralded with a quotation from a Heine poem comparing luck to a frivolous whore.³

Lapidoth's face reflects an important element in his personality: "Once a handsome face, with bright colour, it was now sallow and deep-lined, and had that peculiar impress of impudent

-
1. A Survey of English Literature, 1830-1880, II, p.266.
 2. D.D., III, xx, 19,20.
 3. D.D., VIII, lxii, 224.

suavity which comes from courting favour while accepting disrespect!¹ A "shabby, foreign-looking, eager and gesticulating man,"² in final desperation he has returned to his daughter for comfort and hope. He displays conflicting emotions when asking about his son: "Stay a minute, Liebchen," said Lapidoth, speaking in lowered tone; "what sort of man has Ezra turned out?"³ The personal German-Yiddish form reflects his ability to engender emotion for persuasive purposes. "Liebchen", used to convey great personal affection between lovers or in a family situation between parents and children, evokes the obligations of the family life that he has run away from.

Lapidoth provides a counterpoint to the high ideas of his son concerning the destiny of the Jews. His life represents part of the reality of their life in exile and of those who were not idealists and for whom the struggle for survival has become too much.

The Cohen Family

Those critics who have been sympathetic to the Jewish elements of the novel have on the whole noted the realism and attention to detail in George Eliot's portrait of the Cohens. Thus John Blackwood upon receiving the manuscript of the novel wrote to George Eliot, "That Jew boy [Jacob Alexander Cohen] is a little marvel and in the midst of their substantial kindness Mordecai being helped to "the tails' of the whittings is irresistible."⁴

-
1. D.D., VIII, lxii, 226.
 2. Ibid., 229.
 3. Ibid., 232.
 4. L., VI, 195. 30 November 1875.

This is a reference to the account of the Friday evening dinner at the Cohens when "It was noticeable that the thin tails of the fried fish were given to Mordecai; and in general the sort of share assigned to a poor relation" and George Eliot humorously observes that this is "no doubt a 'survival' of pre-historic practice not yet generally admitted to be superstitious."¹ Handley writes that the younger Cohens, although typical Jewish children, are independently delineated in personality, "Jacob especially" providing a fine example of George Eliot's "thorough understanding of a child's mind, and of her ability to indicate inherited traits and their direction in childhood." Thus "Jacob has his father's eye for profit without the adult and obsequious deference which accompanies it." He also points to a conflict in the Cohens' loyalties to their Judaism and to England. In order to demonstrate their loyalty to the country of their birth the parents call their children, "Adelaide", "Alexander", and "Eugenie Esther" in deference to the royal family.² George Eliot in fact specifically tells her readers that "the Jew is proud of his loyalty" and that in front of Deronda the family discussed "subjects always in taste" such as "the Queen and the Royal Family, the Emperor and Empress of the French" and "both grandmother and wife entered" into the conversation with "zest."³ The grandmother informs Deronda of the details of the visit of the French Emperor and Empress ten years previously,⁴ and draws personal analogies between her own family and the royal family.

1. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 357.

2. A Critical Study of Daniel Deronda, pp. 31, 27. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 352, 358. George Eliot's emphasis.

3. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 357, 358.

4. The visit took place from 16 to 21 April 1855. This helps in dating the action of the book.

Interesting points about the Cohen family are to be found in Möller's account. For Möller, Ezra Cohen is a typical businessman from an urban Jewish area who is continually thinking about his earnings and less and less about living as a Jew, although the close relationship between family members reflect Jewish traditions. Cohen has admitted the consumptive Mordecai not merely out of deference to traditional Jewish teachings to harbour the scholar and the poor. Mordecai is useful, he mends clocks and instructs the young son Jacob, as well as being, as a poor scholar, according to the Talmud, a bringer of blessings into the house. Deronda's visit to the Cohens coincides with a Friday evening and Möller notes that there is a holy atmosphere pervading the visit. Cohen comes from the synagogue, blesses the children and says his prayers.¹ During the meal, the solemnity vanishes and through the turn of conversation the working day appears. Cohen strikes a bargain with Deronda and pays him the required money. Perhaps, Möller comments, George Eliot intended Cohen, the businessman, to profane the Sabbath to show that Judaism can only be recognized in such surroundings by inherited external forms and ceremonies as are shown us in the chapter.² Mordecai at first prevented Cohen from performing the financial transaction, which can only be completed when the former has left the room. There is here a contrast between religious and materialistic values.

A contemporary review of D.D. in The Saturday Review, states that "The Jew pawn-broker and his family" are "a study, the reader

1. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 354. Also the family are dressed in their best clothes.

2. Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum, pp. 47, 48.

suspects, made with a purpose, and not from the simple early instinct of observation".¹ And there are, as is here suggested, dual aspects of the presentation of the Cohens, the general and the particular. Let me begin with the particular. The Cohens are not shown independently of either Mordecai or Daniel's presence and their conduct therefore must in some way be affected by the presence of one or the other of these characters. Their actions are shown with careful attention to revealing details, such as attitudes, speech-rhythms and accents. Young Jacob, for instance, is no respecter of persons, puts on a selling-performance before Deronda, and try to "shwop"² knives with him. The dominating impulse of father and son is to strike a bargain at the slightest opportunity, and even when discussing royalty, financial considerations are not far from the surface.

"Mother and me went to see the Emperor and Empress at the Cryshtal Palace," said Mr. Cohen. "I had a fine piece of work to take care of mother; she might have been squeezed flat - though she was pretty near as lusty then as she is now. I said as if I had a hundred mothers I'd never take one of t'em to see the Emperor and Empress at the Cryshtal Palace again; and you may think a man can't afford it when he's got but one mother - not if he'd ever so big an insurance on her." He stroked his mother's shoulder affectionately, and chuckled a little at his own humour.³

The language, "a fine piece of work", "squeezed flat", "I'd", "t'em", is unmistakably that of the East London Jew and Cockney, reinforced at the beginning of Deronda's meeting with shouts of "Addy!"⁴ However, some of the Cohen's language is Yiddish derived from the

-
1. The Saturday Review, 16 September, 1876. pp. 357.
 2. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 347.
 3. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 358, 359. B.M. Add. MS. 34040, f. 261.
 4. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 341.

German and contained in words such as "Shool"¹ for synagogue Hebrew Classes. Phrases such as "Schlav'm Shabbes fyock on;"² and "yore-zeit"³, with their half English half Yiddish ring, have an authentic air with modern counterparts in Wesker's drama and the every-day speech of London Jews. This still has the foreign Germanic incursion contained in the 'h' of Cohens' "Cryshtal" and Jacob's "we'll shwop."⁴

The functional purpose of the two main appearances of the Cohens is conveyed in the motto-headings of the respective chapters. Deronda's initial encounter, in which he is regarded as just another customer, is prefaced by a Midrashic quotation which stresses the compulsive force of the laws of supply, and demand their being checked by "sentiment".⁵ The motto at the beginning of the next chapter defines this "sentiment" in terms of the bonds of love, family and religion. The source is Heine and tells of the state of the ordinary Jew in exile who strives to make a living. "He is called Israel" and "A witches' spell has transformed him into a dog. But every Friday evening, in the twilight hour, the dog retreats and becomes again a human being."⁶ In the chapter Cohen surrounded by his family enacts the Sabbath ritual.

Humour is the dominant mode of George Eliot's presentation of the Cohens. It is at work in the description of their final appearance in the novel, where the Meyricks, similar characters in

-
1. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 346. 'School' in German means educational establishment.
 2. Ibid., 348. The 'h' of Cryshtal is dropped in the printed edition, as is the 't' of "t'em". B.M. Add. MS. 34040, f.261.
 3. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 359.
 4. Ibid., 358, and D.D., IV, xxxiii, 347.
 5. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 324.
 6. D.D., IV, xxxiv, 351.

the sense of representing such qualities as those of close-knit family life, ordinariness, and good-humoured tolerance of others, attend a dinner and,

were rewarded for conquering their prejudices by hearing a speech from Mr. Cohen, which had the rare quality among speeches of not being quite after the usual pattern. Jacob ate beyond his years; and contributed several small whimpering laughs as a free accompaniment of his father's speech, not irreverently, but from a lively sense that his family was distinguishing itself; while Adelaide Rebekah, in a new Sabbath frock, maintained throughout a grave air of responsibility.

The humour is that of situation and attention to detail, which pinpoints individual peculiarity and personality.

Cohen to Deronda is "the most unpoetic Jew he had ever met with in books or life: his phraseology was as little as possible like that of the Old Testament".² He and his family are representatives of daily life which continues in spite of, and at times in defiance of, ideological considerations. It has to go on in the sheer economic sense that if it does not, the Jewish nation will starve and thus disappear, and the Cohens' very ordinariness ensures a kind of cultural continuation. Not all Jews are like Mordecai, and the Cohens undercut his rhetorical role by bringing him down to the earth of contemporary Jewish existence. This is clearly shown in the juxtaposition of Mordecai with Jacob, whose energy provides a counterpart to the former's seriousness and places his views in perspective. Mordecai has a high regard for the Cohens and recognizes in them the "kinship of Israel."³

1. D.D., VIII, lxx, 364.

2. D.D., IV, xxxiii, 346.

3. D.D., VI, xlvi, 315. Cf. Kaufmann, George Eliot and Judaism, p. 77.

Kalonymos

Even George Eliot's printers seem to have paid insufficient attention to Kalonymos. George Eliot wrote to John Blackwood that in the proofs his name appears as "Kalongmos", thus "The printers have sadly spoiled the beautiful Greek name Kalonymos, which was the name of a celebrated family of scholarly Jews transplanted from Italy into Germany in mediaeval times."¹ In this observation are to be found two main areas of interest, Kalonymos's historical significance, and a further confirmation of George Eliot's attention to detail when dealing with the Jewish aspects of her novel.

The name 'Kalonymos' reinforces Mordecai's sense of inheriting the soul of distinguished mediæval poets and Deronda's actual lineage. The Kalonymos's were a distinguished family of poets and scholars some of whom moved to Mainz in the twelfth-century from Lucca in Italy at the request of Karl the Great, who, as Kalonymos tells Deronda, "fetched my ancestors from Italy to bring some tincture of knowledge to our rough German brethren."² For Möller, Kalonymos is representative of the type of Jew who travels in the Diaspora from one country to another and carries Judaism in his heart. Jewish dogma and love for his Jewish origins are the most important things for him. Hence the action of the artiste Alcharisi seems to him treachery, and an escape from fate, and he is very pleased when his friend's grandchild, Deronda, eventually finds his way back to Judaism.³

1. L., VI, 242. 18 April 1876.

2. D.D., VIII, lx, 200.

3. Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum, pp. 49, 50.

We meet Kalonymos through the Princess's reaction to him. He is the representative of "the world of" her "childhood" who insists on holding her to the promise that her "father had charged" her and her "husband to deliver" to her "eldest son"¹, a chest containing the family papers and treasures, in order to continue the ancestral line and heritage. At the end of the novel *Mordecai*, and, ironically, *Lapidoth*, decipher the ancient Kalonymos manuscripts. With *Deronda* we visit him at his bank in Mainz and he relates his attitude to Jewish life, informs the reader and *Deronda* about his old friend, Daniel Charisi, Daniel's father, and helps *Deronda* to clarify his attitude toward Judaism.

The banker, although his children dwell in Mainz, "in wealth and unity", maintains a strict orthodoxy of vision and considers himself to be "a wanderer". In spite of this indication of an underlying insecurity, he considers the Jewish lot in Mainz to be one of long-term security and permanence, "The days are changed for us in Mainz", he confidently tells *Deronda*, "since our people were slaughtered wholesale if they wouldn't be baptised wholesale".² He and his friend Daniel "were both faithful Jews, thankful not to be Gentiles." Unlike Charisi, Kalonymos admits to not having great vision or insight: "Charisi thought continually of our people's future: he went with all his soul into that part of our religion: I, not. So we have freedom, I am content."³ Kaufmann notes, "What an insight into land and people these bitter words

-
1. D.D., VII, li, 41.
 2. D.D., VIII, lx, 199, 2001
 3. Ibid., 202.

reveal which the authress puts in the mouth of that splendid figure Joseph Kalonymos", and he quotes Kalonymos's "We increase our wealth in safety, and the learning of all Germany is fed and fattened by Jewish brains - though they keep not always their Jewish hearts."¹ And Kaufmann comments at the end of the quotation, with words that now have a tragic note: "Who can deny this?"²

Kalonymos tells Daniel that his father, although a doctor, "mingled all sorts of learning; and in that he was like our Arabic writers in the golden time." Charisi had a lot of Mordecai's ideas in him: "What he used to insist on was that the strength and wealth of mankind depended on the balance of separateness and communication, and he was bitterly against our people losing themselves among the Gentiles". Further, Kalonymos relates, Charisi "poured himself out" to him, and he tells Deronda, "Young man, when I am in the East, I lie much on deck and watch the greater stars. The sight of them satisfies me. I know them as they rise, and hunger not to know more. Charisi was satisfied with no sight, but pieced it out with what had been before and what would come after."

