CRITICAL INTERPRETATION OF GEORGE ELIOT

Aditya Sabharwal
Sonia Jayant

Critical Interpretation of George Eliot

Aditya Sabharwal, Sonia Jayant

Critical Interpretation of George Eliot

Aditya Sabharwal, Sonia Jayant

Wisdom Press
NEW DELHI

Critical Interpretation of George Eliot
Aditya Sabharwal, Sonia Jayant

This edition published by Wisdom Press,
Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi - 110002.

ISBN: 978-93-81052-89-1

Edition: 2022 (Revised)

Wisdom Press

Production Office: "Dominant House", G - 316, Sector - 63, Noida,
National Capital Region - 201301.
Ph. 0120-4270027, 4273334.

Sales & Marketing: 4378/4-B, Murari Lal Street,
Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002.
Ph.: 011-23281685, 41043100.
e-mail : wisdompress@ymail.com

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

DARWIN'S THEORY: VICTORIAN THOUGHT AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES

Sonia Jayant, Assistant Professor
College of Computing Sciences and IT, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- soniaj.jayant@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This summary examines how Charles Darwin's idea of natural selection greatly influenced Victorian philosophy and how it continues to be relevant today. By portraying humans as the product of a never-ending battle for life, Darwin's revolutionary idea contradicted long-held religious notions and drastically altered ideas about the meaning and order of the natural world. This abstract examines the attitudes to Darwinism by renowned Victorian authors including George Eliot and Thomas Huxley, highlighting the range of responses from acceptance to skepticism. It highlights George Eliot's original criticism, which recognized the scientific plausibility of the idea while raising concerns about its ramifications. The abstract also explores how Darwinism is applied to human interactions in Eliot's writings, displaying a comprehensive comprehension of the theory. Additionally, it explores the modern applicability of a non-metaphysical understanding of evolution, providing a provocative viewpoint in contrast to Victorian sensibilities. This investigation highlights how Darwin's theory has influenced intellectual debate and challenged preconceived notions both in the Victorian period and now.

KEYWORDS:

Darwin's Theory, Evolutionary Theory, George Eliot, Intellectual Discourse, Victorian Thought.

INTRODUCTION

The most revolutionary concept to appear in contemporary times was Darwin's theory of natural selection. Secular or humanist alternatives to religion were equally threatened because the human species was no longer privileged and was the result of a struggle for existence that not only lacked an ethical dimension but also would have been negatively advantageous in that struggle. This undermined fundamentally strong justifications for religious belief like the argument from design. The Darwinian hypothesis also questioned ideas of order that influence human sight and intellect, such as reason or proportionality in the relationship between cause and effect. Even its defenders, such as Social Darwinists, could only do so by projecting teleology onto the theory and rejecting the notion that chance played a significant role in which species survive, the fittest species. Darwinism was of course roundly condemned from many different points of view and that still continues, but most of the attacks have been along those lines. Despite the fact that George Eliot read Darwin's Origin of Species nearly immediately after it was published, it has been argued that Darwinism had little to no impact on her thinking or creative output. There is no evidence that the Origin upset Tennyson, according to Morse Peckham.

If The Origin of Species had by itself any effect on her creative imagination, it cannot have been much greater than that of the recapitulation theory - the effect of sharpening and pointing a few specific images.' All the external evidence, in fact, points to Spencer rather than Darwin as the prime intellectual influence concern.' She had no serious doubts about the theory's validity in terms

of science, so unlike virtually all Darwinism commentators in the Victorian era, her critique of it does not attack or condemn Darwin's theory in itself. This makes her critique all the more interesting because, despite being well aware that the theory could be interpreted in socially and ethically subversive ways, she had no serious doubts about its validity in terms of science. Although Eliot's letter to Barbara Bodichon on Darwin has frequently been quoted, it is worth repeating because it reveals so much about her attitude toward natural selection: We have just finished reading Darwin's book on the Origin of Species. it marks an important turning point as the expression of his thorough adhesion to the Doctrine of Development after years of study and not the adhesion of an unknown author like the author of the Vestiges [1].

He has gathered a large number of illustrative facts, but the book is poorly written and regrettably devoid of them. He saves them for a future book, of which this smaller one is the avant-courier. This will prevent the study from becoming popular in the same way that the Vestiges did, but it will have a significant impact on the scientific community by sparking a full and honest debate of a problem that people have hitherto been reluctant to address. Thus, the world advances in the direction of bravery, clarity, and honesty! The mystery that lurks underneath the processes, however, makes the Development theory and all other explanations of how things came to be seemed weak in comparison, in my opinion. This letter's tone neither betrays surprise nor excitement. Eliot was undoubtedly aware with Robert Chambers' Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation, and it is most likely that he read Spencer's 1852 piece The Development Hypothesis, which proposed that species were not unchanging and was published in The Leader.

There is no sign that she had any reservations about Darwin's hypothesis, but her critique of his presentation of the facts and manner of writing may imply that she did not share his enthusiasm. However, it should be emphasized that the reference to mystery need not be taken to mean that she did not fully understand the implications of the theory or preferred a metaphysical interpretation of evolution, but rather as a sign that she believed that any human explanation of evolution cannot in itself explain the mystery of existence. H. Huxley, Darwin's main defender and supporter, also criticized its organization. But the fact that this was her first answer only serves to confirm the idea that, unlike Huxley, she was not a fan or an advocate of the theory, but there is also no evidence that she was either for or against it. Not many of her texts explicitly mention Darwin or natural selection, but those that do all imply acceptance but mistrust of the conclusions that might and were being taken from them, particularly as applied to the human sphere. Natural selection is not always good, and depends on many caprices of very foolish animals, she writes in a letter to publisher George Smith [2].

In a passage from Daniel Deronda, the concept of natural selection is applied to the selection of a spouse: It was impossible to be jealous of Juliet Fenn, a girl as middling as mid-day market in everything except her archery and her plainness, wherein she was noticeably like her father: underhung and with receding brow resembling that of the more intelligent fishes. Marriageable men, or what the new English calls intending bridegrooms, should look at themselves objectively in the mirror because their natural selection of a mate prettier than themselves is not guaranteed to bar the effect of their own ugliness. This passage suggests Eliot understood Darwin well enough but allows her narrator to view natural selection in an ironic spirit. Theophrastus Such's Impressions is the finest example of a skeptical viewpoint on the consequences of natural selection. This chapter challenges the friend of the narrator Trost's assertion that robots would soon be able to do a significant portion of human labor. Am I already living in the shadow of the Coming Race, the narrator questions? And would the beings who will eventually surpass us be steely creatures

that spew forth laboratory waste and execute tasks more accurately and flawlessly than we have, doing so with slovenly approximation and self-defeating inaccuracy? In a future of automation, the narrator argues that if computers can do some of humankind's tasks, there is no reason why they cannot perform all of them if they were created without human limitations.

In the end, machines might reproduce on their own and supersede humans by natural selection: Once this last stage is achieved, whether through human invention or an unanticipated outcome, it becomes clear that mankind must be completely eliminated from the field by the process of natural selection. Since machines will be doing everything, humans won't need to exert any energy. As a result, all but a few of the few inventors, calculators, and speculators will have developed pale, pulpy, or cretinous skin from fatty or other degeneration, and you'll see scanty hydrocephalous offspring all around them. The weaker race, whose physical adjustments happened to be accompanied by a maniacal consciousness that imagined itself moving its mover, will have vanished, as all less adapted existences do before the fittest, that is, the existence composed of the most persistent groups of movements and the most capable of incorporating new groups in harmonious relation. As a result, natural selection will eventually eliminate humanity leaving only machines.

Who is to say that the fittest existences won't be discovered along the path of what we refer to as inorganic combinations if our awareness is, as I have been led to believe, only the faltering of our creatures on their road to unconscious perfection? As a result, the planet may be populated by beings that are as blind and deaf as the inner rock, yet they will carry out changes that are delicate and complex as those caused by human language and the intricate web of things that we refer to as its effects. For example, there may be mute orations, mute rhapsodies, mute discussions, and no consciousness there to even appreciate the silence. This vision is based on a Darwinian and non-metaphysical understanding of evolution, which a contemporary reader may find more appealing than a Victorian reader [3]. It demonstrates how Eliot's thinking goes beyond the constraints of her own time and imagines scientific futures that have been hotly contested and discussed in recent decades. Eliot concurs with Darwin's theory that evolution is just a question of finding the optimal adaptation to the environment in order to live and procreate. She also acknowledges that natural selection has the power to wipe out human ideals and the human race as a whole. Only those who are most adaptable are the best, not the fittest.

The 'worst' may end up being more adaptable and resilient than the 'best' if natural selection could be compared to society and people started thinking of society in such terms. This is a question that is, in my opinion, asked when Darwinism is most overtly indicated in her literature, and it is likely what most alarmed her about the potential effects of Darwinism. The analysis of characters in numerous of her works who attempt to live their lives in implicitly Darwinian terms shows that although the theory may be true in scientific terms, it may also have harmful social applications and implications. By looking at the opinions of her boyfriend G, one might uncover more evidence that Eliot was aware of Darwin and that he had an impact on her. H. Lewes discusses the issue. He was very interested in the issue of evolution, and Darwin himself appreciated his opinions. It is quite possible that Lewes and Eliot would have agreed on the scientific foundations of evolution as well as on the ramifications for morality and society. Lewes was a fervent proponent of the scientific veracity of natural selection, as seen by the four pieces he produced for the Fortnightly Review in 1868 under the heading Mr. Darwin's Hypotheses. According to him, Darwin's hypothesis is very valuable since it is responsible for establishing the monist worldview of science more than anything else. The theory of natural selection, in his opinion, shattered all prior

metaphysical formulations, providing a sudden illumination to the old doctrine of evolution by substituting a precise and verifiable conception for the vague or metaphysical conceptions that were then in use.

He cautions, however, that it should be treated as a hypothesis, to be used provisionally as a means of explanation. He challenges both metaphysical and vitalist theories of evolution including, in an intriguing move, Spencer's Lamarckian theory, which holds that functions may lead to structure. Lewes agrees with the Darwinian theory that an organ's structure determines how well it performs. But we have only one half of the great problem of life, when we have the Organism. and it is to this half that the chief researches have been devoted, the other falling into neglect. From the perspective of anyone interested in Eliot's novels, his third essay on Darwin is most important because it discusses the relationship between organism and medium. Describe the other. the environment that the organism lives in. Every distinct item, whether biological and inorganic, is the product of two factors: first, the relationship between its component molecules, and second, the relationship between its substance and all other objects. Its characteristics as an entity or organism are a product of both its molecular make-up and its capacity for environmental adaptability [4]. Organisms are the products of an oddball collection of energies and peculiar ball assortment of occurrences. Abstractly speaking, we can say that there are three regulative laws of life:

1. The Lex Formationis, or so-called organizing force.
2. The Lex Adaptionis, or adaptive tendency.
3. The Lex Hereditatis, or tendency to reproduce both the original form and its acquired modifications.

The organizing force must constantly be taken into account in respect to all external factors. this relationship is summarily described by the term adaptation. the Organism only preserves its individuality by synchronizing its forces with the forces which environ it. Lewes remarks elsewhere, 'a Monad is an organism. a Cell is an organism. a Plant is an organism. a Man is an organism'. Lewes's discussion of the relationship between organism and medium helps one understand why Eliot strives to recreate the medium of her characters in such detail: Tt is the habit of my imagination to strive after as full a vision of the medium in which a character moves as of the character itself and elucidates her comment in Felix Holt that 'there is no private life which has not been determined by a wider public life'. Lewes defines the medium as 'the sum of the relations which the organism maintains with external agencies'. He recognized, however, that there were essential differences between a man's relationship to his social medium and an animal's relationship to its natural medium despite the apparent similarities between the two, as I shall discuss later.

However, it seemed first that this evolutionary model might be used to explain how a human being interacts with their social environment, which alarmed many people in the Victorian era and beyond. After all, Darwin had drawn his theory's foundation from a comparison between Malthus's view of society and nature. Would it not be logical and justified for human beings to view their relationship to society as one of struggle and adaptation in an effort to survive and thrive at all costs? Lewes claims that unless the organism can adapt itself to the new External Medium by the readjustment of its Internal Medium, it perishes. The potential social repercussions of drawing comparisons between a non-human organism's relationship to nature and a person's relationship to their social environment are highlighted in Lewes' summary of Darwinism: We have seen that

Life, and all the forms of Life, result from the relation of the Organism and the Medium. Mr. Darwin has shown how the only way to preserve this relationship is via constant conflict. The organism must first fight against any external forces that are harmful to its constitution when their movements do not coincide with its motions. To win this battle, the organism adapts to these external forces, or aligns its motions with theirs. It must then contend with other creatures in order to consume from them or be devoured by them [5].

Thirdly, it has to outcompete competitors in order to get the resources necessary for the maintenance of its type and its content. The 'survival of the fittest,' as Mr. Spencer cheerfully puts it, will be ensured against such diverse and constant forces of destruction, and it is obvious that any slight superiority the organism may develop will tend to bring it more and more into synchronism with external forces, cosmical and organic. If such an account also applied to people in society, it is obvious why Eliot would have explored in her fictional work. It could make many people think that individuals who prioritize their own interests above all else would be better able to adjust to changes in their environment than those who uphold strong moral principles. Wouldn't the latter have a harder time competing in the battle for survival and adjusting to societal change? Another argument that Darwinism might be used to promote is that morality is a merely human code with no ultimate authority. If this is the case, why should humans allow morality to constrain their self-interest?

A society that is more Darwinian a place of conflict and rivalry amongst self-interested people who are willing to adapt in any manner to guarantee their personal benefit and survival could result from such notions permeating people's moral and social thinking. By holding a belief that humanity was not fundamentally distinct from lower animals a position he did not develop until The Descent of Man in 1871 but which was a clear implication of the Origin and by the blow his theory dealt to conventional worldviews, Darwin himself contributed to the spread of these ideas. Spencer also promoted the idea that civilization may be seen as an evolutionary process. In reality, a review of Darwinism-related literature reveals that many Victorians, including both scientists and non-scientists, were eager to apply natural selection and the fight for life to human civilization. As one of the most prominent Darwin supporters, Ernst Haeckel, put it, This great competition for the necessaries of life goes on everywhere and at all times, among human beings and animals as well as among plants applies to humans. It is, without a doubt, true that even in the most advanced communities natural selection still plays a certain part.

You need only cast a glance at human society to see that this competition exists everywhere and in all the different branches of human activity. James Sully, a friend of Lewes and Eliot, expresses a similar viewpoint. Natural selection's social effects were viewed dimly by Alfred Russel Wallace, a co-discoverer of the theory, who said: Among civilized nations at the present day, it does not seem possible for natural selection to act in any way so as to secure the permanent advancement of morality and intelligence. Huxley, in his Romanes lecture, was also critical of natural selection in society. He said that 'ruthless self-assertion' must be regulated and 'the gladiatorial philosophy of life' must be rejected for society to advance [6]. The Creed of Science by William Graham, published in 1881, is one of the most fascinating books on the effects of Darwinism. Darwin himself read it and recommended it to Wallace. He connects the fanatical individualism of our time to attempts to apply the analogy of cosmic nature to society.