The relationship of Kalonymos with Charisi is a personal illustration of Mordecai's general points concerning the individual Jew's attitude to his religion and past - that of love and duty. Kalonymos says of his friendship with Charisi, "we loved each other, and as he said, we bound our love with duty; we solemnly pledged ourselves to help and defend each other to the last." In meeting

1. D.D., VIII, lx, 200.

2. George Eliot and Judaism, p. 78.

Deronda and returning the family chest he has "fulfilled"¹ his pledge. Hence Kalonymos acts as a stern father toward Deronda, admonishes him for being idle and elicits from him a clear acknowledgement of his duty. Deronda tells Joseph Kalonymos that "I will not say that I shall profess to believe exactly as my fathers have believed. Our fathers themselves changed the horizon of their belief and learned of other races. But I think I can maintain my grandfather's notion of separateness with communication."² His Judaism will be liberating rather than sterile, maintaining its essentials, yet part of the world.

Klesmer

G.S.Haight writing on Klesmer has well summed up critical reactions to him and his function in the novel.

Though only a secondary character, he performs several important functions in the novel. Like Daniel he acts as mentor to both Gwendolen and Mirah, his opinions of their singing placing them in a strong contrast maintained throughout the story. His brutal dismissal of Gwendolen's dream of earning her living as a singer or actress marks the beginning of her painful effort to face reality, and provides an eloquent statement of the artist's proper place in society. Finally, in Klesmer's marriage love and mutual interests overcome the same obstacle that confronted Gwendolen in hers - disparity of wealth and social position - a happy note too often forgotten by the critics who insist on seeing Daniel Deronda as a melancholy book.

And he notes that the "Polite indifference to music constitutes part of the criticism of English philistinism for which D.D. is notable".³

Little attention has been paid to Klesmer by Jewish critics. This may be due to the fact that in his marriage to Catherine Arrowpoint,

1. D.D., VIII, lx, 202, 203.

2. Ibid., 204.

3. "George Eliot's Klesmer", Imagined Worlds, pp. 205, 207.

Klesmer seems to overcome racial objections. Klesmer is described as a mixture, "a felicitous combination of the German, the Slave, and the Semite, with grand features, brown hair floating in artistic fashion, and brown eyes in spectacles."¹ He appears to care little about his origins, for in the universe of music distinctions between Jew and Gentile are insignificant. Moller only gives him a passing reference, aware no doubt that the ideal of the racial harmony and peace of the world of music were but a dream in the Nazi environment in which he wrote. However, U.C.Knoepflmacher argues that George Eliot uses Klesmer's Jewish origins for the purpose of illuminating Arnold's dichotomy between Hebraism and Hellenism. "Meyrick's 'Hellenic' aestheticism is employed to exalt Klesmer's more 'Hebraic' type of culture, but it is also employed to question the validity of any creed based on the self-sufficiency of the artist." According to Knoepflmacher George Eliot warns her reader that England's lack of "spiritual vitality" can be restored only "by an essential religious form of 'culture', a spiritual force which must have both a national location, as well as an international authority."²

It has not been clear to all critics that Klesmer is a Jew. He is regarded by Mr. Bult as "being a Pole, or a Czech, or something of that fermenting sort, in a state of political refugeemism which had obliged him to make a profession of his music;"³ and

-
1. D.D., I, v, 78.
 2. Religious Humanism and the Victorian Novel, p.132.
 3. D.D., III, xxii, 72.

I. Milner has argued that Klesmer belonged to one of the groups of Central European refugees, mostly intellectuals, who found their home in England, after the abortive 1848 revolutions and subsequent turmoil.¹ Gardner notes that "Herr Julius Klesmer is the Jewish musical genius" but adds that "Not a word does he betray of his real origin. He passes always as the German musician in English Society."²

G.S. Haight has investigated Klesmer's origins and George Eliot's source material. On internal as well as external grounds he firmly dismisses suggestions that the origin of Klesmer was Franz Liszt, and concludes that Klesmer was based upon the Russian-Jewish pianist and composer Anton Rubinstein whom George Eliot and George Henry Lewes met at Weimar and whom they again met in May 1876. And George Henry Lewes wrote to Mrs. Frederick Lehmann, "We shall so like to renew ~~our~~ acquaintance with Klesmer, whom we met at Weimar in 1854!"³

Rabbi David Kaufmann when writing that Klesmer "is unmistakably a Jew, but he never betrays himself although the unfortunate name Julius Klesmer is enough for the initiated,"⁴ indicates the musician's origin. Rabbi S.A. Hirsch, in an article ignored by Professor Haight, discusses the meaning of "Klesmer". He points out that the name is Polish-Yiddish for "musician," and has the more definite meaning of "itinerant musician" or wandering Jewish musician. He quotes an article which discusses the "Klesmer's" function and

-
1. Philologica Pragensia, VII, 1964, pp. 353-358, and see "Writing in Bohemia," T.L.S., 18 June 1964, p. 538.
 2. The Inner Life of George Eliot, p. 257.
 3. "George Eliot's Klesmer", p. 214.
 4. ~~S.A.H.~~ George Eliot and Judaism, p. 78.

origins:

The 'musical instruments', Kle-Semorim, are a portion of Jewish poetical life. They wander about with the fiddle from years' beginning to years' end, knocking at the doors of their brethren, and give him a word in music - his holy tunes. Oh, that holy Jewish music! ... it reminds one of Zion, of Greece, of Rome, of Spain, of Provence, of Italy, of Poland, and of many, many times - that music contains something of everything, but transcribed into Jewish tunes; at the same time weeping and laughing, exulting and moaning

Rabbi Hirsch comments that this is from an anonymous article "but I have every reason to believe that it issued from the pen of Emanuel Deutsch." And it is probable that Deutsch told George Eliot of the Yiddish meaning. Hirsch indicates other functions of the Klesmers, to assist at weddings, to direct what pieces are to be performed. "He is par-excellence the provider of jokes", but he has also to "officiate as preacher," thus his role is a "combination of the functions of jester and preacher."¹

Thus the character Klesmer's reply to Bult's "From what you said about sentiment, I fancy you are a Panslavist," is to be taken at face-value:

"No, my name is Elijah. I am the Wandering Jew," said Klesmer, flashing a smile at Miss Arrowpoint, and suddenly making a mysterious wind - like rush backwards and forwards on the piano.

He is "the Wandering Jew," a Klesmer who traditionally wanders from community to community. Unlike "Elijah",² for whom a cup and food is prepared yet he does not come, the Klesmer arrives. The Klesmers' travels throughout Europe to dispersed Jewry find their counterpoint in Klesmer's rushing up and down the piano scales. It is noticeable

1. S.A.Hirsch, "Some Literary Trifles," A Book of Essays, pp. 266-269.

2. D.D., III, xxii, 72.

that Klesmer when confronted with insularity and conservatism emphasizes his foreign and consequently Jewish origins. At the Braackenshaw Archery Meeting, his mood is jovial, as befits a Klesmer at a festive ceremony, but his clothing singularly marks him out. George Eliot observes that "it must be admitted that" the English "prevailing expression is not that of a lively, impassioned race, preoccupied with the ideal and carrying the real as a mere make-weight." She adds that "The strong point of the English gentleman pure is the easy style of his figure and clothing; he objects to marked ins and outs in his costume, and he also objects to looking inspired." The function of the Klesmer was to be both eccentric and "inspired."¹

One of the Klesmer's tasks was to give a sermon and appropriately George Eliot's Klesmer delivers a magnificent sermon to Gwendolen, one which critics have frequently commented on. However, as I have noted, Mirah knows what to expect in the way of criticism from Klesmer, and thus responds to him much more warmly than Gwendolen. The rapport between the two is not only musical but intuitive, a product of a common heritage. Klesmer not only recognizes "old Leo's music" but the sentiment underlying "Leopardi's grand Ode to Italy".² The Ode deals with the loss of nationhood and glory, and celebrates those who suffered martyrdom for their country and faith. At Lady Mallinger's musical party Klesmer's praise of Mirah's singing is significantly "audible" only to Mirah.³

-
1. D.D., I, x, 181.
 2. D.D., V, xxxix, 155, 154.
 3. D.D., VI, xlv, 292.

The one way in which Klesmer does not fulfil his traditional role, is that he does not perform at Mirah's and Daniel's wedding. Klesmer, the idealist, "looks forward to a fusion of races."¹ With his characteristic irony he "sent a perfect watch, ... with a pretty inscription"² to the Derondas as a wedding present. Possibly the watch is a symbol heralding racial fusion, or before the Derondas' journey to the East, a symbol of the "O patria mia, vedo le mura e gli archi".³

Conclusion.

It is clear that the Jewish characters are linked together within an associative framework. Music is one of these links. Lapidoth, Alcharisi, Mirah, Klesmer, Deronda, Mordecai are all musicians and with the exception of Lapidoth and Klesmer, sing. Further they are wandering, rootless people. What they sing reflects their state. Deronda's song from Rossini's adaptation of Dante's words to his opera based upon Shakespeare's drama dealing with racial conflict, Otello, anticipates his finding and rescue of Mirah. Later additional words in Mirah's performance of "O patria mia," arouses great "passion" in him.⁴ However the words of Deronda's first song are significant,

This is true the poet sings,
That a sorrow's crown of sorrow
Is remembering happier things. 5

-
1. D.D., III, xxii, 73.
 2. D.D., VIII, lxx, 365.
 3. D.D., V, xxxix, 154.
 4. D.D., VI, xlv, 292.
 5. D.D., II, xvii, 336.

In these lines the personal and the tragic are enumerated. Mirah's life like Israel's is in ruins. Israel once saw great days. At the end of the novel, Mirah and Deronda, in deference to Mordecai's wishes set off, in an attempt to restore a lost greatness to Israel.

All the Jews in the novel, with the exception of the Cohen family and Daniel, are wanderers and with, the additional exception of Kalonymos, they are orphans. The Cohens provide the example of rich family life which is counterpointed in the Gentile framework by the Meyricks and Gascoignes. All the Jewish Characters are individuals, with strongly marked characteristics, and ~~would~~ could not be described as nonentities. They have either strong wills and force of character or need guidance. Situation and words are echoed in subsequent scenes and relationships in the novel. The relationships of Kalonymos and Charisi, Daniel and Mordecai, counterbalance each other. Charisi, Daniel's father, is Kalonymos's inspiration - Kalonymos possessing inherited wealth. Daniel, who has come into wealth, is similarly inspired by Mordecai whose words echo Charisi's to Kalonymos.¹

Each character provides a comment upon Jewish patterns of life and the individual reactions of Jews to their situation. George Eliot's characters convey a representative set of responses by individuals to being members of a minority racial group. On the one hand, there is the attempt to forget Judaism and to assimilate into Western European society; the Princess, Klesmer and Lapidoth represent this response. On the other hand there are the Jews such

1. Cf. D.D., VIII, lx, 197, and D.D., VI, xlvi, 317.

as Mirah, Kalonymos and Mordecai who remain true to their faith, and in Mordecai's case actively propagate Jewish nationalism. In the middle of these extremes are ordinary people such as the Cohens whose task is to survive. Daniel Deronda bridges all these responses. He rejects the assimilationist opportunity offered him and finds his self-presentation in becoming an authentic Jew.

Stuart Phelps, "If it were not that Mr. Jew's health is threatened in a peculiar way by any such performance of the heart's office as might come from a sea-voyage", the novel is to be called, "The Jew of the Future," and "It is this that renders the Jew carrying out by longing to go to the East". The possibility of an anti-Jewish George Eliot from noting that "There is a great movement now among the Jews towards colonising Palestine, and utilizing the resources of the soil." On the front cover of one volume of Oriental sermons, probably written during the summer of 1874, the writer newspaper articles relating to Palestine Colonization and a "most interesting detail... respecting the distribution of the Jews all over the world." On holiday in the Black Forest in July 1874 George Eliot noted in his diary that "Dolly says to give the Jews in Hebrew - turning our old Spanish age." According to the newspaper after the 1874 Jews before the Jews, George Eliot noted that...

During the summer of 1874, in the last volume of Daniel Deronda, George Eliot wrote a chapter and an epilogue, which she had written in a letter to George Eliot in 1874 and the last...

1. George Eliot, Journal, 1874, p. 100.
2. George Eliot, Journal, 1874, p. 100.
3. George Eliot, Journal, 1874, p. 100.
4. George Eliot, Journal, 1874, p. 100.
5. George Eliot, Journal, 1874, p. 100.

CHAPTER 8.

CONCLUSION.

George Eliot's interest in the Jews did not stop with the completion of D.D. On 16 December 1876 she wrote to Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, "if it were not that Mr. Lewes's health is threatened in a peculiar way by any such perturbation of the heart's action as might come from a sea-voyage", she would go to America, the "land of the Future," and "It is this that hinders me from carrying out my longing to go to the East".¹ The inability to go did not prevent George Eliot from noting that "There is a great movement now among the Jews towards colonising Palestine, and bringing out the resources of the soil."² On the front cover of her notebook of Oriental memoranda, probably written during the summer of 1878, she pasted newspaper cuttings relating to "Palestine Colonization" and noted "interesting details... respecting the distribution of the Jews all over the world."³ On holiday in the Black Forest in July 1876 George Henry Lewes noted in his diary that "Polly began to give me lessons in Hebrew - reviving our old Spanish days."⁴ According to her biographer Haight just before she died, George Eliot "studied Hebrew."⁵

During the late summer of 1879, in the last month of George Henry Lewes's life, George Eliot wrote a defence and an explanation of D.D. Anti-semitic rioters in German cities in 1819 used the blood

-
1. L., VI, 319.
 2. L., VII, 109. George Eliot to John Blackwood, 25 February 1879.
 3. Pforzheimer, MS. 429.
 4. George Henry Lewes D., 12 July 1876. L., VI, 247-275.
 5. Biography, p.529.

cry "Hep! Hep! Hep!" and George Eliot's work was called "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" The essay began with an examination of the underlying structure of English education, culture and civilization. The great classical histories and traditions of Greece and Rome were "the glorious commonplaces of historic teaching at our public schools and universities"; and it was generally accepted that the restoration of independence to these two countries had been due to "the preservation of national memories" as "a means of national greatness".¹ She then reminded her readers that, "Half a century ago, what was Italy?.... What were the Italians?" They had been despised and laughed at, yet, even so, "the divine gift of a memory which inspires the moments with a past, a present, and a future, and gives the sense of corporate existence that raises man above the otherwise more respectable and innocent brute," had now changed "all that".²

Throughout "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!", George Eliot used arguments founded upon her belief in the existence of a collective racial memory. She examined English history and observed that, "The men who planted our nation were not Christiansnobody has reproached us because our fathers thirteen hundred years ago worshipped Odin, massacred Britons"³. Furthermore, "We do not call ourselves a dispersed and ~~an~~ a punished people: we are a colonising people, and it is we who have punished others", this being exemplified in the extermination of Red Indians and the persecution of Hindus. And George

1. "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!", p. 260.

2. Ibid., pp. 261-262.

3. Ibid., p.263.

Eliot wrote that "The eminence, the nobleness of a people, depends on its capability of being stirred by memories, and of striving for what we call spiritual ends" which "consist not in immediate material possession, but in the satisfaction of a great feeling that animates the collective body as with one soul."¹

In England, the Puritans, by "asserting their liberty to restrain tyrants, found the Hebrew history closely symbolic of their feelings and purpose". The Puritans had "a sense of their supreme moral value"², and in this the Hebrews had been their model. Although, in her Westminster Review article on John Mackay's The Progress of Intellect, and in her comments upon Tancred, George Eliot had scorned Hebrew assumptions about their own ethical superiority, nonetheless, in "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!", she acknowledged the value of Hebrew ethics and actions "I share the spirit of the Zealots", that spirit which had inspired their "resistance to the death against the submergence of their nationality."³ This was a great advance upon her earlier views; and she re-states in this article some of Mordecai's ideas about nationality:

An individual man, to be harmoniously great, must belong to a nation of this order,⁴ if not in actual existence yet existing in the past, in memory, as a departed, invisible, beloved ideal, once a reality, and perhaps to be restored. A common humanity is not yet enough to feed the rich blood of various activity which makes a complete man. The time is not come for cosmopolitanism to be highly virtuous, any more than for communism to suffice for social energy.⁵

-
1. "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" pp. 264-265.
 2. Ibid., pp. 270-271.
 3. Ibid., pp. 269.
 4. i.e. of the Zealots.
 5. "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" p. 265.

George Eliot took "the spectacle of the Jewish people defying the Roman edict, and preferring death by starvation or the sword to the introduction of Caligula's deified statue into the temple, as a sublime type of steadfastness."¹

There are two solutions for the Jew in the face of Jewish suffering proposed in "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!". Either he can assimilate to the society in which he lives: (and the limitations of the assimilationist view are ~~as~~ presented fictionally in D.D. by Alcharisi, Klesmer, and the old Lapidoth, and in F.H. by Barach Nolan), or he can retain "a distinctive consciousness" as a Jew, nourishing a "feeling of separateness." This feeling will call "for the restoration of a Jewish state planted on the old ground as a centre of national feeling, a source of dignifying protection".² She considered that "Every Jew should be conscious that he is one of a multitude possessing common objects of piety in the immortal achievements and immortal sorrows of ancestors".³

For Daniel, England is desolate and offers no such possibilities. Some of England's less attractive features at that time are embodied in Grandcourt, whose attitudes are those of the exterminating, brutal colonialist. During a conversation between Grandcourt and Deronda about the Eyre incident of October 1865, in which many negroes were slaughtered, George Eliot tells her readers that "Grandcourt held that the Jamaican negro was a beastly sort of baptist Caliban".⁴

1. "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" p.270.

2. Ibid., pp. 289-290.

3. Ibid., p. 292.

4. D.D., IV, xxxix, 232.

Grandcourt has "a will like that of a crab or a boa - constrictor which goes on pinching or crushing without alarm or thunder"¹, and his power is exerted by means of an "empire of fear."² Gwendolen, who married him primarily for materialistic considerations, seems to have acquired the status of a colonial native: "That white hand of his which was touching his whisker was capable, she fancied, of clinging round her neck and threatening to throttle her".³ At the conclusion of the novel she is left alone spiritually and physically, although her consciousness has become slightly extended in the direction of a recognition of the lot of others. Daniel, on the other hand, has moved from the assimilationist situation imposed upon him by his mother to the role of an 'authentic Jew'. Mordecai and Mirah throughout the novel exemplified ^{the} value of the "living force of sentiment in common which makes a national consciousness."⁴

One of George Eliot's principal purposes in D.D. was to teach her reading-public about a despised group, the Jews. In so doing she widened the scope of the English novel, in Daiches's words, "reaching out ... to something more profound and universal than any novel based on the merely English social scene could achieve."⁵ Such a novel has been described by Doris Lessing as one "powered with an intellectual or moral passion strong enough to create order, to create a new way of looking at life."⁶

George Eliot set out to educate Jews as well as Gentiles.

1. D.D., V, xxxv, 43.

2. Ibid., 45.

3. D.D., V, xxxv, 49.

4. "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" p. 265.

5. David Daiches, A Critical History of English Literature, II, 1071-1072.

6. Doris Lessing, The Golden Notebook, p.68.

Mordecai's ideology and verbal patterns have as their main sources, the works of Jewish historians, and of Jehuda Halevi, and also the Kabbalah. Halevi was known and accepted by Jewry as a poet and philosopher and at the core of his work there lay a universalistic conception, that Israel was both the weakest and the strongest of the animals and nations, was indeed the "heart of mankind"¹ and once Israel was strong the world would be strong. In her presentation of Jewish characters ~~in~~ in the novels preceding D.D., George Eliot used the Jews as a symbol of weakness yet she showed the Jews gaining moral strength from their laws and from their continuative traditions which they held on to in spite of intense persecution. As to the Kabbalah, Professor Gershom Scholem has written:

The great Jewish scholars of the past century whose conception of Jewish history is still dominant in our days, men like Graetz, Zunz, Geiger ... and Steinschneider, had little sympathy - to put it mildly - for the Kabbalah. At once strange and repellent, it epitomised every thing that was opposed to their own ideas and to the outlook which they hoped to make predominant in modern Judaism.²

The Kabbalist was a non-rationalist and obsessed by the evil of the world, which had found its chief expression in Jewish suffering in Exile. Exile and evil could only be overcome through a return to Israel, the homeland, and that return was seen as a mystical vision. The promise of the realization of ~~this~~ return was the final vision of D.D., and one which in George Eliot's own life time, and in the twentieth-century, was to move toward practical fruition. The stature of George Eliot's vision, and the dramatic power with which it is presented, made Daniel Deronda a great prophetic novel. Subsequent events have confirmed the value of its prophecy.

1. D.D., VI, xlii, 239.

2. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

In this bibliography I have limited myself to works referred to in this thesis. Unless otherwise stated, the place of publication of books or articles is London. This bibliography is divided in the following manner:

1. Manuscripts used.
2. (a). The Works of George Eliot.
(b). George Eliot's Periodical Essays and Reviews.
(c). The Letters of George Eliot.
3. Reviews, Articles, Books on George Eliot and her Work.
(a). Nineteenth-Century Reviews and Articles.
(b). Twentieth-Century Articles on George Eliot.
(c). Books on George Eliot.
4. (a). The Works of George Henry Lewes.
(b). Secondary Works on George Henry Lewes.
5. Jewish materials.
(a). History.
(b). Literature.
(c). Philosophy, Religion, Mysticism,
6. General Works.
7. Unpublished Materials Consulted.

- (a). George Eliot's Periodical Essays and Reviews.
1) The Periodical Essays. In the British Museum, MS. 10677. Folios 119-126.
2) The Inward Papers. In the British Museum, MS. 10677. Folio 52.

1) and (c) consulted on microfiche.

1. Manuscripts.¹

- (a). The Manuscript of Daniel Deronda is in the British Museum. It is described as follows: Brit.Mus.Add. Mss.,34039-34042.
- (b). The Carl H.Pforzheimer Library, New York, George Eliot Holograph notebooks:
- (1). Notebook 429, containing miscellaneous notes, quotations, largely from Hebrew, Arabic, Eastern, Welsh and Irish legend and history, 132 pages.
 - (2). Notebook 711, containing miscellaneous notes, contents include notes on "Jewish Festivals", "Present State of Jerusalem", "Colonization", "Abraham Geiger", and "on Cambridge", etc., 114 pages.
 - (3). Notebook containing Oriental Memoranda and excerpts from books, alphabetically arranged. Front cover contains pasted newspaper cuttings including the "Jewish population of the world", etc., 40 pages.
- (c). Yale University, George Eliot Collection.
- (1). George Eliot's translation of Spinoza's Ethics.
 - (2). George Eliot's Commonplace Book, 1868-69. Including notes on the Gypsies and the Jews.
 - (3). George Henry Lewes Journal, June 1866--May 1870.
George Henry Lewes Diary, 1869--1876.
- (d). (4). Manuscripts relating to E.O.M.Deutsch.
- i). The Panizzi Papers. In the British Museum,Add,Mss., 36717, folios 119--126.
 - ii). The Layard Papers. In the British Museum,Add.Mss., 38997, Folio 52.

1. Items (b). and (c). consulted on microfilm.

2. The Works and Letters of George Eliot.

(a). The Works of George Eliot.

These are given in chronological order and include only work referred to in this thesis.

The Life of Jesus, translated by Marian Evans from the German of D.F. Strauss, 3 Volumes, 1846.

The Essence of Christianity, by Ludwig Feuerbach, translated from the Second German Edition by Marian Evans, 1854.

The Lifted Veil, Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, volume LXXXV1, July #859 (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1859).

Romola, first published in The Cornhill Magazine, volumes V1--V111, July 1862--August 1863.

Felix Holt, the Radical, 3 volumes (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1866).

The Spanish Gypsy. A Poem (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1868).

Middlemarch, first published in eight Parts, December 1871--December 1872 (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London).

The Spanish Gypsy. A Poem, Fifth Edition (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1875).

Daniel Deronda, first published in eight Parts, February--September 1876 (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London).

The Spanish Gypsy. A Poem, Cabinet Edition (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1878).

The Impressions of Theophrastus Such (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1879).

Romola, edited by Guido Biagi, 2 volumes, 1907.

Daniel Deronda, introduction by F.R. Leavis (Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1961).