As I'll describe further, Graham's belief that Darwinism may result in the development of nihilistic self-seekers is similar to Eliot's own belief as expressed in her literature. He infers the following

conclusions from the struggle for survival: Why should we go against our obvious self-interest, the first of our duties, and adopt disinterested ideas that see life as an endlessly competitive battle? The evolutionists cannot claim that we follow them because they provide us more joy and satisfaction, as the benevolent moralists might. And when a conflict which must always exist occurs between the impulses of self-assertion and self-forgetfulness, between our purported interests and conscience, why shouldn't we reject the authority of conscience when her claims to rule amount to nothing more than a simple inherited tendency?

Considering that Darwin and Spencer only provide us with the fact of inherited propensity, he continues, If virtue is only the product of convention, the selfish man can easily rationalize it away when it is in conflict with his self-interest. If Darwinian theory is widely embraced, society would ultimately collapse under the weight of deluge of immorality and moral materialism as bad as immorality. Since Darwinism also dealt the largest blow yet to the ingrained anthropocentric belief that there was order and purpose in the cosmos, these social and moral implications of Darwinism were all the more upsetting to many Victorians. It may be claimed that Darwin's universe seemed to consist simply of blind chance, conflict, and adaptation in contrast to all preceding religious and moral systems. The idea that there is no moral order in the universe that compels people to adopt a morality that transcends self-interest might thus be readily supported by Darwinism.

The moral ordering of the world is obviously a beautiful poetry that is shown to be untrue by the real facts, according to Haeckel, who vehemently asserted that Darwin's theory eliminated any foundation for believing in a moral order. It doesn't exist in either the natural world or human existence. Some Victorians found Darwin's emphasis on chance intolerable: That this ordered Cosmos is not from necessity or chance, is almost a self-evident fact... The terrible and ceaseless Struggle for Existence gives the real impulse to the blind course of the world. Is it a coincidence that heat and light allow plants to continue their amazing processes? Even Wallace found it difficult to accept the absence of direction. He claimed that the world and the universe are as they are, first and foremost, for the development of life culminating in man. secondly, as a vast school-house for the higher education of the human race in preparation for the enduring spiritual life to which it is destined. He expressed the hope that this doctrine would be appealing to all who accept the view that the universe is not a chance product.

In The Creed of Science, William Graham argued that it would be dangerous to replace purpose and design with chance. In the event that Darwin is correct, all theism is useless, and even worse, it was chance that stumbled upon every living thing, as well as that unique thing, the human consciousness, with all its wonderful content - Art, Science, Morality. However, he continues that this cannot be accepted because the need for order and purpose is a mental requirement. The application of natural selection and the struggle for existence by analogy to society and to the social and moral life of humanity, as well as the blow the theory dealt to the idea of design and purpose in the universe, were likely the two most serious implications of Darwinism for many Victorians. However, it should be noted that the majority of people were able to reconcile evolution with comforting concepts of order, such as Spencer's translation of natural selection into struggle for existence. It is most likely that Eliot had already come to terms with Feuerbach's anthropocentric worldviews when she accepted certain of Darwin's findings before the Origin, such as the transmutation of species and that mankind was the result of evolution.

But Darwin made the perilous ramifications of such notions far more obvious, not just to a select group of intellectuals but to everyone who wanted to read his book and make a few straightforward

deductions, as Graham did, for instance These facts of competition and chance... bring the fact and the reminder that life is still, despite our moral progress, in a real and most serious sense, a struggle of each for himself, and a struggle not just against his competing fellows but also against the threatening of contingencies from within and without, to the individual in the thick of the competitive and pitiless struggle [7]. Eliot's fiction anticipates such conclusions being drawn from Darwinism, and I shall try to show that it does. Before focusing on Darwinism in her fiction, one must first consider the fundamental reasons for her criticism: despite some similarities between how humans relate to their social environment and how non-human organisms relate to their natural environment, it was incorrect to view the relationship between a human being and society in terms of struggle and adaptation, primarily because there were significant differences between a social and a natural environment.

Considering Lewes' thorough criticism of social applications of Darwinism in his book, The Study of Psychology, the fourth volume of his Problems of Life and Mind, provides evidence that this was the attitude toward Darwinism that appears in Eliot's fiction. Eliot worked closely on its creation, putting it together from Lewes's notes after his passing. She not only nearly certainly shared his opinions on the matter in general, but she also changed his writing to reflect her own ideas. Lewes objects to Darwin's application of the theory of evolution to people. He emphasizes that because humans are social animals, they are fundamentally different from other animals. As a result, any comparison between people and animals must take this into account. Biology provides both a method and data for understanding how an organism interacts with its environment, and for the purposes of animal psychology, this is sufficient. However, human psychology has a larger scope and takes into account another crucial element, the impact of social media. This is an element that pervades the whole mental structure. it is not only an addition, like the addition of a new sense that gives rise to new modes of Feeling. It makes all the difficulties more difficult. Man is an animal in regard to nature, but he is a social being in connection to culture. Nature is physically and ethically altered by culture.

Although both an ape and a man have hands, the ape's faculties are not a fiftieth part of those performed by the hand of man. They exhibit some sympathy for infants and tiny animals, but this sensitivity disappears when an egoistic desire is present. He draws comparisons between a mother human and a baboon in behavior. The ability of language to convey the outcomes of others' experiences to those who have not personally experienced them, as opposed to an animal's solely personal experience, allows the human mother to transform a maternal instinct into a maternal sentiment in the case of human responses. In this way, a human mother may respect the demands of all of her children, not just her own. She has what a monkey lacks: an intellectual appreciation of the claims of the helpless. Lewes continues, The law of animal action is individualism. its maxim is 'Each for himself against all'. Altruism is the epitome of human behavior, and its slogan is Each with others, all for each [8].

DISCUSSION

It is impossible to overestimate the influence of Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection on Victorian thinking and modern viewpoints. Long-held theological and philosophical assumptions were called into question by Darwin's revolutionary theory, which profoundly altered how people saw the natural world, human life, and the interrelationship between science and religion. This conversation explores Darwinism's tremendous impact on Victorian culture and how it continues to inform modern viewpoints. The revolutionary On the Origin of Speciesthat introduced Darwin's

theory of natural selection had a profound influence on Victorian ideas. Before Darwin, the dominant views focused on a hierarchical vision of existence with humans at the top and a creation by a divine hand. But according to Darwin's view, all species including people had developed through a process of descent with modification fueled by natural selection. This put into question the idea that mankind has a special place in the natural order, seriously undermining religious ideas.

The way Victorian society reacted to Darwin's hypothesis was varied and complex. Darwinism was regarded by some, like Thomas Huxley, as a scientific revolution that transformed our view of the natural world. As Darwin's Bulldog, Huxley vehemently supported the theory and pushed for its adoption. Others, like George Eliot, explored Darwin's theories in more depth. Famous author George Eliot studied Darwin's work but did not completely accept it. She instead criticized Darwin's presentation of the facts and his writing style while recognizing the factual veracity of the idea. Her multifaceted strategy reflects the period's vibrant intellectual climate. Beyond science, Darwinism also had broad ramifications for Victorian culture. The idea of Social Darwinism came into existence, wherein some people tried to apply the ideas of natural selection to human society. This gave rise to divisive concepts on competition, the rule of the fittest, and the function of the government in promoting social welfare.

Discussions of economics and social policy today continue to center on the ethical implications of social Darwinism. Darwin's hypothesis is still relevant in today's viewpoints. The overwhelming evidence supporting evolution by natural selection has been produced in the twenty-first century by advances in science. However, disagreements regarding whether evolution and religious ideas are compatible still exist. While some religious organizations continue to oppose evolution, many have found a way to reconcile the two. Additionally, as the title suggests, the non-metaphysical interpretation of evolution is growing in popularity among modern readers. Scientific naturalism and secular humanism are compatible with the notion that natural selection may be understood without resorting to metaphysical or theological interpretations. It also emphasizes how Darwin's theory continues to be relevant in influencing conversations about the meaning of life, purpose, and ethics.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Darwin's influence on Victorian philosophy and modern viewpoints is evidence of the concepts' ongoing value. Natural selection's far-reaching consequences for Victorian culture sparked discussions that continue to influence how we see science, religion, ethics, and the meaning of life today. Darwin's theory continues to be a pillar in our on-going investigation of these essential concerns as we negotiate the intricacies of the contemporary world. Because society is the result of human emotions and that existence is Pari passu developed with those emotions, which in turn it modifies and enlarges at each stage, biology can never be used on its own to understand humanity. sociology must be taken into consideration. The organism adapts to the external medium. it creates and is in turn modified by the social medium. Lewes believes Darwin is not aware of this enough. Lewes challenges Darwin in the part headed Differences of Animal and Human. Lewes believes that Darwin erred in his distinction between functions and evolved faculties when he said in The Descent of Man that there was no fundamental difference in mental faculties between humans and higher animals. When he refers to an organ's function, he means its native endowment, and when he refers to faculty, he means its acquired variation of activity. Humans and higher animals may be comparable in terms of their biological functions, but there is

little overlap when it comes to their faculties. Humans' acquisition of the language faculty completely altered their primal instincts. In the same section, Lewes makes the following crucial distinction between humans and animals: Animals have egoistic impulses. they have hardly any sympathetic altruistic impulses beyond the sexual and parental.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. M. Smith and G. Beer, Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot, and Nineteenth-Century Fiction, *Yearb. English Stud.*, 1987, doi: 10.2307/3507727.

[2] C. Fleming and J. Goodall, Dangerous Darwinism, *Public Underst. Sci.*, 2002, doi: 10.1088/0963-6625/11/3/304.

[3] J. Van Wyhe, *Phrenology and the origins of Victorian scientific naturalism*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315246857.

[4] S. To and B. Archive, *The Rough Guide to Evolution*. 2009.

[5] S. Rizzo, Adaptation and the Art of Survival, *M/C J.*, 2007, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2623.

[6] A. Hauge, Thomas H. Huxley - Marinelegen som ble Darwins bulldogg, *Tidsskr. den Nor. Laegeforening*, 2000.

[7] A. Soubry, Epigenetic inheritance and evolution: A paternal perspective on dietary influences, *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology*. 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2015.02.008.

[8] B. D. Mckay and R. M. Zink, Sisyphean evolution in Darwin's finches, *Biol. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/brv.12127.

CHAPTER 2

EXPLORING THE EVOLUTIONARY UNDERCURRENTS: CHARACTERS AND RELATIONSHIPS

Indu Tripathi, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- indu_tripathi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This abstract explores the existence of Darwinian motifs in George Eliot's literary works, concentrating on how evolutionary undercurrents are portrayed in characters and relationships. Novels by Eliot, like Felix Holt and others, offer individuals that personify the Darwinian idea of obstinate individuality, motivated by self-interest and situation adaptability. This research emphasizes how the competitive and often immoral characteristics of Darwinian ideology are reflected in these personalities. The abstract also emphasizes the conflict between such individuality and the expectations of human society, highlighting how Eliot's characters struggle to hide their genuine intentions and feelings in a society that places a premium on morality and social cohesiveness. The fundamental subject is the tension between self-interest and social expectations, which is reminiscent of Darwin's theory of evolution and the battle for survival and competitiveness in the natural world. The abstract also examines the development of characters like Harry Transome, who display animal-like characteristics as a result of a lack of socialization. This picture encourages reflection on how human nature and animal impulses interact, in line with Darwin's theory of evolution.

KEYWORDS:

Darwinian, Evolutionary Undercurrents, George Eliot, Human Nature, Individualism, Social Adaptation.

INTRODUCTION

Is Eliot's view on Darwinism a key theme in her fiction? I'll make the case that it is. Particularly, there are strong Darwinian overtones in the character of the immoral individualist that appears more or less often after Silas Marner. This figure is particularly evident in Felix Holt, a book with strong Darwinian resonances, with the rather ironically called Christian being the most obviously Darwinian character. Christian is a chilly, calculating, solitary person who is resolved to always act in his own best interests. His desire to modify oneself to any set of circumstances so that he might take benefit of any condition that occurs serves as an example of the Darwinian component of his character. The book demonstrates that, despite all of his planning and willingness to adjust, he is not always in control of the situation: Mr. Christian was not immune to physical pain, a situation to which there is no known method of adapting one's self. He had been remarkable throughout his life for that power of adapting himself to circumstances that enables a man to fall safely on all fours in the most hurried expulsions and escapes.

The focus on adapting to circumstances in this text references to Darwinian philosophy, which makes Christian collapse to the ground like an animal. The rather convoluted story scenario in which Christian must take opium to treat a physical condition, passes out while holding a crucial letter, and Scales then cuts off his pocket does have a thematic importance. Christian believes he

can use chance and circumstance to his advantage, and he usually succeeds in doing so. However, he is unable to adapt to every condition, and the sheer unpredictable nature of occurrences cannot be predicted. Even by its own standards, living just for one's own interests does not guarantee success. Men like Christian who bet on controlling every circumstance and depend on dishonesty to give them an edge over others are particularly susceptible when things go against them. In Graham's The Creed of Science, Darwinian man is exemplified by the Christian, who subtly asks, Why should we follow disinterested principles against our clear self-interest? on the idea that life is an endless struggle between competitors [1].

Christian, who had long since outlived the more impulsive pleasures of life, had evolved into a sober thinker. He had decided that, for a man who had long since spent all of his own money, working for a wealthy family was the next best thing to retirement. However, if a better opportunity presented itself, a talented individual should not let it pass them by. He was holding numerous threads ends, but if he pulled on them too quickly, it might become dangerous. He is willing to adjust to any situation for his own benefit, quick to take advantage of chance for his own gain, and leads a calculated life that disregards morality. Depending on what appears appropriate given the circumstances, he may be either a master or a slave. While he is submissive to his boss, Mr. Lyon finds him to be a master of manners. Without admitting his history or the repercussions of his actions, he thinks he can live a life free of obligations. He even used a different man's identity for his own gain. Felix Holt, however, demonstrates that this 'Darwinian' type of existence is really extremely unworkable from a human perspective.

He must conceal his motivations and emotions from everyone in order to live it, since disclosing them to anybody would leave him exposed. He must thus decide between seclusion and estrangement. A life committed to unrelenting individualism cannot be lived openly in human society because the person cannot help but be concerned with how other people will perceive his motivations and behavior. It must be kept under wraps and concealed. This is an 'unnatural' human existence. Even if a commitment to one's own self-interest at all times may be 'natural' for an animal, it is unnatural in human society, because individuals are unable to conceive of themselves in isolation from others since language and mind are inherently connected to one another. A man can never separate himself from his past history, despite Christian's belief that the past is unrelated to the person he is now. This is true in two ways: first, Christian is impacted when others perceive him differently after learning about his background, and he cannot help but view of his life as a continuous series of events. The conflict between Christian's individuality and other individualism has unique Darwinian ramifications. Since Jermyn and Johnson share his commitment to self-interest, there is conflict between them [2].

Jermyn is confident that he can defeat his opponents, but the following chess analogy is used to explain the nature of his situation: Imagine what a game of chess would be like if all of the chessmen had passions and intellects, more or less small and cunning: if you were uncertain about your own men as well as your opponent's. if your knight could sneak onto a new square. if your bishop, indignant at your actions, turned away from the Even if you are the most deductively savvy person, you could lose to your own pawns. If you relied haughtily on your mathematical imagination and disregarded your emotive components, you would be particularly likely to lose. However, compared to the game a man must play against other men using other men as his tools, this imagined game of chess is simple. Perhaps because he believes in no tie other than self-interest, he believes himself to be wise. However, the only self-interest he can securely depend on is what seems to be such to the intellect he would use or rule.