Daniel Deronda, edited with an introduction and notes by Barbara Hardy (The Penguin English Library, Penguin Books Harmondsworth, 1967).

(b). George Eliot's Periodical Essays and Reviews.

These are listed in the order in which they appeared.

"The Progress of the Intellect", Westminster Review, Volume LXV, January 1851, pp. 353-368.

"Westward Ho!", Leader, 19 May 1855, pp. 474-475.

"Liszt, Wagner, and Weimar", Fraser's Magazine, Volume LII, July 1855, pp. 48-62.

~~W~~estward Ho! and Constance Herbert ~~7~~ "Belles Lettres", Westminster Review, Volume LXV, July 1855, pp. 288-307.

"Heine's Poems", Leader, 1 September 1855, pp. 843-844.

"Evangelical Teaching: Dr. Cumming", Westminster Review, Volume LXV, October 1855, pp. 436-462.

"German Wit: Heinrich Heine", Westminster Review, Volume LXV, January 1856, pp. 1-33.

"Introduction to Genesis", Leader, 12 January 1856, pp. 41-42.

"Heine's Book of Songs", Saturday Review, 26 April 1856, pp. 523-524.

"The Natural History of German Life", Westminster Review, Volume LXVI, July 1856, pp. 51-79.

"Belles Lettres", Westminster Review, Volume LXVI, October 1856, pp. 566-582.

"The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! ", in Impressions of Theophrastus Such (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1879).

Essays of George Eliot, edited by Thomas Pinney, 1963.

(c). The Letters of George Eliot.

The George Eliot Letters, edited by Gordon S. Haight, in 7 volumes, vols. I--III, 1954. vols. IV--VII, 1956. (Oxford University and Yale University Press).

Autograph Letter, "M.E. Lewes Regents Park" n.d. ~~1868~~ to Emanuel Deutsch. Details in Sotheby's Catalogue, Lot 45, 12 November 1963.

3. Reviews, Articles, Books on George Eliot and her Work.

(a). Nineteenth-Century Reviews and Articles.

These are listed in alphabetical order.

The Atlantic Monthly, Volume XV111, October 1866, pp.479-492. "The Novels of George Eliot" by Henry James, Jr.

The Atlantic Monthly, VolumeXXXV111, December 1876, pp.684-694.

"Daniel Deronda: A Conversation" by Henry James, Jr.

The Contemporary Review, Volume XX1X, February 1877, pp.348-369.

"Middlemarch and Daniel Deronda" by Edward Dowden.

Jewish Chronicle, 15 December 1876, p.585, "Daniel Deronda".

Macmillan's Magazine, Volume XXXV1, June 1877, pp.101-111.

"Mordecai: A Protest Against the Critics" by Joseph Jacobs.

The Nineteenth Century, VolumeXV11, March1885, pp.464-485. "George Eliot's Life" by Lord Acton.

The North American Review, VolumeCV11, October 1868, pp.620-635.

"The Spanish Gypsy" by Henry James, Jr.

The Saturday Review, 16 September 1876, pp.356-358. "Daniel Deronda",

The Spectator, 18 July 1863, pp.2265-2267. "Romola" by Richard Holt Hutton.

The Spectator, 9 September 1876, pp.1131-1133. "Daniel Deronda" by Richard Holt Hutton.

The Tablet, 4 November 1876, p.587. ["Daniel Deronda"].

(b). Twentieth-Century Articles on George Eliot.

These are arranged in alphabetical order under author's name.

Abrahams, Israel, "George Eliot and Salomon Maimon", in The Book of Delight and Other Papers, Philadelphia, 1912, pp.242-246.

Beaty, Jerome, "History by Indirection: The Era of Reform in Middlemarch", Victorian Studies, Volume1, December1957, pp.173-179.

Beaty, Jerome, "Daniel Deronda and the Question of Unity in Fiction", Victorian Newsletter, number15, Spring1959, pp.16-19.

- Beebe, Maurice, "Visions are Creators: The Unity of Daniel Deronda", Boston University Studies in English, Volume 1, 1955, pp. 166-177.
- Carroll, D.R., "The Unity of Daniel Deronda", Essays in Criticism, Volume 1X, 1959, pp. 369-380.
- Haight, Gordon, S., "George Eliot's Klesmer", in Imagined Worlds: Essays on some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt, edited by Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor, 1964, pp. 205-214.
- Harvey, W.J., "The Intellectual Background of the Novel Casaubon and Lydgate", in Middlemarch: Critical Approaches to the Novel, edited by Barbara Hardy, 1967, pp. 25-37.
- Hill, Donald, L., "Pater's Debt to Romola", Nineteenth Century Fiction, Volume XX11, March 1968, pp. 361-377.
- Hirsch, Samson, A., "Some Literary Trifles", in A Book of Essays, /1902/ pp. 264-273.
- Hulme, Hilda, M., "The Language of the Novel Imagery", in Middlemarch: Critical Approaches to the Novel, edited by Barbara Hardy, 1967, pp. 87-124.
- Leavis, Frank Raymond, "George Eliot's Zionist Novel", Commentary, Volume XXX, October 1960, pp. 317-325.
- Levine, George, "Determinism and Responsibility in the Works of George Eliot", Publications of the Modern Language Association, Volume LXXV11, June 1962, pp. 268-279.
- Milner, Ian, "Herr Klesmer, George Eliot's Portrait of the Artist", Philologica Pragensia, Volume V11, 1964, pp. 353-358.
- Milner, Ian, "Writing in Bohemia", Times Literary Supplement, 18 June 1964 p. 538.
- Oldfield, Derek, "The Language of the Novel The Character of Dorothea" in Middlemarch: Critical Approaches to the Novel, edited by Barbara Hardy, 1967, pp. 63-86.

Preyer, Robert, "Beyond the Liberal Imagination: Vision and Reality in Daniel Deronda", Victorian Studies, Volume 1V, September 1960, pp. 33-54.

Robinson, Carole, "Romola: A Reading of the Novel", Victorian Studies, Volume V1, September 1962, pp. 29-42.

Rubinstein, Elliot, L., "A Forgotten Tale by George Eliot", Nineteenth Century Fiction, Volume XV11, September 1962, pp. 175-183.

(c) Books on George Eliot.

These are arranged in alphabetical order under author's name.

Blind [Cohen] Mathilde, George Eliot, 1883.

Bourl'honne, P., George Eliot: essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854, Paris 1933.

Browning, Oscar, Life of George Eliot, 1890.

Cooke, George Willis, George Eliot: A Critical Study of her Life, Writings and Philosophy, 1883.

Cross, John Walter, George Eliot's Life as Related in her Letters and Journals, 3 volumes (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1885).

Cross, John Walter, George Eliot's Life as Related in her Letters and Journals, New Edition (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, [1887]).

Gardner, Charles, The Inner Life of George Eliot, 1912.

Haight, Gordon, S., George Eliot: A Biography, Oxford, 1968.

Hardy, Barbara, The Novels of George Eliot: A Study in Form, 1963.

Harvey, W. J., The Art of George Eliot, 1961.

Kaufmann, David, George Eliot and Judaism: An Attempt to Appreciate 'Daniel Deronda'; translated from the German by J.W. Ferrier (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1877).

Knoepflmacher, U.C., Religious Humanism and the Victorian Novel: George Eliot, Walter Pater, and Samuel Butler, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.

Leavis, Frank Raymond, The Great Tradition: George Eliot: Henry James: Joseph Conrad, 1948.

Mudge, I. Q., Sears, M. E., A George Eliot Dictionary, 1924.

Paris, Bernard, J., Experiments in Life: George Eliot's Quest for Values, Detroit, 1965.

Pfeiffer, Sibilla, George Eliots Beziehungen zu Deutschland, in Anglistische Forschungen, Band LX, Heidelberg, 1925.

Solomon, Henry, Daniel Deronda from a Jewish Point of View, 1877.

Stephen, Leslie, George Eliot, 1902.

Toyodo, Minoru, Studies in the Mental Development of George Eliot, Tokyo, 1931.

4.(a). The Works of George Henry Lewes.

These are arranged in chronological order of publication.

"Spinoza", in Contributions to the Penny Cyclopaedia /1842/.

"Spinoza's Life and Works", Westminster Review, Volume XXXIX, May 1843, pp. 372-402.

"Manifesto", Leader, 30 March 1850, p. 3.

Comte's Philosophy of the Sciences, 2 volumes, 1853.

"Spinoza", Fortnightly Review, Volume XXII, 1 April 1866, pp. 385-406.

Problems of Life and Mind, First Series: The Foundations of a Creed, 2 volumes, 1874-75.

The Life and Works of Goethe, introduction by Havelock Ellis, 1959.

(b). Secondary Works on George Henry Lewes.

These are arranged in chronological order of publication.

"The Merchant of Venice", a review of Lewes's performance as Shylock, by Charles Sever, Manchester Guardian, 12 March 1849, p. 3.

Kitchel, Anna, T., George Lewes and George Eliot: A Review of Records, New York /1933/.

Goldberg, Hannah, "G. H. Lewes and Daniel Deronda", Notes and Queries, Volume CCII, August 1957, pp. 356-358.

Blumberg, Myra, "The bloke George Eliot lived with", The Times, 30 March, 1968, p. 17.

5. Jewish Material.

This is not a comprehensive list. To include all of George Eliot's Jewish reading would mean including works not mentioned in this thesis.

(a). History.

i. Contemporary Articles.

These are alphabetically listed and details are given.

The Academy, 25 April 1874, p.460, item on Jerusalem.
'The state of the Jews in Poland'

The Foreign Quarterly Review, Volume XXV11, 1841,
pp.241-264.

Jewish Chronicle, 13 December 1867, p.6, "Palestine Colonization".

_____, 18 August 1871, p.2, "Shabby treatment of J.J. Sylvester".

_____, 8~~2~~ January 1875, p.649, Montefiore memorial projects and Agricultural school at Jaffa.

_____, 15 January 1875, pp.675-676, Deutsch's treatment.

The Jewish World, 7 August 1874, p.3, Anti-semitism in England.

_____, 27 November 1874, p.5, Population explosion amongst Jewish poor.

The Nuneaton Chronicle, 11 March 1892, p.6, Obituary of A. Shute.

Times, 17 August 1853, p.5, A.H. Layard on the Indian route.

ii. Twentieth-Century Articles.

These are listed under author's name.

Baron, Salo, "I.M. Jost", Proceedings American Academy of Jewish Research, Volume 1, 1930, pp.7-32.

Baron, Salo, "The Jewish Question in the Nineteenth-Century", The Journal of Modern History, Volume X, March 1938, pp.51-65.

Salter, F.R., "The Jews in Fifteenth-Century Florence and Savonarola's Establishment of a Mons Pietatis", The Cambridge Historical Journal, Volume V, 1936--7, pp.193-211.

iii. Books.

Baron, Salo, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 3 Volumes, Columbia, 1937.

Baron, Salo, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 11 Volumes, Columbia, 1937--1966.

Carmoly, Emile, Histoire des Médecins Juifs Anciens et Modernes, Bruxelles, 1844.

Clarke, Thomas, India and Palestine: Or, the Restoration of the Jews, Viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India, 1861.

Elbogen, Ismar, A Century of Jewish Life, Philadelphia, 1945.

Finn, James, Stirring Times, Or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856, 2 Volumes, 1878.

Freedman, Maurice, Edited, A Minority in Britain: Social Studies of THE Anglo-Jewish Community, 1955.

Geiger, Abraham, Das Judentum und seine Geschichte, 3 Volumes, Breslau, 1865--71.

Graetz, Heinrich, Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart, 11 Volumes, Leipzig, 1863--75.

Hyamson, Albert, M., Edited, The British Consulate in Jerusalem in relation to the Jews in Palestine 1838-1914, 2 Volumes, 1939.

Josephus, Flavius, The Whole and Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, 4 Volumes, ~~Translated~~ by William Whitson, 4 Volumes, 18107.

Jost, I. M., Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf Unsere Tage, 10 Volumes, Berlin, 1820--47.

Jost, I. M., Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, 3 Volumes, Leipzig, 1857--9.

Katz, Jacob, Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times, Oxford, 1961.

Kobler, Franz, The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, 1956.