He may never be certain of this. The self-interested individualism of persons like Jermyn, Christian, and Johnson resembles a Darwinian world of rivalry and struggle in the social media, but as the text above demonstrates, there is no security for the human individual who lives this style of existence. Only when other people live law-abiding, moral lives and the individualist is willing to lie and take advantage of them for his personal gain can it work properly. But he can never feel comfortable or fear-free when he must fight against others who have the same self-interest as him. Eliot is arguing that having to maintain such a mental state all the time is unbearable for humans. Jermyn is a figure with Darwinian overtones, much like Christian. His 'savage side' or animalistic traits are heavily stressed. He is described in a way that has evolutionary ramifications. He has a tooth as wicked as a rat, according to Christian, who describes him as such. I have adequate familiarity with the kind of pest. One or two were fattened by Pve'. But even if a guy could be eager to flee via a sewer, a sewer with an opening into the dry air is not usually close. This idea is repeated in a subsequent paragraph about him. He is willing to use any strategy or adaption to survive as Harold Transome puts pressure on him and he is on the verge of destruction [3].

A particularly Darwinian line that is used to characterize him when he has run out of options reads, A doomed animal, with every issue earthed up except that where its enemy stands, must, if it has teeth and fierceness, try its one chance without delay. And a man may reach a stage in his life when he lacks the capacity for scruples to separate his impulses from those of a hunted beast. Because of how strong and numerous it is, our selfishness readily snatches all nourishment away from our pathetic little scruples when given the chance. Eliot is not dismissing or disproving the notion that humans share any traits with lesser animals. On the opposite. However, Lewes asserted that the major distinction between humans and animals is that socialization and the adoption of language have altered human awareness. But before socialization, a person is not much different from an animal.

This is best shown by looking at Harry Transome, Harold Transome's little son, who is the book's most obstinate egotist. Due to his upbringing, which was essentially devoid of social influences, he retains many of his animalistic traits. The passage that follows, which describes his meeting with Esther, illustrates how similar he is to an animal: This creature, with the soft broad brown cheeks, low forehead, great black eyes, tiny well-defined nose, fierce biting tricks towards every person and thing he disliked, and insistence on entirely occupying those he liked, was a human specimen like Esther had never seen before, and she seemed to be equally novel in Harry's experience. He threw himself back against his Gappa, as he called old Mr. Transome, and stared at this new-corner with all the gravity of a wild animal at first because of her light complexion, blue gown, and possibly also her sunny smile and her hands stretched out towards him [4].

The old man started to tell Esther about Harry's amazing deeds after noticing that she tolerated having her hair pulled down and was willing to be harnessed and beaten. He described how, one day, while Gappa was asleep, he had unpinned an entire drawer's worth of beetles to see if they would fly away. then, disgusted with their stupidity, he was about to throw them all on the ground and stamp on them when Dominic entered and stopped him. But the fact that Harry rarely ever spoke in favor of producing inarticulate sounds or mixing words in his own way was what old Mr. Transome considered to be the most amazing evidence of an almost superhuman intelligence. Harry's rejection of language the quality that distinguishes humans from other animals reveals his primal nature. Extreme individualists with tendencies toward animal egoism are Jermyn and Christian. Their actions suggest a rejection of human society and a desire to revert to an exclusively

animal style of existence. There are more characters in Eliot's novels besides Jermyn and Christian whose conceptions may be shown to have been shaped by Darwinism.

Tito in Romola is her most intricate and subtly psychologically portrayed individualist of the Christian kind, while Lapidoth in Daniel Deronda is maybe the most degraded version of the same sort of character. The main criticism of all of these characters is that they choose to ignore the fact that such a way of living is unnatural for people because they are social animals and instead try to live almost animal-like egoistic lives, ready to use any means to take advantage of situations and adapt to their environment to suit their own purposes. Social influences have altered human cognition to the point that an individual cannot conceive of himself or herself in isolation from others or from society. Only by rejecting a human identity can one live a completely autonomous existence. Eliot's criticism may have been influenced by Aristotle's Politics, which argues that because everyone is born into a community or polis and that polis ultimately exists for the benefit of the good life, ethics are an essential component of what it is to be a person. Thus, one notable impact of Darwinism on Eliot's books is the development and contextualization of her interest with human egotism. She would have been even more aware than her contemporaries of the social and moral risks of Darwinism's possible application as a rationale for overt egotism and the pursuit of self-interest since egotism is a major issue in her work before the release of the Origin [5].

She didn't need Darwin to support the idea that humans were descended from animals or to reach the conclusion that people were naturally egotistic, but it was obvious that a scientific theory that might be interpreted as defending and approving egotism and selfish behavior could be hazardous to society. Eliot does not, however, derive only negative and gloomy inferences from Darwinian concepts, in contrast to writers like Graham. Her fiction contends that since people are social animals whose consciousness has been altered by language and social forces, they are able to sublimate rather than simply transcend this animal egotism. Characters like Felix Holt or Mr. Lyon are no less fundamentally egotistic than those like Christian, Jermyn, or Tito, but because to their ethical sensibility, they are usually able to subdue those urges or practice renunciation. Eliot believed that the risk of applying Darwinism to people and society in a basic way was that it would provide philosophical backing to an ideology that did not allow for sublimation or renunciation. Lewes's remark demonstrates that he believed Darwinism did not pose a danger to moral principles on its own: All the animal Impulses become blended with human Emotions.

Even though humans are inherently egoistic and susceptible to animal impulses, the animalistic side of their nature can be transformed or overcome through the influence of a purely human consciousness. In the process of evolution, starting from the merely animal appetite of sexuality, we arrive at the purest and most far-reaching tenderness. Darwinian problems are also present in Middlemarch. The influence of Darwinism is probably most evident in the imagery of the novel, particularly in relation to Lydgate: Lydgate was much worried, and conscious of new elements in his life as noxious to him as an inlet of mud to a creature that has been used to breathe and bathe and dart after its illuminated prey in the clearest of waters. A comparison between Dorset and Middlemarch shows how the novel's imagery reflects Darwinism. She is considerably more competent than he is at sublimation and renunciation, thus their difference is not that she has less fundamental egoism.

She is able to resist the egotistic urge to hurt him even when her ego is under the most pressure after Casaubon ignores her after he consults Lydgate about his health because she understands that doing so would be socially and naturally untrue. the urge to hurt him is an animal impulse that

belongs to the moment and can be consciously resisted. But Lydgate often gives in to such egotistical urges. The apparent illustration of this is his desire for Laure: He knew that this was like the sudden impulse of a madman - incongruous even with his habitual foibles. No big deal! It was the one thing he was determined to do in a manner that would be unthinkable for Dorothea, he is likewise prone to adjust himself to circumstances when doing so advances his limited self-interest. The need to adapt in whatever manner required to live increases as his financial problems worsen and Rosamond's stronger will eventually takes control of him. As a result, he votes for Tyke with Bulstrode even if all of his better emotions implore him to support Farebrother. He adopts the position that chance has an empire which reduces choice to a fool's illusion as his old idealism disintegrates [6].

His initial resolve to refuse Bulstrode's offer of money crumbles as his troubles worsen, and he adjusts to the situation by gladly accepting without fully considering Bulstrode's intentions. Ladislaw, who turns down Bulstrode's money, stands out in stark contrast. Characters like Dorothea and Ladislaw are able to resist animal instincts or the need to quickly adjust to any circumstance for the purpose of self-interest because they have a notion of themselves available to their awareness. Despite having certain idealistic traits and not being as Darwinian as figures like Jermyn or Christian, Lydgate struggles to manage his egotism. It's even been said that his pursuit of knowledge is mostly driven by a desire for power. Therefore, animal egotism predominates in Lydgate, making him susceptible to momentary impulses and motivating him to make self-interested compromises when the going gets tough. We may have found Eliot's most Darwinian figure in Daniel Deronda. Lapidoth is a guy wholly controlled by his own interests and is willing to modify himself to any situation if it would be advantageous.

The book links this trait to gambling, and of course Darwin's focus on chance in species survival indicated that the whole evolutionary process might be likened to gambling. Lapidoth is a gambler and actor who constantly thinks in terms of chance: I came to England with no prospect, but the chance of finding you. He began with the intention of awaiting some really good chance, such as an opening for getting a considerable sum from Deronda. and He came to England with no prospect, but the chance of finding you. In him, gambling is practiced to the utmost degree: His appetite for gambling is more absolute than his physical hunger, which can be subdued by an emotional or intellectual excitement. however, his passion for watching chances his habitual suspensive poise during real or imagined play nullifies his susceptibility to other excitement. It seems to be the unpleasant dissipation of devils seeking distraction on the fiery sea of hell in its last, imperious stage. Lapidoth is capable of adjusting to any circumstance without being constrained by any moral principles at all [7].

Even the prospect of confronting Mordecai, who will undoubtedly be held accountable for his past actions toward his family, does not trouble him: Lapidoth had some sense of what was being prepared for him in his son's mind, but he was beginning to adjust himself to the situation and find a point of view that would give him a cool superiority to any attempt at humiliating him, for his imagination was more wrought on by the chances of his getting something into Even though Mordecai is surprised by the severity of the condemnation, he nevertheless assumes another role to cope with the challenging circumstances: and yet, strangely, while this hysterical crying was an inevitable reaction in him under the stress of his son's words, it was also a conscious resource in a difficulty. Lapidoth doesn't seem to have any kind of human identification. His acts are only motivated by self-interest and the drive to live at any costs. Everything is secondary. He essentially no longer qualifies as a person and merely has animal awareness.

The depiction of Gwendolen Harleth also takes into account Darwinian links. She enjoys playing roles and gambling much like Lapidoth, but unlike Lapidoth, she still has a human personality, although one that is driven by neurosis and guilt. She initially had a lot of faith in her ability to take advantage of chance for herself: for being satisfied with her own chances, she felt kindly towards everyone and was satisfied with the universe. She had known that she had a life full of opportunities that she could take advantage of with her intelligence and enthusiasm. However, she discovers, like Lydgate, that the world is less changeable than she had anticipated when her family loses its financial backing. She discovers that in order to live, she must adapt to her surroundings. She believed that being married to Grandcourt would have provided her with a route out, but learning the truth about his background is devastating: A splendid marriage that appeared to be within reach had revealed a hideous flaw. The roulette odds had not changed in response to her assertions. Then Klesmer dashes her dreams of becoming a famous singer. She seems to be under strain similar to a creature trying to adjust to being in an unfamiliar environment. By being married, according to Mr. Gascoigne, Gwendolen was going to adapt herself to circumstances like a girl of good sense.

Pressure to marry Grandcourt mounts as she has less and less space for maneuvering. It's remarkable that she eventually accepted him without making a conscious decision to do so. She is unable to exercise her willpower to make the moral decision to reject him because she has been trained to constantly act on impulse or out of self-interest: She could not let him go: that negative was a clutch. She gives in to pressure from outside influences like an animal rather than being able to make a human choice to reject egotistical urges. Even though Gwendolen lacks self-transcending ideals and accepts Grandcourt after making a promise to Mrs. Glasher, Eliot believes that humans can be true to an idea or belief that can serve as the object of desire and impulse and thus triumph over animal egotism. In contrast to Lapidoth, animal egotism does not essentially erase the human element of the self, as seen by the psychological effects of this that are so cognitively and emotionally traumatic for her. The link between Gwendolen and Grandcourt has an evolutionary component as well. He is like a sleepy-eyed animal on the watch for prey. The story places a lot of emphasis on his delight in dominating, which derives from animal egotism. He finds relevance in a statement made by Lewes on animal behavior: The animal must destroy in order to eat. Anger, the feeling of a thwarted urge, is triggered when a competitor threatens to steal part of this food. The similar emotion is evoked by the suppressed sexual need. This will lead to the higher creative animals' passion of Domination, which is the urge to frighten or subjugate others [8].

This paragraph from Lewes helps in defining the sexual sadism that underlies Grandcourt and Gwendolen's relationship. He is an aristocrat as well, but one without any longer. His domineering traits may have once found a healthy social outlet if he had been sent to govern a difficult colony but in the absence of such, they have degraded into sadism. This allusion to the Governor Eyre scandal may be interpreted as a recognition that the perversion or distortion of animal egotism and the desire to rule can result in oppression or tyranny and have far worse repercussions than giving in to a purely animal impulse. The novels make the argument that sublimations carry some risk and should be subject to criticism. For instance, Savonarola's idealism in Romola is seriously flawed, as Romola eventually realizes, and it is to a much greater extent that of the prior in The Spanish Gypsy, a devoted inquisitor who feels justified in carrying out mass murder. Even Felix Holt and Mordecai's seemingly optimistic presentation of idealism is met with considerable skepticism. Since Felix gives opportunity for the multitudinous small wickedness’s of small selfish

ends to issue in widely shared mischief that might yet be hideous, he indirectly contributes to the death of a police officer and also makes the situation worse than it was originally.

According to traditional interpretations of Mordecai, he and his idealistic proto-Zionist optimism are portrayed in an unmistakably good light. However, as I will explain in more detail below, the book implies that Mordecai, an idealist, is ignorant of the evil side of human nature and that prophets and visionaries are in dangerous company with lunatics in addition to figures like Copernicus and Galileo. It could be good that Deronda, who has more experience, would carry on Mordecai's idealistic legacy. Darwinism, which purportedly demonstrated that humans originated from lower animals, also greatly influenced gloomy conceptions of human nature, as seen by its effect on neo-Gothic works like Dracula and Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The portentous opening sentence of the epigraph of Daniel Deronda, Let thy chief terror be of thine own soul, hints that Daniel Deronda and literature like these are related. The darker messages that can be drawn from Darwinism have some validity, and higher ideals that refuse to acknowledge and, therefore, fail to confront those darker messages, may be more dangerous than giving in to animal impulse, she does not deny. However, as I have argued, Eliot subjects Darwinism as applied to the human situation to serious critique.

DISCUSSION

The Victorian era's interesting synthesis of literature and science may be seen in George Eliot's use of Darwinian themes in her work. Natural selection, a hypothesis put out by Charles Darwin that contradicted conventional wisdom on the relationship between humans and the natural world, had a significant influence on the intellectual climate of the day. A well-known Victorian author named George Eliot explored similar evolutionary concepts in her writings, carefully incorporating them into the fabric of her stories. With an emphasis on the evolutionary undercurrents in George Eliot's characters and their interactions, this debate examines the study of Darwinian themes in her writing. Eliot's investigation of adaptation in her characters is analogous to Darwin's theory of natural adaptation. Characters like Christian show the capacity to adapt to varied circumstances and take advantage of possibilities for one's own gain. However, Eliot also emphasizes how unpredictable life can be, warning readers that even the most cool-headed people could not always be in charge.