- Liptzin, Sol., Germany's Stepchildren, Philadelphia, 1944.
- Meyer, Bertha, Salon Sketches, New York, 1938.
- Munk, Salomon, Palestine, Description Géographique, Historique et archéologique, Paris: [1845].
- Pulzer, Peter, G.J., The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria, New York, 1964.
- Roth, Cecil, The Rise of Provincial Jewry: The Early History of the Jewish communities in the English countryside, 1740-1840, 1950.
- Roth, Cecil, A History of the Jews in England, Oxford, 1964.
- Samuel, Maurice, Blood Accusation: The Strange History of the Beiliss Case, New York, 1966.

(b). Literature.

i. Works of Fiction, Drama, and Poetry.

These appear in alphabetical order. For a comprehensive bibliography, see L.C. Klein, The Portrait of the Contemporary Jew in English and German Fiction and Drama, 1830--1880, M.A., London University, 1963.

Daly, Augustin, Leah the Forsaken, Lacy's Acting Edition, 1874.

Defoe, Daniel, The Political History of the Devil as well Ancient AS Modern, 1726.

Disraeli, Benjamin, Alroy, 1833 *The Wondrous Tale of Alroy: The Rise of Iskander, 3 vols., 1833.*

Disraeli, Benjamin, Coningsby: or the New Generation, Signet Classics Edition, New York, 1962. *First Edition, 1844*

Disraeli, Benjamin, Tancred: or The New Crusade, 3 vols. 1847.

Dumas, Alexander, fils, La Femme de Claude, Paris 1873.

Goldstein, David, Edited, Hebrew Poems from Spain, New York, 1966.

Halevi, Yehuda, "For the Sake of God's House", translated S.J. Kahn, The Jewish Quarterly, Volume XVI, 1968, p.30.

Heine, Heinrich, "Donna Clara", Berlin 1819, in Vermischte Schriften, 3 Volumes, Hamburg, 1854.

- Heine, Heinrich, Briefe, Berlin, 1821.
_____, Almansor, Berlin, 1823.
_____, Der Rabbi von Bacharach, Berlin, 1840.
_____, Romanzero, Berlin, 1851.
_____, Sämmtliche Werke, Philadelphia, 1855.
_____, The Poems of Heinrich Heine, translated by Louis
Untermeyer, 1938.
_____, The Poetry and Prose of Heinrich Heine, Edited
Frederic Ewen, New York, 1948.
- Kompert, Leopold, Aus dem Ghetto. Geschichten, Leipzig, 1850.
_____, Neue Geschichten aus dem Ghetto, 2 Volumes, Prag, 1860.
_____, Scenes from the Ghetto: studies of Jewish Life,
translated from the German, 1882.
- Lessing, Gotthold, Ephraim, Nathan der Weise, Berlin, 1779.
- Lytton, Edward, Bulwer, Leila, or the Seige of Granada, 1838.
- Phelan, Charlotte Elizabeth, (Mrs. Tonna), Judah's Lion, 1843.
- Taylor, Jeremy, Holy Living and Holy Dying, Volume 3 of Works, 1850--56.
- Trollope, Anthony, Nina Balatka, or The Maiden of Prague, in
Blackwood's: Edinburgh Magazine, Volume C--C1, July 1866
--June 1867.
_____, The Eustace Diamonds, in Fortnightly Review, from
July 1871 to February 1873.
_____, The Way We Live Now, 20 monthly parts from
February 1874 to September 1875.
_____, The Prime Minister, 8 monthly parts from November
1875 to June 1876.
_____, The Way We Live Now, First Edition, 2 Volumes, 1875.
_____, The Eustace Diamonds, Edited M. Sadlier and F. Page,
Oxford Trollope Edition, 1950.

Trollope, Anthony, The Prime Minister, Edited, M. Sadlier and F. Page,
Oxford Trollope Edition, 1952.

Yates, Edmund, Kissing the Rod, 7 Volumes, 1856.

ii. Works on Fiction, Drama, and Poetry.

Arnold, Matthew, "Heinrich Heine", Essays in Criticism. First Series,
1863.

The Athenaeum, 3 May 1873, p. 563, review of Dumas fils', La Femme de
Claude.

Castro, Rodriguez, de, Biblioteca, 2 Volumes, Madrid, 1781.

Delitzsch, Franz, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poësie, Leipzig, 1836.

Fisch, Harold, The Dual Image: A Study of the Figure of the Jew in
English Literature, 1959.

_____, Jerusalem and Albion The Hebraic Factor in Seventeenth-
Century Literature, 1964.

Geiger, Abraham, Divan des Castilurs Abu'l-Hassan Juda ha-Levi,
Breslau, 1851.

_____, Jüdische Dichtungen der Spanischen und italienischen
Schulen, Leipzig, 1856.

Jacobs, Joseph, George Eliot: Matthew Arnold: Browning: Newman. Essays
and Reviews from the Athenaeum, 1891.

Liptzin, Sol., "Heine, the Continuation of Goethe: A Mid-Victorian
Legend", Journal of English and German Philology,
Volume, XVIII, 1944, pp. 317-325.

Meier, Ernest, Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der
Hebräer, Leipzig, 1856.

Rose, William, Heinrich Heine: Two Studies of his Thought and Feeling,
Oxford, 1956.

Rosenberg, Edgar, From Shylock to Svengali: Jewish Stereotypes in
English Fiction, Stanford, 1960.

Sachs, Michael, Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, Berlin, 1845

Steinschneider, Moritz, Jüdische Literatur, Leipzig, 1850.

_____, Jewish Literature from the eighth to the
the eighteenth century with an introduction
on Talmud and Midrash, translated by W.
Spottiswoode, 1857.

Waxman, Meyer, A History of Jewish Literature, 4 Volumes, New York,
1930--41.

Zunz, Leopold, Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters, Berlin, 1855.

_____, "On the Sufferings of the Jews during the Middle Ages",
translated by Abraham Löwy, included in Miscellany of
Hebrew Literature, 1872.

(c). Philosophy, Religion, Mysticism

Arnold, Matthew, "Tratatus Theologico-Politicus", London Review,
27 December 1862.

_____, "Spinoza", in Essays and Criticism. First Series, 1863.

Bible, Authorized Version, Oxford, 1948.

_____, Revised Standard Version, Fontana Books [1960].

_____, The Pentateuch and Haftorahs: Hebrew Text, English Translation
and Commentary, Edited J.H. Hertz, 1956.

Buber, Martin, Between Man and Man, translated by R. Gregor Smith,
1947.

Deutscher, Isaac, "The Wandering Jew as Thinker and Revolutionary",
Universities and New Left Review, Volume #V, 1958,
pp.9-13.

Froude, J.A., "Spinoza", Westminster Review, Volume LXIV, July 1855,
pp.1-37.

Ginsberg, Christian David, The Kabbalah, its Doctrines, Development
and Literature, 1865.

Goldstücker, Theodor, Literary Remains, 2 Volumes, 1879.

- Halevi, Jehuda, Kusari, Edited David Cassel, Leipzig, 1853.
_____, Kusari; the book of proof and argument, Abridged Edition with an Introduction and a Commentary by Isaak Heinemann, Oxford, 1947.
- Klausner, Joseph, The Messianic Idea in Israel from its beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah, English translation, W.F. Stinespring, 1956.
- Maimon, Salomon, Lebensgeschichte Von ihm selbst geschrieben und herausgegeben, Berlin, 1792.
_____, Solomon Maimon: an autobiography. Translated from the German, with additions and notes by J.C. Murray, 1888.
- Maimonides, Moses, Main Principles, Hebrew and English, translated by H.H. Bernard, Cambridge, 1832.
- Munk, Salomon, Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe, Paris, 1857.
- Scholem, Gershom, C., Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, New York, 1965.
- Spinoza, Baruch, Opera Posthuma, Amsterdam, 1677.
_____, Opera Omnia, edited C.H. Bruder, 3 Volumes, Lipsiae, 1843--6.
_____, The Chief Works of Benedict De Spinoza, translated from the Latin, with an introduction by R.H.M. Elwes, 2 Volumes, Dover Publications, New York, 1955.
- Strangford, Emily, The Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch with a Brief Memoir, 1874.
- The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia, Edited Cecil Roth, 1959.
- Wolfson, Harry, A., The Philosophy of Spinoza, Meridian Books, New York, 1960.

6. General Works.

These are listed under author's name.

- Annan, Noel Gilroy, Leslie Stephen: His Thought and Character in Relation to his Time, 1951.
- Arnold, Matthew, The Complete Prose Works, Edited R.H. Super, 6 Volumes, Ann Arbor, 1960--68.
- _____, The Poems of Matthew Arnold, Edited K. Allott, 1965.
- Beauvoir, Simone, de, Le deuxième sexe, 2 Volumes, Paris 1968.
- Bergstraesser, Arnold, Edited, Goethe and the Modern Age, Chicago, 1950.
- Blackham, H.J., Six Existentialist Thinkers, 1967.
- Booth, Bradford, A., Anthony Trollope, 1958.
- Borrow, George, The Zinçali; or, an Account of the Gypsies of Spain, 1841
- Brownell, W.C., Victorian Prose Masters, New York, 1901.
- Buckley, J.H., The Triumph of Time: A Study of the Victorian Concepts of Time, History, Progress and Decadence, Oxford, 1967.
- Bunyan, John, Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners and The Pilgrim's Progress, Edited, R. Sharrock, Oxford, 1966.
- Butler, Samuel, Unconscious Memory, 1880.
- Camus, Albert, The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays, translated, Justin O'Brien, New York, 1955.
- Chapman, John, Analytical Catalogue of Mr. Chapman's Publications, 1852.
- Clapham, John, H., An Economic History of Modern Britain, 3 Volumes, Cambridge, 1926--38.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge, 2 Volumes, 1835.
- Comte, Auguste, Cours de Philosophie Positive, 6 Volumes, Paris, 1830--42.
- _____, Système de Politique Positive, 4 Volumes, Paris, 1851--4.
- _____, Catéchisme Positiviste, Paris, 1852.

- Comte, Auguste, The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, translated Harriet Martineau, 2 Volumes, 1853.
- _____, The System of Positive Polity, translated J. H. Bridges, F. Harrison and others, 4 Volumes, 1875--7.
- Daiches, David, A Critical History of English Literature, 2 Volumes, 1963.
- Depping, G. B., Histoire Générale de L'Espagne, 2 Volumes, Bourdeaux, 1814.
- Elton, Oliver, A Survey of English Literature 1830-1880, 2 Volumes, 1920.
- Erckman, Émile, Chatrian, Pierre, Histoire d'un Conscrit de 1813, Paris, 1864.
- Espinasse, Francis, Literary Recollections, 1893.
- Feuerbach, Ludwig, Wesen des Christentums, Leipzig, 1841.
- Glauser, Lisa, "Die erlebte Rede im englischen Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts", Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten, Volume XX, Berne, 1948.
- Goethe, Johann, W., Die Wahlverwandtschaften, Berlin, 1809.
- _____, Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann and Sorel, translated by J. Oxenford, 1879.
- Grellman, H. M. G., Die Zigeuner: Ein historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volkes im Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge, Leipzig, 1783.
- Hardy, Barbara, The Appropriate Form: An Essay on the Novel, 1964.
- Hartley, L. P., The Go-Between, 1953.
- Hennell, Charles Christian, An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity, 1841.
- Hennell, Sara, Sophie, A Memoir of C. C. Hennell, 1899/[Private Circulation]
- Heywood, James, Introduction to the Book of Genesis, 2 Volumes, 1855.
- Hook, Sidney, From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx, 1936.
- Houghton, Walter, E., The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870, Yale, 1964.
- Jahn, Friedrich, Ludwig, Deutsches Volkstum, Leipzig, 1817.

- Jewsbury, Geraldine, Constance Herbert, 1855.
- Kierkegaard, Soren, Fear and Trembling, a dialectical lyric by Johannes de Silento, translated by R. Payne, 1939.
- Kingsley, Charles, Westward Ho! or, The Voyages and Adventures of Sir Amyas Leigh, Knight, of Burrough, in the County of Devon, in the Reign of Her Most Glorious Majesty Queen Elizabeth", rendered into Modern English by Charles Kingsley, Cambridge, 1855.
- Layard, A.H., Nineveh and its Remains: with an account of a visit to the Chaldaean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, Or Devil-Worshippers; and an enquiry into the manners and arts of the ancient Assyrians, 2 Volumes, 1849.
- Lessing, Doris, The Golden Notebook, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1964.
- Mackay, Robert William, Progress of the Intellect, as Exemplified in The Religious Development of the Greeks and Hebrews, 2 Volumes, 1850.
- Mosse, George, L., The Culture of Western Europe: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: An Introduction, 1963.
- _____, The Crisis of German Ideology: intellectual origins of the Third Reich, 1966.
- Poole, Benjamin, History of Coventry, 1852.
- Poole, S.L., "E.O.M. Deutsch", Dictionary of National Biography, Volume 5, 1921, pp. 872--873.
- Pott, A.F., Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien, 2 Volumes, Halle, 1844--5.
- Prescott, W.H., History of Ferdinand and Isabella, 3 Volumes, 1842.
- Riehl, Wilhelm, Heinrich, von, Land und Leute, Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1851.
- _____, Die bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1855.
- _____, Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes, 3 Volumes, Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1856.