Darwin's theories regarding the principle of the survival of the fittest and the significance of chance in evolution are reflected in this conflict between adaptation and unpredictability. The intricate interaction between individuality and society conventions is explored in Eliot's literature. Even if self-interest and adaptability are valuing that individual like Christian and Jermyn embrace, they also have to deal with the repercussions of their choices in a human society that is marked by entwined ties. The conflict between Darwinian individuality and the innate interdependence of human society is shown in this investigation. The protagonists in Eliot's works must strike a careful balance between their own desires and the demands of a broader societal order. Eliot's characters, like Harry Transome, provide light on how socialization affects conduct in people. Due to his isolated upbringing and lack of social interactions, Harry still exhibits certain animalistic characteristics. This picture casts doubt on the idea of a fully Darwinian perspective of individuality by highlighting the influence of cultural conditioning on human nature and behavior.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the inclusion of Darwinian elements in George Eliot's writing gives her stories more nuance and complexity. Eliot investigates the evolutionary undercurrents that were altering Victorian ideas via her characters and their interactions. Her complex depiction of individuality, adaptability, and the interaction between human nature and social conventions reflects the continuing conversation between science and literature at this time. Eliot engages readers in a provocative investigation of the growing knowledge of human life and the natural world by incorporating Darwinian elements into her novels. Characterization of George Eliot's characters is one of the most obvious examples of Darwinian themes in her literature. Notably, individuals like Christian from Felix Holt represent characteristics linked to Darwin's hypothesis. Christian exemplifies the Darwinian idea of individualism, which is the tireless pursuit of one's own interests and adaptation to one's environment for one's own benefit. Eliot's depiction of Christian's methodical and isolated life is a literary allegory of Darwin's description of the battle for survival and advantage in the natural world.

REFERENCES:

[1] Ryan, Victorian Empiricism: Self, Knowledge, and Reality in Ruskin, Bain, Lewes, Spencer, and George Eliot, by Peter Garratt, *Vic. Stud.*, 2012, doi: 10.2979/victorianstudies.54.3.525.

[2] R. Rylance, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*. 2011. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198122838.001.0001.

[3] A. La Vergata, Gillian Beer, Darwin’s Plots. Evolutionary Narrative In Darwin, George Eliot And Nineteenth-Century Fiction, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, ARK Paperbacks 1983, xi, 303 pp., *Nuncius*, 2012, doi: 10.1163/182539189x00266.

[4] D. Griffiths, *The age of analogy: Science and literature between the darwins*. 2016. doi: 10.1080/08905495.2018.1395802.

[5] L. Cameron, Spencerian evolutionary psychology in Daniel Deronda, *Vic. Lit. Cult.*, 2015, doi: 10.1017/S1060150314000345.

[6] A. Neill, *Primitivr minds: Evolution and spiritual experience in the Victorian novel*. 2013. doi: 10.5860/choice.51-3106.

[7] B. Vermeule, A Comeuppance Theory of Narrative and the Emotions, in *Subversion and Sympathy: Gender, Law, and the British Novel*, 2013. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199812042.003.0015.

[8] S.-C. Wu *et al.*, Traditional and Agile Earned Value Management Processes, *J. Syst. Softw.*, 2013.

CHAPTER 3

A REVIEW: THREADS REBELLION AND INDIVIDUALISM

Zareen Usmani Farooq, Associate Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- farooqzf@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

The intriguing examination of the Byronic egotist by George Eliot in her literary works is the focus of this abstract, which also explores the author's connection with the concepts of rebellion and individuality on a deeper level. Although commentators have noted Eliot's obsession with the Byronic character, her distinctive viewpoint and criticism of this archetype need greater investigation. The traits of the Byronic egotist, a character type with roots in Gothic literature and Romanticism, include a rejection of outside authority and the conviction that one can create their own moral code on their own. Through the Byronic characteristics she gives her characters, as Silva in The Spanish Gypsy, Eliot is able to see through difficult philosophical and cultural terrains. It also emphasizes Eliot's complex treatment of the Byronic egotist by focusing on her investigation of the reasons behind and effects of their egocentric impulses. Additionally, it highlights Eliot's efforts to undermine the Byronic's subversive influence inside European literary and intellectual settings, highlighting her broad interests outside of her home English literature.

KEYWORDS:

Byronic Egotist, Character Analysis, Cultural Critique, George Eliot, Individualism, Philosophical Exploration.

INTRODUCTION

George Eliot's concern with egotism has been acknowledged by almost all of her critics, but she is not typically regarded as one of the nineteenth-century authors who took a serious interest in the Byronic egotist, a figure who emerged from Gothic literature and the Sturm und Drang and who gained the most notoriety in Byron's works. Numerous authors utilized this character often in nineteenth-century literature to represent revolution or egotistical striving. The Byronic egotist's refusal to recognize any outside authority that may define him may be his defining characteristic. Like Byron's Manfred, he either rejects all authorities that want to establish their supremacy over the self, or he believes that he may forge his own moral standards by an act of will that is completely independent of all publicly recognized moral laws. However, characters with Byronic associations or aspects who are committed to ego or will or to their own self-selected values appear in most of her novels, such as Stephen Guest in The Mill on the Floss to a lesser extent. Mrs. Transome and Esther Lyon in Felix Holt.

Ladislaw in Middlemarch, who Mrs. Cadwallader calls a sort of Byronic hero though more of a Romantic aesthete Since realist literature is not well suited to portraying the Byronic in its most extreme form, critics seldom examine these characters in Byronic terms. In instance, Armgart in the poem of the same name and Don Silva in her tragic verse play The Spanish Gypsy are two of Eliot's most overtly Byronic characters. When examining Eliot's whole body of work, critics should pay close attention to her persistent interest in the Byronic. Despite the fact that she came to detest Byron's poetry and persona Byron and his poetry have become more and more repugnant

to me of late years her familiarity with his work is evident in all of her works. Examining why she chose to criticize the Byronic so forcefully in The Spanish Gypsy and why she continued to write about it as late as the 1860s and 1870s would once again demonstrate her interest in the most important intellectual and philosophical topics of her day. The Byronic, like Darwinism, poses a serious challenge that, like Darwinism, has persisted and presents questions that are still relevant in the twenty-first century.

The Spanish Gypsy is where Eliot takes the Byronic most seriously. Even if the general agreement among critics is that it is an aesthetic failure, it is unquestionably one of her most ambitious works in terms of conception she labored on it for four years before it was published in 1868. The most rebellious of the Romantics, Byron established a transgressive legacy that lasted far into the twentieth century. According to Carlyle in his semi-autobiographical Sartor Resartus, the Byronic egotist represented a negative rebellion during the Romantic era against a universe that was all void of Life, of Purpose, of Volition, even of Hostility: it was one huge, dead, immeasurable Steam-engine rolling on, in its dead indifference, to grind me limb from limb. Carlyle's alter ego Teufelsdrockh had responded in Byronic style, asserting the Everlasting No, a negative that at least permitted resistance even if it lacked a solution [1].

He eventually overcame this egotistical resistance, largely by realizing that God existed in an organic cosmos, much like Wordsworth and Goethe, and famously said, Close thy Byron, open thy Goethe. But as science and philosophy advanced in the latter part of the nineteenth century, culminating in Darwin, the idea of a mechanistic, impersonal, and godless cosmos became more prevalent than it had ever been. Was the Byronic egotist's pessimistic view of the world and rebellious attitude not still true today? Additionally, throughout the nineteenth century, there were egotistical and pessimistic attitudes that went far further than Byron, most notably those of Schopenhauer, an admirer of Byron's poetry. Eliot was possibly more concerned about this since she had translated Feuerbach's main book, The Essence of Christianity: With the ideas of Feuerbach I everywhere agree, but of course I should, of myself, considerably alter the phraseology was used to support the most egotistical viewpoints: intelligent opponents have frequently urged it against Feuerbach that his system must morally lead to pure Egoism. Max Stirner's Der Einzige und sein Eigentum, which was originally published in 1844 and is considered the most blatant example of egotism in the nineteenth century, was greatly affected by Feuerbach's theory.

Both Stirner and Feuerbach are considered to be members of the so-called Young Hegelians. Eliot would undoubtedly have expressed concern at the growth of the concepts she had come to embrace, which led Stirner to claim that all morality originated inside the individual: I decide whether it is the right thing in me. there is no right outside me. It is correct if it is right for me. Nietzsche, who admired Byron's Manfred, had similar sentiments: The distinguished type of human being feels himself as value-determining. he knows that he is the something which gives honor to objects. he creates values? As a result, Byron may be considered the most important contributor to the skepticism, nihilism, and egocentrism that characterized nineteenth-century philosophy and persisted into the twentieth century and beyond. By declaring, as Carlyle did in Sartor Resartus, that nature is the Living Garment of God, Eliot, who had previously denied the idea of a transcendent reality, is unable to counter the Byronic egotist's contention that, in an impersonal cosmos, each person is free to rebel against or uphold his own personal moral standards.

She acknowledged the importance of religion when she praised church gatherings for expressing the recognition of a binding belief or spiritual law which is to lift us into willing obedience and

save us from the slavery of uncontrolled passion or impulse. however, she was unable to make the case that the truth of religion upheld Christian morality and disproved the egotist's assertion that there is no moral order that can define the self. To put her argument in the simplest words possible, she writes that the self has an existential need for a sense of moral order, but that this need must first be found inside the self as emotion. This may then inspire a more comprehensive moral and social outlook [2]. It was naive to think that the egotist could simply ignore all moral and religious restrictions and adhere to his or her own chosen value, even if the world were amoral and devoid of a creator. It is simple to understand Eliot's interest in Byronic egotism if Byron's literature is understood in the philosophical and cultural background I have described above.

Eliot cannot, as with Darwinism, just dismiss the Byronic by contesting its veracity. Therefore, her goal is not just to criticize or attack the Byronic Don Silva, but rather to investigate the causes of his egotistical tendencies and make the case that they will almost certainly result in tragedy. A tragedy does not have to explain why the individual must yield to the general. rather, it must demonstrate that it must yield, with the tragedy consisting of the struggle involved and frequently in the wholly disastrous issue in spite of a grand submission. Silva is a symbol of the tragedy of the whole revolt. Fedalma is a magnificent surrender that is made ineffective by the results of Silva's insurrection. Zarca is the battle for a lofty goal that is turned ineffective by everyday circumstances. Few Eliot analysts have taken an interest in The Spanish Gypsy, but when read as a poem of ideas, it has enormous power and sheds light on both Eliot's thought and why the Byronic is so important to her writing. Given that the Byronic is far more influential in German, French, and Russian writing than in English literature following Byron, it demonstrates that her interests extended to areas not often identified with her and that these interests tie her to a European literary and intellectual background.

It is obvious that The Spanish Gypsy falls into the artistic trap that Eliot herself recognized, that of lapsing from the picture to the diagram. Nevertheless, the fact that she spent so much time on its composition demonstrates how important it was to her to try to counter the subversive power that the Byronic continued to exert within European culture. Don Silva is a Spanish knight who has lost faith in his country's history due to the nature of the Moorish invasion and the Inquisition's actions. He despises Spanish politics and believes that he has every right to rebel against his ancestry since it has no claim on his respect. He does not, however, have a backup strategy in mind. Despite believing that he is free to do as he pleases, he continues to support the Spanish cause. His disobedience only takes the form of hostile defiance. His uncle, the prior, the embodiment of the Spanish imperialism, and an eager inquisitor oppose and criticize him [3]. The previous interprets Silva's decision to wed the Gypsy-born non-Spaniard Fedalma as a tacit repudiation of his obligation to Spain. Silva responds defiantly, channeling Byron:

Tis you, not I, will gibbet our great name to rot in infamy. If I am strong in patience now, trust me, I can be strong Then in defiance.

However, the prior makes the prophetic proclamation that he would never achieve a stable identity if he completely rejects the claims of the past for his own self-determined value:

you will walk for ever with a tortured double self, A self that will be hungry while you feast, Will blush with shame while you are glorified, Will feel the ache and chill of desolation, even in the very bosom of your love.

Silva has built his own unique value out of love since he was raised in a tradition that he can no longer embrace and is unable to feel any loyalty to a Christianity that has been corrupted into persecution. In Fedalma, Silva finds a paradise where faith and hope were drowned as stars in day, Fedalma is his replacement for the virtues he has lost. He will choose her and abandon his previous God even if this blasphemy damns him:

Is there no God for me Save him who's cross I have forsaken? -Well, I am forever exiled - but with her!

In the extremes that Silva takes it, love is an effort to create worth that is entirely subjective in order to combat his dejection after coming to the conclusion that the world has no purpose or value. The speech that follows foreshadows Schopenhauer at his most extreme:

Death is the king of this world. 'tis his park Where he breeds life to feed him. Cries of pain Are music for his banquet. and the masque - The last grand masque for his diversion, is The Holy Inquisition.

Love is a frantic attempt to actively select one's own worth in order to transcend life's amorality and guard against despair. He cannot abandon Fedalma when she chooses to embrace her Gypsy roots at her father's urging. Silva believes that his chosen value of love is greater than what his history and all of his previous allegiances have to say. It justifies breaching any rules or obligations, and he is willing to do anything regardless of how unethical it would be by conventional standards to keep it:

I will sin, if sin is what it takes, to win my life back.

Losing her would mean losing himself, and he claims that that lost self my life is aching with and that his love for her Makes highest law, must be the voice of God. In a Stirnerian or early Nietzschean manner, he scorns any authority higher than himself:

I will elect my deeds, and be the liege Not of my birth, but of that good alone I have discerned and chosen.

This extreme example of Byronic egotism asserts that nothing outside of the self can define it and that the will must be used to overcome any prior claims or current challenges. The intellect must establish its own value since it cannot perceive any other values as legitimate. In the poem, Eliot compares this theory to experience. Silva has resisted his Spanish history, but he hasn't yet freed himself from it. His status as a Spanish knight continues to serve as the cornerstone of his identity. The latter's way of life and views are an ingrained aspect of him that he does not even consider discarding. Eliot's discussion of the Byronic elevation of the ego makes it a point to demonstrate that social forces are among its most crucial drivers. Eliot placed the egotist in a social setting using her understanding of sociology and psychology [4]. It is impossible to analyze his thoughts and actions in isolation since they are a result of the society and culture that have molded him. He unquestioningly identifies with the presumptions of an aristocracy who has been raised in Spain.

He views Fedalma's escape and birth as momentary crosses, hindrances. A Spanish noble might despise when he hears of them. He has a lot of faith that he can win her back:

What could a Spanish noble not command? He only helped the Queen, because he chose. Could war on Spaniards, and could spare the Moor. Buy justice, or defeat it - if he would: Was loyal, not from weakness but from strength of high resolve to use his birthright well.

Thus, the will he praises is a result of the aristocratic upbringing he claims to loathe. His declaration of his personal will to violate the expectations of the tradition in which he was raised is nothing more than a derogatory manifestation of the social dominance that tradition entails:

Don Silva had been suckled in that creed, Held it absurd as foolish argument If any failed in deference, was too proud Not to be courteous to so poor a knave as one who knew not necessary truths of birth and dues of rank. but cross his will, The miracle-working will, his rage leapt out as by a right divine to rage more fatal Than a mere mortal man's.