- Rumney, Joshua, Herbert Spencer's Sociology, 1934.
- Ruskin, John, Modern Painters, Volumes 3 and 4, 1856.
- Schmidt, Helmut, D., Koebner, Richard, Imperialism: The story and significance of a political word, 1840-1960, Cambridge, 1964.
- Schnabel, Franz, Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, 4 Volumes, Freiburg, 1929--32.
- Scott, Walter, Old Mortality, in Tales of My Landlord, 2 Volumes, Edinburgh, 1816.
- Shakespeare, William, Complete Works, Edited H. Alexander, 1955.
- Sismondi, J.C.L., The History of the Italian Republics, being a view of the origin and progress of Italian Freedom, Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia Edition, 1832.
- Spencer, Herbert, "Genesis of Science", British Quarterly Review, Volume XX, July 1854, pp. 108-162.
- _____, The Principles of Psychology, 1855.
- _____, First Principles, 1862.
- _____, The Principles of Biology, 2 Volumes, 1864--7.
- _____, An Autobiography, 2 Volumes, 1904.
- Stowe, Harriet, Beecher, Dred; A Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp, 1856.
- Strauss, David, F., Das Leben Jesu, 2 Volumes, Tübingen, 1837.
- Tanner, Tony, "Trollope's, The Way We Live Now, Its Modern Significance", Critical Quarterly, Volume 1X, 1967, pp. 256-271.
- Ticknor, George, History of Spanish Literature, 3 Volumes, 1863
- Trollope, Anthony, An Autobiography, Edited M. Sadler and F. Page, Oxford Trollope Edition, 1952.
- Varnhagen, Karl, August, von Ense, Goethe in den Zeugnissen der Mitlebenden, Berlin, 1823.

Wagner, Richard, Tannhäuser, Dresden, 1845.

_____, Nibelungen, Munich, 1852.

Wordsworth, William, "Ode" 1815, in Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty, 1816.

_____, The Poetical Works of, Edited E. de Selincourt and H. Darbishire, 6 Volumes, 2nd Edition, Oxford, 1954--59

7. Unpublished Materials Consulted.

Handley, Graham, R., A Critical Study of 'Daniel Deronda': Its Relation to George Eliot's Fiction and to its Time, Ph.D., London University, 1962.

Klein, Lea, Charlotte, The Portrait of the Contemporary Jew in English and German Fiction and Drama from 1830 to 1880, M.A., London University, 1963.

_____, The Portrait of the Jew in English and German Fiction and Drama, (1830-1933), Ph.D., London University, 1967.

Kreifall, Luther Harry, A Victorian Apocalypse: A Study of George Eliot's Daniel Deronda and its relation to D.F. Strauss' Das Leben Jesu, Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1967.¹

Möller, Alfred, Abraham, George Eliots Beschäftigung mit dem Judentum und ihre Stellung zur Judenfrage, ^{Ph.D.} Hamburg University, 1934.

Pratt, John, C., A Middlemarch Miscellany: An Edition, With Introduction and Notes, of George Eliot's 1868-1871 Notebook, Ph.D., Princeton University, 1965.¹

1. Items consulted on microfilm.

- Rumney, Joshua, The Economic and Social Development of the Jews in England 1730-1860, Ph.D., London University, 1933.
- Santangelo, G.A., The Background of George Eliot's Romola, Ph.D., University of North Carolina, 1962.¹

1. See, Dissertation and Abstracts, Volume XXIV, 4--6, pp. 2485--2486, 1962.

APPENDIX:

"Mordecai: A Protest Against the Critics. By a Jew."

Joseph Jacobs's review appeared in Macmillan's Magazine in June 1877 and has not been reissued as a whole since. Jacobs defends the Jewish elements of the novel and in doing so brilliantly shows up the limitations of critical reactions to it. What he says has a great relevance to subsequent criticism. It is therefore included as an appendix to this thesis.

MORDECAI: A PROTEST AGAINST THE CRITICS.

By a Jew.

Sephardo.

"Wise books

For half the truths they hold are honoured tombs"
Spanish Gypsy, p. 205,

The critics have had their say: the recording angels of literature, more sorrowful than angry, have written down Daniel Deronda a failure. And there seems to be at least this much of truth in their judgment that one of the parts of which the book is composed has failed to interest or even to reach its audience. For the least observant reader must have noticed that Daniel Deronda is made up of two almost unconnected parts, either of which can be read without the other. Every "book" after the first is divided into two parts, whose only claim to be included under the same covers is the common action or inaction of the eponymous hero. One of set of characters and interests centres round the fate and fortunes of Gwendolen Harleth, and of this part of the book we can surely say that it has excited as much interest and bitten as deeply into men's minds as any of the author's previous studies of female character. Indeed, we would submit that George Eliot's last portrait of female egoism is in many ways her best: her hand has become more tender, and, because more tender, more true than when she drew such narrow types as Hetty Sorrel and Rosamond Vincy, so unnaturally consistent in their selfishness. The story of Gwendolen Harleth's purification from egoism is, then, one might say, even a greater success than the former pictures of girlish struggles, and displays the author's distinguishing excellences in undiminished

brilliantcy. But there is another part of the book with which the English-speaking public and its literary "tasters" have failed to sympathise, and which they have mostly been tempted to omit on reperusal. The tragedy of Mordecai Cohen's missionary labours, on which the author has spent immense labour of invention and research, must be pronounced to have completely failed in reaching and exciting the interest and sympathy of the ordinary reader. Mr. Bagehot has told us that the greatest pain man can feel is the pain of a new idea, and the readers of Daniel Deronda have refused painfully to assimilate the new idea of the Mordecai part of the book. This idea we take to be that Judaism stands on the same level as Christianity, perhaps even on a higher level, in point of rationality and capacity to satisfy the wants of the religious consciousness, "the hitherto neglected reality," to use the author's own words (ii.292), "that Judaism is something still throbbing in human lives, still making for them the only conceivable vesture of the world." The difficulty of accepting this new idea comes out most prominently in the jar most readers must have felt in the omission of any explanation of the easy transition of Deronda from the Christianity in which he was bred to the Judaism in which he had been born.

The present notice proposes to discuss the failure of this unsuccessful part, from the standpoint of one for whom this initial difficulty does not exist, and who has from his childhood seen the world habited in those Hebrew Old Clothes of which Mr. Carlyle and others have spoken so slightingly. And the first thing that it is natural for a Jew to say about Daniel Deronda is some expression of gratitude for the wonderful completeness and accuracy with which

George Eliot has portrayed the Jewish nature. Hitherto the Jew in English fiction has fared unhappily: being always represented as a monstrosity, most frequently on the side of malevolence and greed, as in Marlowe's Barabbas and Dickens's Fagin, or sometimes, as in Dickens's Riah, still more exasperatingly on the side of impossible benevolence. What we want is truth, not exaggeration, and truth George Eliot has given us with the large justice of the great artist. The gallery of Jewish portraits contained in Daniel Deronda gives in a marvellously full and accurate way all the many sides of our complex national character. The artistic element, with the proper omission of painting and sculpture, in which Jews, though eminent, have not been pre-eminent, is well represented by Klesmer, Mirah and the Alcharisi. Ezra Cohen is a type of the common-place Jew, the familiar figure of prosperous mercantile dealing, the best known trait of Jews to Englishmen; while little Jacob exhibits in a very humorous form the well-known precocity of Jewish children. The affectionate relations of Ezra Cohen and his mother and the tender respect of Mordecai and Mirah for the memory of theirs, point to the exceptional influence of the Mother and the Home in the inner life of Jews. Then in Kalonyneos,¹ whom we feel tempted to call the Wandering Jew, we get the nomadic spirit which has worked in Israel from times long previous to the Dispersion, while all must join in the scorn the author evidently feels for Pash, the Jew who is no Jew. Yet he is the representative of what might be called the Heine side of Jewry - the wit and cynicism that reached their greatest intensity in the poet of Young Germany. The more temperate Gideon represents, it is to be feared, a large proportion of English Jews, one not ashamed of his race, yet not proud of it, and willing

[1. Macmillan's Magazine spelling.]

to see the racial and religious distinctions we have fought for so valiantly die out and perish utterly among men. Perhaps the most successful of the minor portraits is that of the black sheep Lapidoth, the Jew with no redeeming love for family, race, or country to preserve him from that sordid egoism (the new name for wickedness) into which he has sunk. His utter unconsciousness of good and evil is powerfully depicted in the masterly analysis of his state of mind before purloining Deronda's ring. To some extent the weird figure of the Alcharisi serves as a sort of companion-picture of female renunciation of racial claims but the struggle between her rebellious will and what old-fashioned folk call the Will of God (Professor Clifford would perhaps name it the Tribal Will) raises her to a tragic height which makes Deronda's mother perhaps the most imposing figure in the book. Deronda himself, by the circumstance of his education, is prevented from typifying any of the social distinctions of a Jew, yet it is not unlikely that his gravity of manner and many sided sympathy were meant by the author to be taken as hereditary traits.

These, with Ram the bookseller, the English Jew of the pre-emancipation era, and some minor characters, give to the reader a most complete picture of Jews and Jewesses in their habits as they live, of Jews and Jewesses as members of a peculiar people in relation to the Gentile world. To point the moral of human fallibility, besides some minor slips in ceremonial details on which it were ungrateful to dwell,¹ we cannot but think (a critic is nothing if

1. e.g. Taliths of fringed mantles are not worn on Friday nights (ii. 292-300), the Kaddish or prayer in honour of the dead, is only said for eleven months, not eleven years (iv.92), and then only by a son. Mirah seems to be under the same delusion (ii.306). Before breaking the bread (ii.356), Cohen should have "made Kiddush," i.e. pronounced a blessing over some sacramental wine. It is doubtful whether Cohen would have paid money and written a pawn-ticket on Sabbath eve, but this may be intentional.

not critical) that the author has failed to give in *Mirah* an adequate type of Jewish girlhood. *Mirah* is undoubtedly tame; and tameness, for those who know them, is the last infirmity of Jewish girls. Still even here the sad experience of *Mirah's* youth may be held to have somewhat palliated any want of brightness, and the extra vivacity of Mrs. Cohen junior perhaps supplies the deficiency.

So much for the outer life of Judaism. The English reader will find here not idea so startlingly novel as to raise opposition to its admission, or to disturb his complacent feeling of superiority over Jews in all but a certain practical sagacity (he calls it sharpness or cunning), which must be postulated to explain the "differentia of success" characterising the Jewish species of commercial dealings. One new fact he may indeed profitably learn: from the large group of Jewish characters in *Daniel Deronda* he may perhaps gather that there are Jews and Jews, that they are not all Lapidoths, nor even all Ezra Cohens, as he has been accustomed to think.

But the new idea of which we have spoken is embodied in the person of Mordecai Cohen, the Jew par excellence of the book, the embodiment of the inner life of Judaism. The very fact of this recognition of an inner life, not to speak of the grand personality in which she has typified it, entitles George Eliot to the heart-deep gratitude of all Jews; the more so inasmuch as she has hazarded and at least temporarily lost success for her most elaborated production by endeavouring to battle with the commonplace and conventional ideas about Judaism. The present article aims at striking another blow to convince the English world of the existence in the present day and for all past time of a spiritual life in Judaism. And we can conceive of no better point of defence for the position than the historic probability of the character of Mordecai, which critics have found so mystic, vague, and impossible.