Therefore, his assertion that one can construct their own worth via the power of will is intrinsically false. He is just using Spanish aristocratic ideals for the sake of his own objectives, rather than establishing a new foundation for his identity. Thus, the inherent presumptions of the following claim of his will philosophy and of Byronic egotism undercut it:

I have no help Save reptile secrecy, and no revenge Save that I will do what he schemes to hinder. Ay, secrecy, and disobedience - these No tyranny can master. Disobey! You may divide the universe with God, keeping your will unbent, and hold a world Where He is not supreme.

The poem challenges this ideology by demonstrating that it was not a decision made voluntarily and that there are other options available in a society devoid of moral standards. In Silva's situation, it is really the result of his social isolation and the negative affirmation of the societal views he was raised with. He is yet another interpretation of Felix Holt's adage that there is no private life which has not been determined by a wider public life [5]. Although this uncertainty further fuels the narrator's rebellion against the prior, whose identity is wholly determined by his Catholic religion, he recognizes that underneath his outward statement of his will and defiance, he feels Murmurs of doubt, the weakness of a self / That is not one:

With all his outflung rage Silva half shrank before the steadfast man Whose life was one compacted whole, a realm Where the rule changed not, and the law was strong. Then that reluctant homage stirred new hate, and gave rebellion an intenser will.

Therefore, even his rebellion was not of his own will but rather the product of the psychological stress brought on by his social estrangement. The argument between Silva and Sephardo, his Jewish servant, is one of the poem's most significant discussions in which Silva's Byronic egotism is contested. Sephardo responds to Silva's claim that Death is the king of this world by saying that even if this were true, human morality would still exist. Even if all the angels in heaven denied it, a doctor would be aware of the presence of compassion inside himself. The good would still exist as a wholly human creation based only on human sentiment if God does not exist and the world is as Silva depicts it, which Sephardo makes no effort to refute. The person can never fully transcend culture since they are intrinsically linked to it. In significant part, the ego is a cultural creation. The egotist's delusion that he could exist independently of others and entirely detach himself from them was unfounded. Silva continues by stating that naked manhood, or men who can stand alone and are unattached to any ideologies or systems, is necessary. Sephardo responds that such a thing does not exist. We all have a duty to a cause greater than ourselves, in this instance, his Jewish ancestry. We are bound to have some priorities and partialities: My father is first father and then man [6]. It is absurd to view all things without preferences. Silva, though, is willing to disregard all arguments in order to wed Fedalma:

That I'm a Christian knight and Spanish duke! The consequence? Why, that I know. It lies in my own hands and not on raven tongues.

But it has already been shown how flimsy his theory that these traits are just coincidental features is. Contrarily, Sephardo is the brand of brotherhood that limits every pledge. In order to define the self, we need a higher rule than the will:

Our law must be without us or within. The Highest speaks through all our people's voice, Custom, tradition, and old sanctities. Or he reveals himself by new decrees of inward certitude.

The self's inner need for a sense of meaning and value is projected outwardly in customs and traditions. however, if these become outmoded and moribund, their essential content, which corresponds to this need within the self, must be reformulated. Silva doesn't try to accomplish this. Since it tries to perpetuate itself via dominance and persecution of other races and religious groups, the Spanish society in which he lives has become decadent. He creates a self-made philosophy of the will rather than attempting to find a new shape for the valuable substance of his ancestry or combat corrupt elements within it. Eliot compares this concept to reality and demonstrates that it provides no chance of a solid identity. One cannot choose to entirely reject the past without splintering the self. Silva learns this quickly. Many of his old acquaintances are slaughtered, and the prior is put to death when the Gypsies capture the town of Bedmar. His own activities against his previous stronghold are seen as self-inflicted wounds, which painfully emphasizes to him how deeply ingrained his connection to the lineage he believes he can abandon is. During this moment, he comes to terms with the fact that his Spanish heritage is an integral part of who he is, and his inner life becomes cancerous:

Silva had but rebelled - he was not free. And all the subtle cords that bound his soul Were tightened by the strain of one rash leap Made in defiance.

He is trapped in the same self that he built in the past. Denying continuity of being prevents the self from being really human, and any act of willful rejection of the distinguishing characteristics of one's history must result in severe psychological damage. He even admits that the earlier person exemplifies certain principles that are fundamental to who he is. He rejects the persona that he has assumed, saying, I am a Catholic knight, a Spaniard who will die a Spaniard's death! Zarca, the Gypsy chief and Fedalma's father, is slain. He suffers from an excruciating feeling of self-division as a result of rejecting his background. This causes him to have a serious identity crisis, which drives him to murder. Any stable sense of selfhood must be based on the worthwhile experiences of his prior lives. He cannot just reject Christianity and the Spanish past and worship a self-created God of his own. this is true even in a Spain dominated by the Inquisition. The poet promises to serve Spain, the heir to the richest endowments, who fed me on her waiting breast, at the conclusion of the poem. Silva and Fedalma are unable to fully embrace the tradition they follow. Fedalma decides to follow her father and acknowledge her Gypsy heritage, taking the opposite stance from Silva, although she does not find satisfaction in this decision.

According to the poem, their separation from their separate traditions symbolizes the detached reaction of contemporary awareness to the assertions of the past. In contrast, the previous and Zarca both hold fully secure identities in distinct ways. The previous identifies himself with the concept of Gypsy nationhood, while Zarca fully accepts the objective truth and superiority of his faith. Fedalma was raised outside of the Gypsy culture and can only consciously choose to adopt it, unlike Silva, who is innately hostile to an Inquisition-dominated Spain. She is unable to reply

to it with a single, unbroken thought. The prior and Zarca are free from the sensation of self-division brought on by excessive self-consciousness because they are assured of their commitments. The prior's rock-solid sense of who the is cannot be weakened by anything, not even the possibility of death. He had the strength of determined, undivided souls who own law and obey it. Such confidence is not feasible for Fedalma and Silva because of how their circumstances have forced them to become self-conscious and split. Silva is Doom-gifted with long resonant consciousness and perilous heightening of the sentient soul and, as a result of his defection, experiences the tortured double self the prior had prophesied. Although Fedalma does not have the same identity problem as Silva, it is nevertheless clear that she is divided inside herself. She must choose sadness, the sublimer pain, since she has accepted her Gypsy position, which requires her to reject passionate love.

Her decision cut her heart with smiles beneath the knife. Like a sweet babe foredoomed by prophecy. She consciously chooses to live a Gypsy lifestyle, but she doesn't feel emotionally connected to it. She compares her own situation to that of Hinda, her gypsy servant. She is unaware of challenges and does not see any obstacles: Here, destiny is freedom because her choice and the only law she has ever known the law of her own people are one. I have fire inside of me, but the freezing snow of ideas, which first arrive as delicate flakes and then push with a heavy, ice weight, falls on my will. Fedalma's circumstances has robbed her of the security and assurance of her servant, and the poem indicates that this is emblematic of the contemporary or post-Romantic predicament. From such a feeling of tribal awareness, she is cut off. She is an illustration of the separate, self-conscious ego, cut off from those conventional ideas, those cosmic syntaxes, that may unite the self into a single, universally acknowledged world view. Fedalma's embrace of a Gypsy lifestyle has only served to increase her awareness of her dual consciousness. She believes she will be able to walk erect, hiding my life-long wound when she experiences the strength of Zarca's vision [7].

She feels powerful in her commitment at these moments. This sensation, however, is fleeting. shortly after, self-consciousness and the impression that there is nothing but chill grey silence, or the hum / And fitful discord of a vulgar world return. Fedalma and Silva had both tried to mend their own conflicts via love. It served as a type of compensation for their lack of a fully recognizable background or religion. Silva's situation is more challenging since it is obvious that the tradition, he belongs to has degenerated into corruption and decadence. Silva's Byronic revolt is an intellectual reaction to his situation: Fedalma may at least consent intellectually and with some of her sentiments to the Gypsy goal:

Thus, he called on Thought. On dexterous Thought, with its swift alchemy to change all forms, dissolve all prejudice of man's long heritage, and yield him up A crude fused world to fashion as he would.

But he learns that there are deeper forces inside himself that the will cannot override. He longs for the former memories and connections as well as for human touch after joining the Gypsies. Rejecting his origins and facing the uncaring cosmos alone results in too much alienation and isolation:

He could not grasp Night's black blank mystery and wear it for a spiritual garb Creed-proof: he shuddered at its passionless touch.

Zarca's goal may be supported by the poem, but it also demonstrates how the outside world is unconcerned with human goals. Morally good must be projected onto a world where value is not inherent, but this might be hindered by the morally neutral course of events. With Zarca's passing, the one thing that might have kept the Gypsies together broke down, leading to a kind of dispersion among the Gypsies. Carlyle believed that the Byronic egotist must transform his disobedience and will assertion into commitment to the greatest interests of his community, and Zarca is the clearest example of this idea. This was one strategy for changing Romantic egotism in society. The poem, however, makes the argument that Zarca's transcendentalism, which underlies his faith in his vision, is a less contemporary viewpoint than the condition of detached self-consciousness that Silva and Fedalma share.

Silva and Fedalma ultimately decide to follow their different cultural traditions, but this neither unites them nor gives them access to love. Their predicament is doubly tragic because, while the negative effects of alienated self-division are obvious, any attempt to recover the sense of identity associated with a tribal consciousness is for them not only nearly impossible but also a mental state that they no longer find appealing. Eliot's last book, Daniel Deronda, which revisits several of the themes from The Spanish Gypsy, leaves room for reconsideration of this dismal ending. Zarca and the Gypsies and Mordecai and the Jews have apparent parallels, while Deronda's predicament is comparable to Fedalma's. The issue of Byronic egotism again recurs in the portrayal of Gwendolen and the princess. Eliot changes the poem's tragic structure by having Mordecai, like Zarca, transfer the torch to Deronda, who, although having doubts about prophecy and transcendentalist certainty, is willing to dedicate his life to the pursuit of Mordecai's goal.

Deronda achieves this not by overcoming alienation but by finding a way to constructively transform it, giving him the mental space needed to make decisions that, in his opinion, can advance world progress, though this is not without difficulties as I will discuss later. There is therefore hope for the future even though it cannot be guaranteed as Deronda is well aware of but he succeeds in controlling the negative alienation to which he had previously been vulnerable, which threatens the modern consciousness with self-division. Certainly, The Spanish Gypsy merits more consideration than Eliot reviewers have given it. It makes thoughts and concerns clear that are also present in the books but are less visible since they have been woven into the very fabric of realism. Additionally, it demonstrates Eliot's intellectual engagement with the issues and concerns of post-Romanticist authors in Europe, a quality that has largely been overlooked by critics on her work who have preferred to restrict her to the English social novel tradition [8].

DISCUSSION

The literary writings of George Eliot, known for their profundity and intellectual rigor, show a clear interaction with the Byronic egotist archetype. Although Eliot is largely known for the Victorian age and its realism traditions, her investigation of the Byronic egotist demonstrates a significant intellectual effort that reveals the complex webs of rebellion and independence in human nature. This talk explores Eliot's complex relationship with the Byronic egotist and sheds insight on her distinct viewpoint and the intellectual principles that underlie her representation. The Byronic egotist, who derives from Gothic literature and the Romantic movement, is known for his vehement defiance of authority figures outside of himself and his ambition to forge his own moral code. This archetype reflects a contestation of conventional standards and a celebration of the liberty of the individual, and it is personified by Lord Byron's famous figures. Eliot's interest

in this persona is seen in her characterizations, where she carefully analyzes the psychology of disobedience and revolt against social standards.

Eliot uses the Byronic characteristics of his characters to explore the intricacies of individuality. While challenging traditional authority, these individuals also have to deal with the repercussions of their choices in a linked world. The conflict between a person's right to personal autonomy and the demands of a wider societal structure is highlighted by Eliot's nuanced approach. Her conviction in the interconnectedness of people throughout society, despite their assertion of individuality, is shown by this analysis. Beyond the realm of English literature, Eliot engages with the Byronic egotist. Her investigation of this archetype is a reflection of a larger literary and intellectual milieu in Europe. Eliot's writings show her great understanding of the European literary past as the Byronic character continued to have an impact on European literature in the nineteenth century. Her efforts to combat the Byronic's subversive influence in this setting demonstrate her dedication to confronting the changing intellectual and cultural currents of her period.

CONCLUSION

One interesting aspect of George Eliot's literary legacy is her intellectual interaction with Byron's egotist. Her creative output acts as a rich tapestry for revealing the strands of individuality and rebellion in the human mind. Eliot's examination of this archetype addresses the intellectual and cultural issues of her day while also illuminating the Byronic figure's ongoing attraction and complexity. She strengthens her reputation as a writer who transcends the limitations of her period by dealing with deep and timeless subjects that still speak to readers today in this intellectual undertaking. The search for significance and morality in a society where conventional theological and ethical frameworks were changing is at the heart of Eliot's investigation. Eliot explores the existential need for a sense of moral order inside the person by investigating the Byronic egotist. She asserts that often, this desire starts as an emotional, interior experience before igniting a more expansive moral and societal vision. Her characters debate whether moral principles may be established independently in an impersonal universe.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. M. Twenge, H. VanLandingham, and W. Keith Campbell, The Seven Words You Can Never Say on Television: Increases in the Use of Swear Words in American Books, 1950-2008, *SAGE Open*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2158244017723689.

[2] S. Florini, This Week in Blackness, the George Zimmerman acquittal, and the production of a networked collective identity, *New Media Soc.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/1461444815606779.

[3] O. Klein, From utopia to dystopia: levels of explanation and the politics of social psychology, *Psychol. Belg.*, 2009, doi: 10.5334/pb-49-2-3-85.

[4] M. Liu, Q. Liu, and T. Ma, The 52-week high momentum strategy in international stock markets, *J. Int. Money Financ.*, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.jimonfin.2010.08.004.

[5] J. A. Ross, Durkheim and the Homo Duplex: Anthropocentrism in Sociology, *Sociol. Spectr.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/02732173.2016.1227287.

[6] C. Williams, The Unhappy Divorce of Sociology and Psychoanalysis: Diverse Perspectives on the Psychosocial, *Contemp. Sociol. A J. Rev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0094306116681813k.

[7] D. Thunder, George Rupp: Beyond Individualism: The Challenge of Inclusive Communities. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015. Pp. 205.), *Rev. Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1017/s0034670516000474.

[8] G. Musambira and J. Matusitz, Communication technology and culture: Analysing selected cultural dimensions and human development indicators, *Int. J. Technol. Manag. Sustain. Dev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1386/tmsd.14.1.17_1.

CHAPTER 4

GEORGE ELIOT'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY: EXPLORING THE UNRECOGNIZED DEPTHS

Kanchan Gupta, Assistant Professor
College of Paramedical Sciences, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- kanchanricha63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This abstract explores the deep moral philosophy of George Eliot and its often-disregarded Kantian impact. Although commonly regarded as a moralist, George Eliot has come under fire for what is seen as her didacticism and dependence on Victorian ethical standards. This abstract clarifies the criticism she has received and makes the case that her moral theory merits a deeper look. The significance of taking into account Eliot's work within the framework of moral philosophy by highlighting her multiple identities as an artist and an academic. Notably, the article draws attention to Immanuel Kant's glaring omission from discussions of Eliot's masterwork, The Mill on the Floss. grasp Eliot's characters and their moral conundrums requires a grasp of Kant's moral theory, which is typified by the idea of rational will and freedom. Maggie Tulliver, make moral decisions that are consistent with Kantian principles by drawing on Kant's fundamental writings, highlighting the significance of logical moral decision-making above emotional impulses. The essay Moral Freedom, in which Eliot expresses her opinion that free will is essential to existence, further demonstrates the impact of Kant on her writing. The groundwork for a thorough investigation of George Eliot's moral philosophy, exposing the fundamental Kantian foundations that deepen our comprehension of her literary accomplishments. It emphasizes the necessity to appreciate her moral perspective's depth and complexity beyond simple didacticism and makes a strong argument for the importance of Kant's effect on her literary universe.