Those who know anything of the great leaders of spiritual Judaism will recognise in Mordecai all the traits that have characterised them. Saul of Tarsus, Ibn Gebirol (Avicebron), Jehuda Halevi, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, Spinoza, Mendelssohn, not to mention other still more unfamiliar names, were all men like Mordecai: rich in inward wealth, yet content to earn a scanty livelihood by some handicraft; ardently spiritual, yet keenly alive to the claims of home affection; widely erudite, yet profoundly acquainted with human nature; mystics, yet with much method in their mysticism. The author seems even to have a bolder application of the historic continuity of the Hebraic spirit in view: she evidently wishes Mordecai to be regarded as a "survival" of the prophetic spirit, a kind of Isaiah redivivus. Hence a somewhat ~~fff~~ unreal effect is produced by his use of a diction similar to what might be expected from a "greater prophet" stepping out of the pages of the Authorised Version. Still it is to be remembered that we almost always see Mordecai in states of intense excitement, when his thought would naturally clothe itself in the forms in which all his literary efforts had been written. He speaks in a sufficiently prosaic and unbiblical style when the subject is prosaic, as to Daniel Deronda at their first meeting (ii.336): "What are you disposed to give for it?" "I believe Mr. Ram will be satisfied with half-a-crown, sir," remarks sufficiently on the level of nineteenth century conversation to give Mordecai some community with ordinary folk.

There is yet another quality which Mordecai shares with the sages and prophets of the past: he is a layman. The natural thing for a writer describing "a spiritual destiny embraced eagerly in youth," a representative of the religious life of a nation, would be to describe some young priest ardently striving for the spiritual enlightenment of his flock, some Mr. Tryan, some Savonarola; and it would have

been right for all other religions. But in Judaism the inner development of the Spirit has been carried on entirely by laymen: the Jewish Summa Theologiae, the Guide to the Perplexed (Moré Nebouchím) of Maimonides, was written by a physician. We shall be using more familiar illustrations when we remind the reader that Moses and Ezra, and, above all, the prophets were men from the lay community, not members of an organised priesthood. This may account for that spirit of Compromise (writers of the New English call it "adaptation to environment") which is as marked a characteristic of the religious history of Jews as of the political history of Englishmen. Other religions have had churches, bureaucracies: Judaism has had a synagogue, a representative assembly.

Mordecai shares yet another gift of his predecessors: he is a poet. The fragment in chapter xxxviii. commencing -

"Away from me the garment of forgetfulness,
Withering the heart,"

might well be a translation from a Piut of Ibn Gebirol or a Selicha of Jehuda Halevi, and makes him a fit dramatis persona of that "national tragedy in which the actors have been also the heroes and the poets."

We do not then speak without knowledge of the history of Jews, post-biblical as well as biblical, when we say that Mordecai Cohen is a lineal successor of those great leaders of spiritual Judaism who have fought in the van in that moral warfare which Judaism has waged and won against the whole world; a fitting companion of that valiant-band which has guarded through the ages the ark of the Lord intrusted to Israel's keeping four thousand years ago; a noble representative of that spirit of resistance that has repulsed the most powerful dis-integrating forces ever brought against a nation or a creed. A "nation of shopkeepers" has produced a Milton, a Shelley, a Newman; a "nation

of pawnbrokers," if you will, has given birth to a Jehuda Halevi, a Spinoza, a Mordecai.

To believers in the principle of Heredity this would be enough to give to Mordecai that possibility which is sufficient for artistic existence. English critics, however, seem not to believe in hereditary influences: they have unanimously pronounced him an impossibility. They require, it would appear, some more tangible proof of the existence among modern Jews of a character like Mordecai's than the à priori probability afforded by the consideration of the historic continuity of national character. Even this want could be supplied. The present writer was fortunate enough to discover¹ traces of a Jew who, allowing for the idealisation which is the privilege of the artist, might well stand for the prototype of Mordecai. In the Fortnightly Review for April 1, 1866, Mr. George Henry Lewes prefaces an article on Spinoza with an account of a philosopher's club where he first made acquaintance with the doctrines of the Hebrew thinker, and which resembles in every particular the club at the "Hand and Banner" in the sixth book of Daniel Deronda. The locality, Red Lion Square, near Holborn, is the same; the free and easy method of discussion is the same; the vocations of the frequenters are the same, - a freethinking second hand bookseller (Miller), a journeyman watchmaker (Pash), a bootmaker (Croop), one who "penned a stanza when he should engross" (Lilly), and so on. But above all, the leading spirit of Mr. Lewes' club was a German Jew named Cohn or Kohn, whom he describes in words which might be applied almost without alteration to Mordecai. Mr. Lewes says ~~of~~ Cohn: -

1. The discovery was communicated to the Academy of July 29, 1876, by my friend, Mr. Mc Alister, to whom I had shown it.

"We all admired him as a man of astonishing subtlety and logical force, no less than of sweet personal worth. He remains in my memory as a type of philosophic dignity. A calm, meditative, amiable man, by trade a journey-man watchmaker, very poor, with weak eyes and chest, grave and gentle in demeanour, incorruptible even by the seductions of vanity; I habitually think of him in connection with Spinoza almost as much on account of his personal worth as because to him I owe my first acquaintance with the Hebrew thinker. My admiration of him was of that enthusiastic temper which in youth we feel for our intellectual leaders. I loved his weak eyes and low voice; I venerated his intellect. He was the only man I did not contradict in the impatience of argument. An immense pity and a fervid indignation filled me as I came away from his attics in one of the Holborn courts, where I had seen him in the pinching poverty of his home, with his German wife and two little black-eyed children; indignantly I railed against society which could allow so great an intellect to withdraw itself from nobler work and waste the precious hours in mending watches. But he was wise in his resignation, thought I in my young indignation. Life was hard to him, as to all of us; but he was content to earn a miserable pittance by handicraft, and kept his soul serene. I learnt to understand him better when I learnt the story of Spinoza's life.

"Cohn, as may be supposed, early established his supremacy in our club. A magisterial intellect always makes itself felt. Even those who differed from him most widely paid voluntary homage to his power."

Aut Mordecai aut diabolus. Just as Walter Scott merely idealised Rebecca Gratz, the beloved of Washington Irving, into his Rebecca of York, so George Eliot, by the force of her genius, has transformed Kohn into a prophet of the New Exile. Even the omission of the wife and two children (in whose stead we get Mrs. Cohen junior, with Jacob and Adelaide Rebecca) only serves to heighten the isolation which

makes the pathos of Mordecai's lot.

But surely the critics had no occasion to doubt the possibility of a Jew like Mordecai at a time when we are still mourning the loss of one who laid down his life for the regeneration of our views of Israel's past as Mordecai sacrificed his for the elevation of our hopes of Israel's future. "I have certain words in my possession," wrote Emanuel Deutsch,¹ "which have been given me that they might be said to others, few or many.... I know also that I shall not find peace or rest until I have said my whole say. And yet I cannot do it. And I yearn for things which I see and which might have been mine and would have been blessing and sunshine and the cooling dew to the small germs within me - and yet! and yet! -"

Would that Mr. Deutsch had lived to convince the world in his own burning words that Mordecai is no inert scarecrow of abstractions, but a warm living reality!

We have laid so much stress upon the artistic truth of Mordecai's character because, if this be granted, it is inexplicable that the central incident of the Jewish part of Daniel Deronda, the meeting on the bridge between him and Deronda, should have failed to strike readers as perhaps the most remarkable incident in English fiction. If Mordecai has artistic reality we contend that the meeting on the bridge in Chapter xl. reaches at tragic intensity which almost transcends the power of the novel, and would perhaps require the manifold emotive inlets of the Wagnerian drama to do it justice: eye, ear, brain, and heart should all be responsive. We boldly deny

1. The Literary Remains of the late Emanuel Deutsch (Murray, 1874), p.xii.

greater tragic intensity to any incident in Shakespeare. Nor are there wanting signs that the author herself, no contemptible critic of her own productions, sets an equal value on the incident. In the motto prefixed to chapter xxxviii., describing Mordecai's yearnings, she tells us in Brownesque English -

"There be who hold that the deeper tragedy were a Prometheus bound, not after, but before, he had well got the celestial fire into the ναίπηξ, whereby it might be conveyed to mortals. Thrust by the Kratos and Bia of instituted methods into a solitude of despised ideas, fastened in throbbing helplessness by the fatal pressure of poverty and disease - a solitude where many pass by, but none regard."

"In other words, George Eliot considers the circumstances of Mordecai's fate to surpass in tragic pathos the most colossal monument of Greek dramatic art. Notice, too, the care with which she leads up to the incident. In chapter xxxvii. we have Deronda coming to the Meyricks at Chelsea to announce to Mirah the forthcoming visit of Klesmer, and the chapter finishes as he is leaving Chelsea. The next chapter (xxxviii.) is filled with a description of Mordecai's yearning for a spiritual successor, and gives us en passant a fine picture of the scene of the meeting (iii:137). We get here in short all we need to understand and sympathise with the final episode of the "book;" but lest we should come upon the fulfilment of the prophecy with too vivid a memory of the author's sublimation of the idea of prophecy, we have interposed, like a comic scene in an Elizabethan tragedy, the magnificent account of Klesmer's visit to the Meyricks in chap. xxxix., which clearly occurred after the events described in chapter xl., which takes up the stream of narrative from chapter xxxvii.

It seems to us clear that all this seemingly inartistic transposition of events is intended to make the incident of chapter xl. stand

out more sharply into relief. We have the miracle explained away, it is true - the modern analytic spirit requires it - but the author wishes us to forget the explanation, or at least to relegate the intellectual element of chapter xxxviii. to the unconscious background, where it may be ready to assist, though not present to obstruct, emotion. All this care appears to show the importance attached by the author to the last chapter of book v.

And in itself, apart from what the author may think of it, what a soul-moving incident is there contained! A representative of an ancient world-important people, whose royalty of wrongs makes the aristocracies of Europe appear petty, finds himself clutched by the griping hands of want and death before he can move the world to that vision of the Phoenix-rise of Israel which the prophetic instincts of his race have brought up clear before him. Careless of his own comfort, careless of coming death, he desires only to live anew - as the quasi-Positivist doctrine of the Cabala bids him live - in "minds made nobler by his presence." His prophetic vision pictures to him the very lineaments of his spiritual alter ego, whom he pathetically thinks of as differing from himself in all externals, and, as death draws nigh, the very scene of their meeting. And in this nineteenth century, in prosaic London, this inward vision of the poor consumptive Jew is fulfilled to the letter.

Would it be too bold a suggestion if we suspected the author of having typified in the meeting of Deronda and Mordecai that

"One far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves."

the meeting of Israel and its Redeemer? In personal characteristics, in majestic gravity (we cannot imagine Deronda laughing), in width of sympathy and depth of tenderness, even in outward appearance, Daniel

resembles the great Galilean Pharisee¹ whom all Christendom has accepted as in very truth the Messiah that will restore Judaea to the Holy People. To say the least, the author suggests the audacity in her comparison of the two to the figures of Jesus and ^{the} Pharisee in Titian's "Tribute Money."

We do not remember a single criticism² which has referred to this magnificent scene, where to our mind George Eliot's power of representing soul speaking to soul has reached its greatest height. We do not remember a single critic who seemed to think that Mordecai's fate was in any way more pitiful than that of any other consumptive workman with mystic and impossible ideas. What reasons can be given for this defect of sympathy? In addition to the before-mentioned assumption that Mordecai does not possess artistic reality, there has been the emotional obstruction to sympathy with a Jew, and the intellectual element of want of knowledge about modern Judaism. If Mordecai had been an English workman laying down his life for the foundation of ~~some~~ English International with Deronda for its Messiah Lassalle, he would have received more attention from the critics. But a Jew with views involving issues changing the future history of Humanity - "impossible, vague, mystic." Let us not be misunderstood: the past generation of Englishmen has been so generous to Jews that we should be ungrateful if we accused cultured Englishmen of the

-
1. A friend informs me that Pharisee is derived from W79, to extend (the law), not from W75 to separate and define it.
 2. Professor Dowden's article in the Contemporary Review for February, which appeared after the above was written, forms an exception with respect to this as to all the other deficiencies of the critics against which we here protest.

present day of being consciously repelled by the idea of a poor Jew being worthy of admiration. But fifteen centuries of hatred are not to be wiped out by any legislative enactment. No one can say that the fact of a man's being a Jew makes no more difference in other men's minds than if he were (say) a Wesleyan. There yet remains a ~~deep~~ ^{deep} unconscious undercurrent of prejudice against the Jew which conscientious Englishmen have often to fight against as part of that lower nature, a survival of the less perfect development of our ancestors, which impedes the Ascent of Man.

Along with this unconscious Judaeophobia there has gone the intellectual element of a tacit assumption that modern Judaism is a lifeless code of ritual instead of a living body of religious truth. Of course the pathos and tragedy of Mordecai's fate depend in large measure on the value of the ideas for which he laid down his life. If he were a crazy believer that the English nation is descended from the lost Ten Tribes, his fate would only deserve a smile of contemptuous pity. Hence the artistic necessity of the philosophic discussion in chapter xlii., where his ideas are explained and defended. Here again we have to complain of the want of sympathy shown by the critics, but perhaps still more of their want of knowledge. Our author devotes the forty-first chapter to a piece of special pleading (really addressed to the reader, though supposed to be a philosophic musing of Deronda's), the outcome of which is that if we want to tell whether an enthusiast is justified in his faith, our only test is knowledge of the subject-matter. And the moral naturally is: study the history of the Jews. Hegel says somewhere - "The heritage a great man leaves the world is to force it to explain him," and we may say the same of a great work of art. But the critics of Daniel

Deronda have refused to pay the heavy probate duty of wading through the tenn volumes or so of Gratz's Geschichte der Juden to see whether Mordecai's ideas have anything in them or no: the easier plan was to denounce them as "vague and mystical." If it be contended that the subject is too unfamiliar for ordinary readers, and therefore unsuited for a novel, we may answer that similar reasoning would exalt an Offenbach over a Beethoven. George Eliot has endeavoured to raise the novel to heights where it may treat of subjects hitherto reserved for the Drama or the Epic, but instead of encouragement from English critics she meets with their neglect.

Apart, however, from the intrinsic value of Mordecai's ideas, the discussion would deserve our admiration as a literary tour de force. It was the high praise of the Greek philosopher that if the gods spoke Greek they would talk as Plato wrote: may we not say that if Isaiah had spoken English he would have prophesied as George Eliot makes Mordedai speak? We trace in this the influence which the Authorised Version, - with all its inaccuracies, the most living reproduction of the Hebrew Scriptures - has had on our principal writers, notably in the case of so unbiblical a writer as Mr. Swinburne.

And what of the ideas which Mordecai clothes with words as of one whose lips have been touched with coals of burning fire? What vagueness or mystery is there in the grand and simple lines of Jewish policy laid down by Mordecai? Two ideas dominate Mordecai's arguments throughout the discussion. The resumption of the soil of Palestine by the Jews (which has often been proposed by Gentile writers as a solution of the much vexed Eastern Question), and as a consequence the third and final promulgation of the ~~the~~ Jewish religion to the world, are sufficiently definite ideas, however large and grand they

may be. Even if one disagree with Mordecai's vows one may at any rate pay him the respect due to an energetic leader of opposition, and recognise in him the leader of those who refuse to believe that Israel's part in history is played out, and amalgamate with the nations as soon as possible, letting her glorious past sink into an antiquarian study instead of living as a perennial spring of political action. Mordecai is not of those who hold that the millennium will come when men shall have arrived at that nicely balanced mediocrity, that the "pale abstract" man shall know his brother from other cosmopolitan beings only by some official badge necessary for distinction. He rather holds that in the world-organism of the nations each nationality will have its special function, Israel, as the Jewish poet-philosopher said, being the nations' heart¹. The now-prevailing doctrine of Heredity and the political enthusiasm for Pan-slavism, Panteutonism, Pan-whatnotism, will have nought to urge against these Panjudaic views. And to our minds Mordecai's is the profounder philosophy of history when he further thinks that the great quarry of religious truth, whence two world-religions have been hewn and shaped, but only into torsos, has yet where-withal to completely fashion the religion of the future. The one theologic dogma of Judaism, the unity of the Godhead (involving, as Mordecai remarks, the unity of mankind), can meet with no harsh reception from the philosophies of the day, imbued as they all are with the monism of the "God-intoxicated Jew." The rationalism of Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, which has

1. Cusari, ii. 36. Mordecai attributes the saying to Jehuda Halevi; Sepharo in the Spanish Gypsy, p.210, to the Book of Light, the Cabalistic book Sohar. It occurs in both. Vide Cassel's note in loco.

undermined mediaeval Christianity, now tottering from the attack, merely represents the outcome of a long line of Jewish thought on prophecy, miracles, and the like, and is, in large measure, derived from our summa theologiae, the *More Nebouchim* of Maimonides. Again, reverence for law, as marked a trait of the Jewish spirit as of Roman pride (the Talmud is but a *Corpus Juris*), is another characteristic which Judaism shares with the *Zukunft Religion*. The divorce between man and the world, which is the disintegrating factor in Christianity, nowhere finds a place in Judaism. Further, the teleologic tendency of the evolution doctrine must find a reason for the miraculous tenacity with which Judaism has clung to life. If, as biologists tell us, life consists in the adaptation of internal forces to the relations of the environment, Judaism, of all religions, has most truly lived, and George Eliot has with due knowledge connected the utterances of Mordecai on Judaism with the problem of the hour, "What is progress?" In this connection it were interesting to contrast the history of the two religions of civilisation in the ages previous to the Reformation. While Father after Father was crystallising the freethought of Jesus into stony dogma; while Doctor after Doctor was riveting still closer the fetters of reason; Rabbi after Rabbi was adapting tradition to the reason of the time, each, when his task was done, dying with the *shemah*¹ on his lips. Our author has put into the mouth of a Jew one of her noblest passages, describing this progress in Judaism. Sephardo, in the *Spanish Gypsy* (p.215), speaks thus of the principles of order and progress in the Jewish religion -

"I abide
By that wise spirit of listening reverence
Which marks the boldest doctors of our race,
For truth to us is like a living child,
Born of two parents: if the parents part

1. The assertion of the Divine Unity, *Deut.* vi, 4.

And will divide the child, how shall it live?
Or I will rather say: Two angels guide
The paths of man, both aged and yet young,
As angels are, ripening through endless years.
On one he leans: some call her Memory,
Some Tradition; and her voice is sweet
With deep mysterious accords: the other,
Floating above, holds down a lamp which streams
* A light divine and searching on the earth,
Compelling eyes and footsteps: memory yields
Yet clings with loving check, and shines anew,
Reflecting all the rays of that bright lamp
Our Angel Reason holds. We had not walked,
But for tradition: we walk evermore,
To higher paths by brightening Reason's lamp."

The pages of that history of rationalism that shall treat of the progress of Jewish theosophy, culminating in the epoch-making thought of Spinoza, will fully bear out the historic truth of the above description. And surely that represents the spirit with which we may expect the religion of the future to be informed.

But the new birth of Judaism and its revelation to the world are, in Mordecai's opinion, indissolubly connected with the new birth of the Jewish race as a nation. "The effect of our separateness," he says, "will not be completed and have its highest transformation unless our race takes on again the character of a nationality." And here again history confirms his views. For the life of Judaism has been connected with the history of Jews in a way such as has been the fate of no other religion. The very name of the religion displays this intimate connection; of all religions Judaism alone has been named after the race of its believers. And it is to this that we may perhaps attribute the peculiar interest that George Eliot has felt for Jews, which we can trace at least as far back as 1864, when the first draft of the Spanish Gypsy was written. The two chief interests

of the translator of Strauss and the friend of Mr. Herbert Spencer have been the religious consciousness, which she was the first to use for the artistic purposes of the novel, and the influence of hereditary forces, which she first raised into an ethical creed. And Jews are interesting in both connections, exhibiting in the greatest known degree what is to her the highest virtue, fidelity to claims of race. At the same time this relation of believers and creed has been the source of much misconception. No distinction is made in the popular mind between the theologic and ethical doctrines of Judaism and the national customs of Jews. It is true that in the biblical times and afterwards the social and religious sanctions were not differentiated, but their raison d'etre nowadays, apart from the sanitary sanction of many of the customs, is merely the same as that which preserves many family customs among the aristocracies of Europe. It is our national boast to have been the first to proclaim the true God, and the "Swiss Guards of Deism," as Heine wittily calls us, have clothed themselves with such customs as with a uniform. These rites and ceremonies are not essential to the Judaism we have the mission to preach to the world: for Jews are a missionary though not a proselytising people; however our voices may have hitherto been stifled, we have lived our mission if we have not been permitted to preach it. Those who become Jews in religion need not adopt the Mosaic rites unless they wish to be naturalised as Jews in race. Still the religious trust that has kept the national life throbbing through the centuries has been the conviction that the Messiah who shall spread Judaism to the four corners of the world will be a Jew by race as well as in creed. And Mordecai's views of the resumption of the soil of the Holy Land by the holy people are the only logical position of a Jew who desires that the long travail of the ages shall not end

in the total disappearance of the race. For from the times of the Judges periods of prosperity, such as the one upon which the present generation has entered, have been the most perilous for our national life: it is the struggle for national existence that has resulted, we are vain enough to think, in the survival of the fittest missionaries of the true religion. The Sages say, "Israel is like the olive, the more it is pressed, the more copious the oil;" and it is to be feared that the removal of the pressure will result in the cessation of the noble needs that are typified by the oil. Unless some such project as Mordecai has in view be carried out in the next three generations, it is much to be feared that both the national life of Jews and the religious life of Judaism will perish utterly from the face of the earth. "A consummation devoutly to be wished," the scoffers may say; but not surely ^{in whose} those veins runs the blood of Israelites, and who have the proud heritage of God's truth to hand down to their children.

Enough has perhaps been said to show that Mordecai's views about the future of Judaism and of Jews have all history and much reason on their side and display those powers of intellectual intuition of the future which the psychological system of Maimonides assigns to the Prophet. And we have perhaps contributed somewhat to an explanation of Deronda's acceptance of his spiritual inheritance. Like Mordecai, Deronda protests against the "blasphemy of the time," that men should stand by as spectators of life instead of living. But before he meets with Mordecai what noble work in life has this young and cultured Englishman with his thousands a year? This age of unfaith gives no outlet for his deep, spiritual yearnings (nor for those of thousands like him). The old beliefs are gone: the world is godless, and Deronda cannot, for all the critics have said, offer to

Gwendolen Grandcourt any consolation in a higher order of things instead of the vague platitudes which alone remain to be offered. Yet there comes to this young ardent soul an angel of the Lord (albeit in the shape of a poor Jew watch-mender) with a burning message, giving a mission in life as grand as the most far-reaching ideal he could have formed. Is it strange that his thirsty soul should have swallowed up the soul of Mordecai, in the Cabalistic way which the latter often refers to? Is it strange that Deronda should not have refused the heritage of his race when offered by the hands of Mirah's brother? But is it not strange that the literary leaders of England should have failed to see aught but unsatisfactory vagueness in all the parts of Daniel Deronda which treat of the relations of the hero with Mordecai Cohen? Is it possible that they have failed to see the grandeur and beauty of these incidents because of the lack of that force of imagination necessary to pierce to the pathos of a contemporary tragedy, however powerful their capacity might be to see the romance of a Rebecca of York or the pathos of a Baruch Spinoza?

One possible source of misconception for English readers may be mentioned. Since the time of Moses Mendelssohn the home of spiritual Judaism has been in Germany, and George Eliot, whose pages are informed with the writings of German Jews like Zunz, Geiger, and Gratz, has with true historic insight attributed Mordecai's spiritual birth to the teachings of his German uncle. English Judaism is without signs of life: the only working of the spirit, the abortive reform agitation, was due to a similar movement in Germany. And English Jews have themselves much to blame for the neglect that English criticism has shown for Mordecai.

What we have attempted to show has been that the adverse criticism on the Mordecai part of Daniel Deronda has been due to lack of sympathy

and want of knowledge on the part of the critics, and hence its failure is not (if we must use the word) objective. If a young lady refuses to see any pathos in Othello's fate because she dislikes dark complexions, we blame the young lady, not Shakspeare: and if the critics have refused to see the pathos of Mordecai's fate because he is a Jew of the present day - so much the worse for the critics!

We have not attempted to criticise Daniel Deronda as a whole. Whether it errs in the juxtapositions of two parts appealing to such widely diverse interests, or in the position of the hero - which seems to partake of that unstable equilibrium which the proverb assigns to ~~the~~ him that sitteth on two stools - or the frequent introduction of physiological psychology couched in Spenserian phraseology, we have not cared to inquire. We have only spoken because we have some of the knowledge and all of the sympathy which alone, we contend, are needed to make the Mordecai part of Daniel Deronda as great a success as all must acknowledge to have attended the part relating to Gwendolen Harleth. If this be so, the lovers of English Literature will have the gratification of knowing that the hand of one of our greatest artists has not lost its cunning in these last days. Indeed, if a higher subject argue higher faculties, the successful treatment of a great world-problem would seem to be an advance on her previous studies of village life.

One word more of explanation. I have spoken throughout the above remarks in the plural, as feeling that most of what I have said would be shared by all Jews who have the knowledge and the sympathy which enable them to recognise in Mordecai Cohen not only the finest representative of their religion and race in all literature, but also the most impressive personality in English fiction.

Joseph Jacobs.