KEYWORDS:

Ethical Norms, George Eliot, Kantian Influence, Literary Criticism, Moral Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

Few critics have argued that George Eliot should be understood as a moral philosopher, despite the fact that she is commonly recognized as a moralist. It's perhaps possible that some of her detractors haven't taken her moral perspective seriously. She has often been accused of being didactic, which implies that her moral philosophy is nothing more than a collection of ethical rules rooted from Victorian ideas of what is good and wrong. Never, perhaps, have sterner voices declared the authority of impersonal and un recompensing law. Even when Eliot is taken seriously in relation to moral philosophy, she is accused of lacking originality: She draws from various traditions, and comes up with a position that is neither systematic nor particularly compelling. Despite Nietzsche's apparent lack of direct familiarity with her writing, he was mocked for his statement that In England, in response to every little emancipation from theology one has to reassert one's position in a fear inspiring manner as a moral fan There is clearly a lack of academic respect for Eliot as a moral philosopher, and one can see this mirrored in the way reviewers have reacted to her portrayal of moral difficulties in her work. she vacillates in her presentation of selfishness, said one reviewer.

The moral dilemma presented by Maggie Tulliver in The Mill on the Floss following her unintentional elopement, when she must choose between marrying Stephen Guest and going back to St. Ogg's, is perhaps the most well-known. Since critics often believe that Eliot is only using a certain set of moral norms that are typically Victorian, they don't see the need to make any allusions to moral philosophy while discussing this. The following criticisms serve as an example of this: She has placed Maggie in a dilemma in which no preconceived principle could direct her choice, What positive is there to set against the sour taste of renunciation, The difficulties experienced by readers are caused by a didacticism which falsifies the drama and makes genuine moral choice impossible, remains a figure of pathos, remains the prey of circumstances that are capricious and accidental, and The Mill on the Floss is a text of scandal and fascination to feminists, as evidenced by Elaine Showalter's assertion that Maggie is the progenitor of a heroine who identifies passivity and renunciation with womanhood.

Eliot's detractors believe they have a right to disagree with the viewpoints or beliefs that she passively and didactically imposes on the text, so they presume there is no need to The type of criticism the moral conundrum in the book has brought up tacitly ignores Eliot's dual identities as an artist and an academic. I'll argue that ignoring how moral philosophy functions in her work is to neglect a factor that is really important to interpretation. Immanuel Kant is notably absent from critics' discussions of the novel's Great Temptation section. This is a significant omission because Kant is not only one of the greatest moral philosophers, but also because his work directly addresses the moral conundrum at the heart of Eliot's novel [1]. Eliot makes explicit and knowledgeable references to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason throughout her articles, and it is logical to infer that someone with Eliot's interest in moral issues would be acquainted with his ethical works. I would argue that Kant's influence on Eliot's writing of the Maggie Stephen Guest sections is clear from the words each character employs. I'll use two quotes from Kant's most significant works that speak to the issue of moral decision-making to illustrate this.

He claims that will is a kind of causality that belongs to living things inasmuch as they are rational in his Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals. Freedom would thus be the ability for this causality to function without being determined by outside forces. We have at least shown that the idea of freedom is the source of the determinate concept of morality, but we haven't been able to show that this idea actually exists in ourselves or in human nature. Instead, we've only been able to show that this idea is necessary if we want to imagine a rational being who is aware of the consequences of his actions, or who has a will. It should be noted that although associated with determinism, Eliot believed that in practice a belief in free will was existentially necessary, as she makes clear in a short essay, Moral Freedom: Life & action are prior to theorizing, a prior logic in the conditions necessitating action. Thus, we find that on precisely the same ground we must attribute to every being endowed with reason and a will this property of determining himself to action under the Idea of It is contradictory to view any theory that displaces that logic as possessing the highest level of intellectual authority.

When we have determined that a certain viewpoint is opposed to practice, which is another way of saying life, we are then determined to let that viewpoint to influence how we behave, not because of the supremacy of the intellect but rather because of our lack of good judgment. Instead of rejecting tried and true methods in favor of reasoning that tends to invalidate all methods, it is rational to accept two irreconcilables. According to Kant, a true moral act or decision is one that is made rationally by the will and may entail acting against one's strongest feelings and inclinations. He states in the Critique of Practical Reason, The essential point in every

determination of the will by the moral law is that it is determined simply by the moral law, not only without the cooperation of sensible impulses, but even to the rejection of all such, and to the checking of all inclinations so far as they may be contrary to that law.

Therefore, we can see from the start that the moral law, as the guiding principle of the will, must cause a sensation that may be referred to as pain by obstructing all of our inclinations. Kant has a highly critical view of nature. According to him, morality has nothing to do with nature. in fact, nature has to be rejected fiercely. Naturally, he is linked to the categorical imperative, which holds that all moral behavior must be guided by unchanging rules in order to be unconditional. In the Groundwork, while discussing duty, he writes: It is of the highest significance to take caution that we should not even conceive of attempting to infer the truth of this concept from the unique traits of human nature [2]. The only way responsibility can be a rule for all human wills is if it is a practical, unconditional requirement of action that holds for all rational beings. On the other hand, anything that derives from the unique predisposition of humanity, from certain feelings and propensities, and even, if this were possible, from some special bent peculiar to human reason, and not necessarily holding for the will of every rational being, all of this can supply a personal maxim, but it is not a law: it can give us a subjective principle, on which we have a propensity and inclination to act, but not an objective one on which we should. In this book, Maggie Tulliver makes a moral choice to reject Stephen Guest's love since they both have other relationships.

This choice is based on Maggie's feeling of obligation to others, which she sees as a moral rule. It is evident that she would choose Stephen Guest as her husband if these connections did not exist. But even if it goes against her deepest emotions, she makes the deliberate and moral choice to reject him: O it's hard. life is hard! It sometimes seems right to me that we should follow our strongest feelings, but these feelings constantly run up against the ties that our previous lives have created for us the ties that have made and dark to me. however, I see one thing very clearly: I must not, cannot, seek my own happiness by sacrificing others. Stephen Guest disagrees, saying, Maggie, if you loved me as I love you, we should throw everything we own out the window. She rejects this reasoning, but later circumstances draw them together, and she shows no opposition when Stephen lets the tide, a natural force, carry their boat. Although she hasn't consciously decided to change her mind, she briefly loses control of her moral will and gives in to this stronger presence that seemed to bear her along without any act of her own will. and she had no other feelings. Memory has been left out. But the next day, once this dreamlike condition fades, her conscience and will take control once again, and she resolves to leave Stephen and go back to St. Ogg's. The discussion between them, both before she boards the boat with him and later, hints strongly at the impact of Kantian moral philosophy. Stephen advocates the anti-Kantian perspective that strong emotions and nature should take precedence when deciding on courses of action and choices [3].

Though, as the story demonstrates, that objective force may not be simple to prove, Maggie feels that decision is only real if it is the result of both the will and a principle that she believes has objective force. She thus chooses to suppress her greatest emotions as a result. Yes, sentiments play a role in her choice, but without her moral will, the stronger, more 'natural' sensations that draw her to Stephen would win out over the ones that urge her to give him up. The constant emphasis Stephen places on nature reveals how anti-Kantian his views are. he repeatedly tells her that her resistance to their love is unnatural: It is unnatural - it is horrible . It is come upon us without our seeking: it is natural - it has taken hold of me in spite of every effort I have made to resist it . and See how the tide is carrying us out - away from all those unnatural When Maggie

tried to cease their meetings in the Red Deeps, Philip Wakem had reasoned in a similar way: No one has strength given to do what is unnatural. To seek protection in negations is nothing more than cowardice. Maggie, however, departs from Kant in that she believes moral obligations are also natural: Love is natural. but surely pity, faithfulness, and memory are natural too. Maggie holds the Kantian position that will and rational choice are more important than nature or inclination. However, it is important to fight against inclination, to use a fundamental phrase from Kant. Maggie fights it off even if Stephen battled strongly with over-mastering tendency and lost: Remember what you felt weeks ago that we owed people ourselves and that we had to overcome any tendencies that would cause us to default on that obligation. Where can duty be if the past cannot bind us? We need to just follow the inclination of the time as our rule.

Maggie disagrees with Stephen's assertion that we must accept our own actions and start afresh from them. The opposite is true: Every influence tended to lull her into acquiescence instead of her choosing to walk out with him. Maggie's will be set unwaveringly on the impending wrench as she awoke from the passivity of the tide-driven slide down river. She was determined to endure suffering. It may be tempting for Eliot's detractors to interpret this decision to suffer as evidence of masochism, but it can be regarded as reflecting Kant's theory that the thwarting of all our inclinations must result in pain. She accuses Stephen of denying her choice repeatedly, saying things such, You have wanted to deprive me of my choice and I couldn't choose yesterday. She also says, I will not begin any future, even for you. knowingly giving my assent to something that shouldn't have been. I have already caused sadness I know it I feel it, but I have never knowingly given my consent to it... You wouldn't have my whole soul if you were to get my assent from the fleeting victory of my feelings for you, which has never been my intention [4].

The uneasy consciousness that he had robbed her of perfect freedom yesterday. One may also see Kant's moral theory at work in a number of Eliot's other books. For instance, Lydgate takes anti-Kantian actions in Middlemarch that have devastating results. His acts are driven by the spur of the moment and the exigencies of the situation, disregarding reason and volition. However, Lydgate thinks he has a powerful will. Because he perceives Farebrother's will as being weak, Lydgate has a low opinion of him: Lydgate thought that there was a pitiable infirmity of will in Mr. Farebrother. However, Lydgate's understanding of the will is not Kantian. It doesn't denote a strong adherence to reason, conscience, or anything that strives to be considered a moral rule. He is haughty and conceited, and his will serves as the expression of his deepest emotions. Lydgate's conceit was of the conceited kind. it was never simpering or impertinent, but huge in its demands and benevolently scornful. Because of this, he is more prone to emotional outbursts like his affections for French actress Laure: He knew that this was like the sudden impulse of a madman - incongruous even with his habitual foibles.

No big deal It was the one thing he was determined to do. Similar to this, Lydgate's decision to propose to Rosamond was driven by impulsive feelings and desire, despite his earlier rational decision to remain single: Lydgate, forgetting everything else, completely mastered by the outrush of tenderness at the sudden belief that this sweet young creature depended on him for her joy hurriedly poured forth words of appreciation and compassion. Lydgate's vote for Tyke over Farebrother, even though Tyke was the more worthy candidate, demonstrates his inability to make a decision based on any kind of objective moral basis [5]. He had hoped that the vote would be decided without his involvement, but when he is required to cast the deciding vote, he chooses Tyke partly out of narrow self-interest not doing so would probably have a negative impact on his relationship with Bulstrode and partially to express his disdain for those who perceive him as being

under Bulstrode's control. Lydgate contrasts with other characters in the book, Dorothea, Mary Garth, and Ladislaw, who all have moral principles and wills strong enough to uphold them, in that he lacks the sense of moral principle reinforced by will and rationality that would make him capable of making a choice that resisted his dominant impulse or pressure from circumstances. Daniel Deronda's Gwendolen Harleth shares Lydgate's conviction that she has a strong will and enjoys nothing more than using it. Her will was absolute, according to what is said.

In contrast, will for her also expresses her deepest desire or emotion rather than the will in any Kantian sense. She is completely helpless when asked to use her will in a scenario when morality is at stake. When she first encounters Grandcourt's mistress Mrs. Glasher, she knows right away that she shouldn't marry him, so she runs away to the continent. However, as time goes on, the strain of her circumstances progressively erodes this moral resolve. She discovers that she has no capacity to resist since she has never used her will to go against powerful feelings or her own interests. She realizes a moment of choice was come when Grandcourt writes her a letter asking whether he may call. Her volition is once again ineffective, and she drifts towards acceptance: She seemed to herself to have only drifted towards the tremendous decision: but drifting depends on something besides the currents, when the sails have been set beforehand. Maggie Tulliver's brief lack of moral composure is brought to mind as she agrees to float down the river with Stephen. Ironically, Gwendolen Harleth, who firmly believes in the power of the will, decides to let her will expire and therefore makes the most significant choice of her life [6].

It is evident that the word will has two different meanings in Eliot's fiction: in Kant's sense, as a way to make moral choices even in the face of inclination, as with Maggie Tulliver, and in the opposite sense, as with Lydgate, Gwendolen, and several other egotist characters. Naturally, these distinctions should be taken into account while understanding the term in her works. There is a fundamental difference between Kant's moral theory and Eliot's, despite the fact that I've claimed that Eliot highly appreciated it. Though he does not explicitly state what actions are right and wrong, Kant's morality is based on the moral law and the concept of duty that is derived from it. By implication, the moral law has a metaphysical or, more precisely, religious basis. Eliot was against metaphysical philosophy and was not a religious person, but she appreciated others who were. Her assertion that philosophy must renounce metaphysics and her association of Kant with German metaphysics in her article The Future of German Philosophy raises the question of why she defends a Kantian moral viewpoint.

Does she have a non-metaphysical foundation for her moral evaluations and decisions in Kantian terms? If one rejects the metaphysical, what should one use the will to make moral judgments in respect to? A deeper analysis of The Mill on the Floss could provide some answers to this question. Maggie Tulliver is unable to embrace Stephen Guest's love because she is unable to balance such acceptance with the ideals and obligations that are a part of her background. Despite the fact that she sometimes uses religious language I couldn't live in peace if I put the shadow of a willful sin between myself and God this has considerably less impact than her human sense of duty toward others this does occur. She emphasizes duty to others again and time again as what drives her to fight the pull of inclination: I can't believe in a good for you things we both believe is unjust to other people'. She also states that in order to feel whole in herself, she must continue to uphold moral principles like consistency and commitment to others. It is necessary to fight urges and desires that put the continuity of the self in danger. Therefore, an authentic moral choice is an action or judgment that derives from the subject's sense of who she is as a whole. My entire spirit has never consented, and it does not assent now, she says to Stephen.

She responds, No, not with my whole heart and soul, Stephen, to Stephen's assertion that they must break free of their former relationships since this is the first time they have loved with their whole heart and soul. I've never given it my wholehearted approval. Her perception of her whole mind is implied by the phrase whole mind, which suggests that reason is crucial to moral decision-making as much as emotion. She would have to sink and wander forever vaguely, driven by uncertain impulse if she had chosen Stephen. Eliot does not see the past as a force that should be obeyed passively, despite the fact that it is essential to one's feeling of wholeness. Past obligations and relationships must be acknowledged. The self must believe that it has the freedom to choose them and to logically justify them since they are not causally determining.

The past in Eliot's writing has often been seen by previous commentators as being in a static connection with the self. It is inaccurate to speak of the authority of the past or the worship of the past because the idea of the whole self implies that one must make choices from the past in order to construct their sense of who they are as a whole. There is no passive acceptance of the past for its own sake, and certain aspects of the past may be rejected for logical reasons. For instance, when Catherine Arrowpoint defies her family's demands and decides to wed Klesmer, she takes a decision that seems to be in opposition to Maggie Tulliver's in Daniel Deronda. Her parents admonish her to reject Klesmer and uphold family obligations and the ideals they hold dear. The reasoning of Catherine's mother is governed by a clumsy and unintentional parody of Kant's moral theory, as shown by her use of Kantian language [7].

A woman in your position has serious duties. She must obey duty when it conflicts with her desire. However, Maggie and Catherine don't contradict one another. Their relationship to the past and the obligations and values they have acquired from it is significantly influenced by reason. Both rejecting and embracing pieces of the past may be necessary for a feeling of full self. Although Catherine's parents want her to consider her class and riches when choosing a spouse, she has little concern for these factors and believes that she is free to reject them: I'm sorry to upset you, mama. Nevertheless, I won't compromise my pleasure for ideologies or traditions I don't appreciate. Respect is a key idea for Kant, who believes it to be a result of the moral law. However, Catherine does not make the same claim as Stephen Guest that love should always take precedence: I feel at liberty to marry the man I love and think worthy, unless a higher duty forbids.

The sensation of being able to make decisions is fundamentally rational. Her sense of who she was would be violated if she followed her parents' definition of responsibility. But it's obvious that Maggie's circumstance is much more challenging than Catherine's, as her past has been so marred by conflict and divided loyalties that she doesn't have a secure sense of who she is for the majority of the book. She only finally does so as a result of the crisis brought on by her unintentional elopement, and even then, she is still prone to doubt and temptation, as she is when she later receives a letter in which Stephen informs her of his suffering. Before regaining her moral resolve and the sense of contradiction with her past self in her moments of strength and clarity, she tries to resist. Eliot used the term persistent self in Middlemarch, which is evidently closely tied to the notion of a whole self. Strange, that some of us, with quick alternate vision, see beyond our infatuations, and even while we rave on the heights, behold the wide plain where our persistent self-pauses and awaits us follows the passage I previously quoted about Lydgate's passion for Laure. He had two selves inside him obviously, and they had to learn to coexist and overcome mutual obstacles. Lydgate's will never consider any feeling of enduring self in his acts or choices.

As an example, when Dorothea overcomes her resentful impulse after seeing Ladislaw and Rosamond together in what appears to be a compromising situation and regains consciousness of the feelings that motivated her to visit Rosamond in the first place, we see characters like Dorothea and Mary Garth resisting impulse or the pressure of circumstances to act in keeping with their persistent selves. Featherstone also orders Mary Garth to burn his will, but she refuses, despite his efforts to coerce her and his promises of money. She makes a thoughtful choice that is consistent with the ideals she was raised with. Even after learning that Fred Vincy would have suffered severe losses as a consequence of her choice, she remains certain that she made the correct choice. When Ladislaw declines Bulstrode's offer of money, despite the fact that in his situation money would be extremely helpful to him, he also demonstrates his sense of persistence: My unblemished honor is important to me. I value keeping the details of my birth and connections private.

Eliot is said to be against impulsive behavior, although this has to be clarified. When 'impulse' is employed in a writer's fiction, caution should be used, much as with 'will. Despite being fully aware of the risks involved in letting instinct rule over reason, when it is in line with a strong sense of self, it is seen favorably. 'There are moments when by some strange impulse we contradict our past selves - fatal moments, when a fit of passion, like a lava stream, lays low the work of half our lives,' says the final story of Scenes of Clerical Life, 'Janet's Repentance.' But Janet's impulse to confess to Tryan is one that is consistent with her persistent self: 'The impulse to confession almost always requires the presence of a fresh ear and a Similar to our hesitation to allow sunshine into a room of artifacts that we have never seen save in curtained stillness, Tryan hesitated to tell Janet about his prior existence. But the initial instinct won out. Ladislaw's rejection of Bulstrode's money in Middlemarch is similarly motivated by impulse: The impulse within him was to reject the disclosed connection.

Although absent from Kant's literature on morality, the concept of a full self or enduring self does not seem out of place to me. On the surface, it could seem like a notion without any philosophical depth, yet there are parallels between Eliot's concept of the full self and the ideas of a later philosopher who was likewise concerned with the nature of genuine and free decision. According to Bergson, one is only really free when they have acted in accordance with their whole personality, and this freedom is forfeited if they let their emotions or the demands of their environment control what they do. He describes the act of performing a free action in Time and Free Will as follows: For the action which has been performed does not then express some superficial idea, almost external to ourselves, distinct and easy to account for: it agrees with the entirety of our intimate feelings, thoughts, and aspirations, with that specific conception of life which is the equivalent of all our past experience, in other words, with our personal idea of happiness and honor.

DISCUSSION

The debate on George Eliot's Moral Philosophy and Kantian Influence: Exploring the Unrecognized Depths is a thorough investigation of the literary and philosophical elements of George Eliot's work. In this discussion, we will go into the essential elements of this fascinating topic, emphasizing the importance of Eliot's moral philosophy and the often-overlooked Kantian impact. George Eliot's Moral Philosophy, to start: To start the conversation off right, it's important to lay forth George Eliot's moral philosophy's tenets. Mary Ann Evans, who wrote under the pen name George Eliot, was a well-known Victorian author who was renowned for her deft examination of moral and ethical quandaries. The complex characters in her books, like as Middlemarch and The Mill on the Floss, are known for debating moral dilemmas and cultural

expectations. Through the stories she creates and the moral dilemmas her characters encounter, her moral system is revealed. Immanuel Kant, a major character in Western philosophy, had a substantial impact on moral philosophy. This influence may be seen in the literature. His focus on logical, duty-based ethics and idea of the categorical imperative had a significant impact on literature as well as philosophy. Many writers, notably George Eliot, found resonance in Kant's views, which offered a conceptual framework for analyzing moral quandaries. This discussion's central theme is encapsulated in the term Exploring the Unrecognized Depths. It accepts that literary critics often overlook or underappreciate George Eliot's moral philosophy and its influence from Kant. Many critics only consider the surface meanings of her writings, labeling her as didactic or constrained by Victorian moral standards. This debate, however, tries to dive into the complex layers of moral philosophy that are hidden inside her tales and go beyond such oversimplifications.

Using Maggie Tulliver as an Illustration It is essential to look at particular examples from Eliot's writings in this topic, such the Maggie Tulliver character from The Mill on the Floss. In Maggie's moral predicament, where she must decide between love and duty, Eliot's moral theory is poignantly shown. Kant's impact may be seen in various literary situations, especially in Maggie's decision-making process, which is logical and duty-bound. Special consideration should be given to George Eliot's two identities as an artist and an intellectual. Her writing is known for its masterful blending of intellectual nuance and gripping narrative. It is clearer to appreciate her as a writer and a thinker when one considers the subtle ways that Kantian philosophy shapes her stories. The Importance of Identifying Kantian Influence Understanding the impact of Kant on George Eliot's writing goes beyond just academic considerations.

CONCLUSION

The study of George Eliot's Moral Philosophy and Kantian Influence: Exploring the Unrecognized Depths concludes with extending an invitation to engage in a literary and philosophical exploration trip. This broadens our understanding of George Eliot's deep moral philosophy, often inspired by Kantian ideals, which lurks underneath the story and increases our appreciation of her long literary legacy. It also urges us to look below the surface of George Eliot's books. It deepens our comprehension of her creative accomplishments by illuminating the intellectual foundations that influence the moral dilemmas of her characters. Additionally, it offers a different viewpoint on her work than that of standard critique. This conversation has effects on literary criticism and analysis. Scholars and readers may interact with Eliot's work more deeply by recognizing and examining the Kantian influence in her books. It challenges us to reconsider how we understand the moral decisions made by her characters and the ethical implications of her narratives.

REFERENCES:

[1] E. Coit, ‘This immense expense of art’: George Eliot and John Ruskin on consumption and the limits of sympathy, *Nineteenth-Century Literature*. 2010. doi: 10.1525/ncl.2010.65.2. 214.

[2] D. Abitz, Eliot & hobbes: Finding leviathan in ‘Hints on snubbing’ and Janet’s repentance, *Victorians*. 2017. doi: 10.1353/vct.2017.0004.

[3] H. Li, Dialectical Envisioning: Daniel Deronda and British Ethical Idealism , *Lit. Compass*, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1741-4113.2012.00918.x.

[4] K. Asher, *Literature, Ethics, and the Emotions*. 2017. doi: 10.1017/9781316888643.

[5] A. E. Clark, Expectation and 'fellow-feeling' in George Eliot's Daniel Deronda, *English Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/0013838X.2016.1206320.

[6] T. Bender, Then and now: The disciplines and civic engagement. Liberal Education, *Lib. Educ.*, 2001.

[7] D. Coleman, Money, in *George Eliot in Context*, 2011. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139019491.024.

CHAPTER 5

GEORGE ELIOT'S NARRATIVE IDENTITY: AUTHOR AND NARRATOR

Anuradha Pawar, Assistant Professor
College of Pharmacy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- anumayak@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT:

The famed Victorian writer George Eliot stands out in the literary canon for her ground-breaking works as well as her in-depth examination of narrative identity. This research explores the complex and nuanced interactions between George Eliot the writer and the narrators who appear in her books. Eliot's storytelling style defies categorization since she expertly manipulates her authorial presence to create complex tales that draw readers into a meaningful conversation with the book. The nuanced aspects of George Eliot's narrative persona are explored in this abstract, with particular attention paid to the ways in which she conflates the roles of author and narrator. This research demonstrates how Eliot's tales are infused with a complex and dynamic interaction between her own ideas, experiences, and the varied voices of her characters via a detailed examination of a few key works, such as Middlemarch and Daniel Deronda. Eliot's talent in capturing the human condition is shown by her capacity to sympathize with her characters and authentically convey their inner lives. The social and cultural circumstances in which Eliot wrote, illuminating how her literary choices were impacted by the philosophical and intellectual currents of her day. This research aims to clarify the complexity of Eliot's narrative identity and its consequences for a more comprehensive knowledge of Victorian literature by looking at the author-narrator relationships in her works.

KEYWORDS:

Characterization, George Eliot, Interior Lives**,** Literary Craftsmanship, Narrative Identity, Narrator.

INTRODUCTION

The narrator of George Eliot's works is often mistaken for the author herself by the majority of readers. Edward Dowden proposed that the narrator be understood as the author's second self as early as 1872, but in actuality, reviewers have been satisfied to perceive the narrator as George Eliot. In Middlemarch, for instance, George Eliot intervenes in her own person more than in any previous novel, according to Michael Mason. This attitude toward the narrator has contributed to the perception which is still prevalent among many readers that George Eliot intrudes too frequently in her own person and thereby interferes with the reader's response. These intrusions are seen as indicators of an overly morbid outlook or of an unwillingness to let the book stand on its own. Only the author could have 'omniscient' knowledge of her make-believe world, hence the phrase 'omniscient narrator' has fostered association of the narrator with the author. However, I would argue that the narrator should be seen as an essential component of the plot of her books and that a thorough comprehension of her literature relies on this being done. Offered one of the most significant criticisms she has ever made, one that deserves to be often quoted. She expresses concern that Alexander Main's collection of literary excerpts, which has several sections in which

the narrator addresses the reader, may give the impression that her books are not creative wholes: If that were true, I might be rather stultified as an artist.

My writings are flawed if they don't inspire readers to pursue the goals, I set for them via the works as a whole rather than through an assortment of snippets. I've always kept a close eye out for anything that may be seen as preaching, and if I've ever indulged in a diatribe or a conversation that isn't directly related to the plot of one of my works, I've broken one of my own rules. It is significant that she describes herself as an artist rather than just a writer. She obviously wanted the narrator's remarks and intrusions to be a part of the fiction's larger creative framework. If this is the right reading, it's more necessary to examine the part the narrator plays in the way Eliot's books are put together than it is to associate the narrator with the creator. The fact that the narrator is explicitly identified as male in Scenes of Clerical Life and Adam Bede is one indication that Eliot wanted to distance herself from the narrator. There are no gendered allusions to the narrator in the books that came after, but in her last book, Impressions of Theophrastus Such, the narrator is explicitly separated from Eliot as the author and is described as a bachelor, without domestic distractions of any kind. All of this shows that the author intends for the narrator to exist independently of her throughout the whole book. The fact that the narrator in her work is portrayed as a historical writer who writes about what are genuine persons and events for him or her is a more significant fact linked to this [1].

But I gathered from Adam Bede, to whom I spoke of these matters in his old age, even though the author initially seems to be narrating in her own person and addressing the reader as if they both accept the novel as pure fiction with imaginary characters. The narrator must be writing a book about persons he has known or been told about, unless one thinks Eliot is unusually muddled. This holds true for the other books as well. The Mill on the Floss, the narrator recalls an actual historical situation with actual people: Ah, my arms are terribly benumbed. I've been leaning against the chair's armrests and having dreams in which I'm on the bridge in front of Dorlcote Mill, just as it appeared on a February day in the past. The narrator of Silas Marner, Felix Holt, Middlemarch, and Daniel Deronda describes the book as a history and identifies as a historian. We belated historians must not linger after his example. and if we did, it is likely that our discourse would be thin and eager, as if given from a camp-stool in a parrot-house.

This is said in the line from Middlemarch, for instance. I must focus all the light I can muster on this specific web and not spread it out across that alluring spectrum of relevancies known as the cosmos since I have so much to do in unraveling certain human lots and discovering how they were weaved and intertwined. However, it should be noted that nothing about human nature in general is described here. Instead, the history as it stands at this time only concerns a small group of individuals in a remote area of Wessex, all of whom were on friendly terms with high-ranking individuals despite their impeccable reputations. In this regard, Romola is particularly intriguing since the action takes place in the late fifteenth century, making it clear that the narrator cannot seem to be both current with the reader and to have known the individuals as actual people. This shouldn't be an issue if the narrator is only the 'omniscient' author. The time period shouldn't change how well the author understands her characters' thoughts [2].

However, there is a problem if the narrator is to be seen as a component of the fiction, as I am proposing, since how could the narrator have learned so much about the thoughts of people who lived in a long-gone historical period? All of Eliot's other books were set in eras that would have allowed a narrator who was alive during the time of the books' original readers to have either met

the characters in person or learned about them from others, then created a fictionalized account of their inner lives. Eliot may have found it difficult to defend the narrator's knowledge of persons the narrator could never have known, judging by how she handles the narrative in Romola. In The Proem, the narrator, who is present-day like the reader, summons the ghost of a deceased Florentine in order to narrate the narrative. This Florentine returns to familiar places and people, serving as the novel's central center of awareness. Following the Florentine's vision, the narrator applies his own contemporary perspective to what he observes. Although the narrator makes a lot of observations and judgments, it is crucial that the narrative does not employ the first person.

If the narrator is only interpreting what the Florentine observes, Eliot could have seen such an intrusion in the first person in the style of Adam Bede or Middle marcb as improper. Eliot may have been imitating Thackeray by having the narrator seem to be writing a historical tale about actual people. The Newcomes makes the following claim: All this story is told by one, who, if he was not actually present at the circumstances here narrated, yet had the information concerning them, and could supply such a narrative of facts and conversations as is, in fact, not less authentic than the details of other histories. But the obvious question raised by this is why Eliot felt it necessary to include this information. Perhaps there are two significant reasons for this: first, the author did not want to imply that the narrator had divine omniscience but rather that she was an interpreter of the world, much like a historian, and second, it is a means of getting around a common criticism of realism in fiction. The author once stated that philosophy must renounce metaphysics.

It might be argued that the realism novel's claim to depict reality authentically or objectively is problematic since narration imposes a shape on the world it claims to describe, the narrative itself being a construction of the world. Eliot does not, however, think that the intellect can directly reach reality. She emphasizes the idea that shape is created from the mind of the artist and does not reflect external reality in her brief theoretical essay titled Notes on Form in Art: But what is fiction other than an arrangement of events or feigned correspondences according to predominant feeling? We make what pleases us, or what we believe will please others.' By giving the reader the impression that the narrator is writing a book about real people and events, the narrator can get around some of the formal and philosophical issues that realist novelists face. Instead of reflecting an order that is inherent in the world, the novel's form, which shapes the reality it is dealing with, reflects the narrator's own ordering through a narrative that looks back on and interprets from the narrator's own point of view events and experiences that are real for the narrator [3].

This fictional narrator makes the decisions on where to start, how to format the story into a book, and how to finish the story. The narrator forms opinions about events by observing them from a future perspective rather than as they really occur. The question of how the structure a narrative imposes on reality in a realist book is to be justified is clearly answered by this usage of a fictitious narrator who is ostensibly writing a historical novel about real people. Eliot's penchant for a highly structured book structure may have contributed to her preoccupation with defending the narrative form of her works. It has been noted that she enjoys using analogies as structural devices, and one can see many connections between characters and events that are thematically significant, particularly in her later books. In a book with a very loose structure, the reader may not sense that the narrative form is distorting reality, but in a story built on thematic connections and comparison structures, the reader could believe that the narrative form is, unless it is somehow justified. Eliot's novels, Barbara Hardy uses the author's use of coincidence as a formal technique to demonstrate this idea. This inevitably brings up the issue of how to balance form with reality.

The word coincidence implies that Eliot must sacrifice realism for formal reasons, even though Barbara Hardy praises Eliot's skillful use of coincidence to create parallels and relationships between characters and situations. Coincidence is frequently used in fiction to serve the needs of the plot and has the potential to undermine realism. Although Barbara Hardy doesn't address this issue, it would be simple to claim that Eliot's obsession with form and pattern is incompatible with a credible portrayal of the world in realist terms using the coincidences she mentions. Eliot's critical writings strongly imply that she wanted to keep the novel's connection to a convincing portrayal of reality and would have been dissatisfied if the development of a highly organized structure made her novels seem to imply that life and the universe are parts of a metaphysical order.

Since the narrator is a novelist who is interpreting and shaping the reality he or she is dealing with and using novelistic devices and techniques in the representation of it, the reader need not feel a sense of contradiction between the form of the novel and reality by having the narrator claim to be a historian who is writing a novel about real people and events. Of fact, it has been claimed that even traditional historians cannot completely avoid using methods from the book. However, it is inaccurate to refer to the similarities and connections that give a book like Middlemarch structure as coincidences, as Barbara Hardy does. In reality, the narrator is structuring reality through narrative and picking details for artistic effect so that certain incidents and situations take on a particular significance. This suggests that chance or accident is to blame for the parallels and relationships that are embodied in the narrative. For instance, the narrator is the one who compares the demises of Featherstone and Casaubon, dubbed the most interesting coincidence in Middlemarch by Barbara Hardy [4].

The only reason these events, when seen as historical occurrences in the actual world, should be connected or significant is because the narrator notices similarities between them and arranges the story to highlight them. But there need not have been a connection between these two deaths if one can imagine the events of Middlemarch being described from another angle. In other words, there is no coincidence in the traditional meaning of the word. the analogy between these occurrences is one the narrator draws. Responding to criticism of Eliot's work using this view of her narrator is helpful. For instance, John Bayley thinks that perceptions of the world influence how reality is portrayed in her books. He contends that in order to advance ideas, she must do away with history as a historical reality and that her fiction cannot account for the contingent nature of experience. However, one may counter that no tale can accurately portray history as a collection of unadulterated facts. ideas must always be present to relate to and shape the facts shown, and even the inclusion of the contingent would not be exempt from ideas and representation.

Any author who feels they have no worldviews that are structuring their narratives is just unaware of them. One would even go so far as to say that authors who felt their narration was fully impartial and objective would deprive the reader of reality since it would seem that they were saying there was no difference between the reality their novel's narrative generated and reality itself. But Eliot enables the reader to notice this distinction by making them aware that the narrator is creating and interpreting a specific image of reality. It would be bad faith to not make it clear to the reader that the story clearly represented the narrator's own point of view. As a result, Middlemarch is full of remarks like this one: Certainly, this matter of his Casaubon's marriage to Miss Brooke touched him more deeply than it did any of the people who had previously expressed their disapproval of it, and at this point in the situation, I feel more tenderly toward his success than I do toward the amiable Sir James' disappointment. Not only does the narrator have a particular point of view and

express opinions and judgments, but there is also no attempt made to hide the fact that the narrator is crafting and writing a novel, as seen, for instance, when the reader is urged to view certain passages as allegories: Thus while I tell the truth about loobies, my reader's imagination need not be entirely excluded from an occupation with lords [5].

While Fever had ambiguous conditions and gave him that delightful labor of the imagination that is not mere arbitrariness, but the exercise of disciplined power combining and constructing with the clearest eye for probabilities and the fullest obedience to knowledge. and then, in yet more energetic alliance with impartial Nature, stoodi The term imagination implies a connection between science and art, and it's important to keep in mind that Eliot described her books as a set of experiments in life. A book cannot subject itself to verification tests, of course, but the reader's impression of how realistically plausible and persuasive it was may be seen as somewhat equal. One of the narrator's most interesting digressions is the passage about the pier-glass, where he claims that a philosopher friend who can dignify even your ugly furniture by lifting it into the serene light of science, has shown me this pregnant little fact, which is that scratches on a mirror appear concentric in form when a candle is held against them. These events are symbolic. The candle represents the egoism of any individual who is now missing, such as Miss Vincy, and the scratches are occurrences.

However, it would seem that the narrator is either not included in this or at least denies that this would also apply to a story made up of several occurrences. However, it would be premature for critics to claim that the book contradicts itself since, as I will explain, Eliot is fully aware of the problem as the author. However, it seems that the narrator is assuming that the reader will accept the claim that the scratches on the pier glass are going everywhere impartially as an unquestionable fact based on science, which would imply that the language of science provides true and direct access to a world of fact. Therefore, critics influenced by Roland Barthes, who rejected what he claimed was science's transparent view of language as a window onto the world, can assert that Eliot's narration strives for such transparency in its representation of reality, which is seen by Barthes as equivalent to complicity with ideologies that promote passive acceptance of the world as given. Examples of such critics include Colin MacCabe. The pier-glass passage undoubtedly alludes to the mirror being frequently used as an analogy in the eighteenth century for the relationship between the mind and reality, a comparison that was contested during the Romantic period and replaced with the comparison of the mind to a lamp.

According to science, it is a delusion to think that the scratches are concentric even though they appear to be when a candle is applied to them, so the lam To give no more than a faithful account of men and things as they have mirrored themselves in my mind is the narrator of Adam Bede's stated goal as a writer. Are the scientific descriptions of the scratches as non-concentric and the narrator's mirror as an account of men and things thus objective facts and hence free from bias? This objectivity about the scratches is presumably attained by looking at them in broad daylight and noting that they extend in all directions. Although the narrator gives the impression that the scientific viewpoint is the one that is true, what the narrator really demonstrates is that the application of light determines whether or not the scratches are concentric. It's important to recognize the play on words in the term serene light of science. Because science by the nineteenth century had developed into the most potent of ideologies and refused to give other views on the universe any weight, it is possible to identify the scientific explanation for the pier-glass scratches as being accurate.

Despite the fact that Eliot supports science, the pier-glass paragraph suggests that scientific truth can only be a certain viewpoint on the universe, one that is created using its own processes and operating norms to achieve specific goals. What seems to be a categorical statement of fact by the narrator is not quite what it seems because truth in science, unlike truth in a metaphysical or religious sense, cannot and perhaps Eliot as author is implying that it should not aspire to an absolute status. However, this does not mean that scientific fact should not be respected. A lamp-like relationship to reality is something that both humans and the narrative are compelled to have as a result of their inevitably self-interested desires. The narration states, All the light I can command must be concentrated on this particular web [6]. Thus, relativism is acknowledged both at the personal and philosophical levels since even scientific truth can only be a viewpoint on reality. Although the narrator of Middlemarch may inadvertently embrace relativism and comprehend that language cannot be a window into the world but must instead build it, this insight is not integrated into the book at the level of form, according to a structuralist critic inspired by Barthes.

The reader is denied access to any alternative viewpoints even if the narrative may only represent one view of the reality. In fact, it may be argued that this seeming admission of relativism is only a ruse to convince the reader to accept the metalanguage of the narrative without question. Later modernist fiction, however, recognizes that relativism, or more specifically, perspectivism, is incompatible with the kind of overpowering metalanguage found in a book like Middlemarch. As a result, novelists like Virginia Woolf and Joyce began to incorporate this insight into their work at a formal level by fragmenting narration and creating techniques like interior monologue, stream of consciousness, and a radical use of free indirect discourse. Of course, at the time Eliot was writing Middlemarch, these techniques were not available in English fiction, but it's possible that the passage's underlying epistemological implications eventually sparked the creation of fresh literary techniques that attempted to account for them. Eliot could have still favored her style of narration, nevertheless, for both aesthetic and philosophical reasons. Her style of narration allows for the integration of abstract thought into the creative framework of the book since she is an intellectual writer. Although Joyce is most often associated with stream of consciousness, particularly in Ulysses, this is obviously not maintained throughout the whole book, maybe because he knew its limits.

Eliot writes at the introduction of Notes on Form in Art that every difference is form and that form must depend first on the discrimination of wholes and then on that of parts. As a result, it cannot be removed from literary works since it must apply to the whole work. as a result, it will function as a form of covert or concealed metalanguage. Can 'omniscient' narrators and the metaphysics they imply be avoided in books that use an impersonal style of narration? Free indirect speech is used in this kind of narration, particularly in the contemporary age, to go from the impersonal third-person narrator to the mind of a specific character. It is challenging to distinguish 'omniscient' narration from impersonal narration if the impersonal narrator is different from the characters, whose consciousnesses are sometimes penetrated. Eliot's narrative avoids this issue since everything is filtered via the awareness of the narrator. She sparingly uses free indirect speech as a literary device to switch between the viewpoint of the narrator and that of the characters in her stories. This method avoids any suggestion of a metaphysical intrusion into the thoughts of the characters.

However, as I'll show in the next section, Eliot's style of narration does not stop her from undermining the narrator's metalanguage, although less drastically than in high modernist literature

like Ulysses. However, Eliot's main criticism of neutral, objective, or impersonal narration was probably philosophical in nature since it suggests that there is no separation between the shape the narrative creates and reality [7]. The narrator in all of Eliot's works has a strong presence, however Middlemarcb has more of a presence than the other books. But why was the narrator forced to acknowledge that the individuals and circumstances are made up? She probably believed that if the novel's status as a work of fiction was publicly revealed, it would have the same impact as Sterne's anti-art.

Although Henry James, whose narrator, like Trollope's, is also conceived as a historian even if James does not pay emphasis, disapproves of Trollope's use of this technique in several of his works, it does not fit the aims of Eliot. If the narrator admitted that the universe in the book was entirely the creation of the author's mind, the reader could get the impression that it shouldn't be taken too seriously. Eliot undoubtedly did not intend for the reader to feel this way, but he or she may have thought that if the narrator was shown to believe that the persons and events in the book were genuine, it would enhance the realistic illusion. However, some reviewers continue to connect her with the 'conventional book' and it's too literalistic kind of realism. As stated by Gabriel Josipovici, it is not nonetheless, the process of vision or awareness itself is never neutral. rather, art imposes shape on the substance of reality and so modifies it.

This is something that Proust, Homer, and Virginia Woolf are all aware of, but the conventional book seems to overlook. As a consequence, it implicitly presupposes that the real world and the one that is brought to our attention are one. On the other hand, Proust and Virginia Woolf enable us to perceive both history and flux, as well as the gulf that will always exist between them, by highlighting the urge to create that is typical of consciousness. Tolstoy and Eliot are two of the most prominent 'traditional' authors mentioned by Josipovici. The above discussion, I hope, has shown that there is solid evidence to support Eliot's assertion that she at least was aware of the disconnect between the forms produced by the mind and reality itself and that she attempted to account for this in the structure of her books. To be fair, she does not actively use this for subversive goals or to investigate epistemological issues in the style of postmodernist literature, with the possible exception of her short work The Lifted Veil. Even while the narrator often challenges his or her view on the world, the reader is typically not encouraged to do so. However, the fact that the narrator is basing this interpretation on certain principles and presumptions is made clear to the reader.

DISCUSSION

Mary Ann Evans wrote under the pen name George Eliot, a major character in the canon of Victorian literature who is renowned for her masterful storytelling as well as her in-depth examination of the interaction between author and narrator in her works. We will explore the nuances of this connection and its importance in George Eliot's body of writing in this conversation. Eliot's ability to conflate her role as author with that of the narrators who appear in her books is one of the characteristics of her narrative style. Eliot's narrative voice often combines with that of her characters rather than being strictly distinct, establishing a distinctive narrative identity that goes beyond traditional authorship. This combination enables her to connect closely with the viewpoints, feelings, and moral quandaries of her characters, producing stories that seem incredibly real and compassionate. A wide variety of characters, each with their own unique voices and viewpoints, may be found throughout Eliot's writings. She gives her characters the freedom to tell their experiences and portray their worldviews by deftly manipulating the narrative.

By providing several perspectives on the events and topics of her works, this method enhances the reading experience and entices readers to participate in a deeper investigation of the human condition. Eliot's narrative self is intricately entwined with the social and cultural milieu of her day. Eliot's writings serve as a reflection of the important intellectual and philosophical upheavals that characterized the Victorian period. Her narrators often struggle with moral, religious, social, and gender-role issues, reflecting the worries of Victorian society. Her stories so become priceless historical and sociocultural records in addition to everlasting literary works. Traditional ideas of authorship common in her age are challenged by Eliot's investigation of the author-narrator connection. She illustrates the notion that the author is not a remote, all-knowing entity but rather a bridge between the reader and the fictitious world by her ability to blend into her tales and take on the voices of her characters. Through navigating the intricate interplay between authorial purpose and narrative interpretation, this technique encourages readers to actively engage in the production of meaning within her works [8].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, George Eliot's creative talent is evident in her own narrative identity, which is characterized by the complex interaction between author and narrator. Her books continue to enthrall and fascinate readers because to her skill at fusing a variety of voices and viewpoints while also capturing the spirit of her day, making her a recognized figure in the world of literature. Readers and academics alike continue to be fascinated by George Eliot's intricate portrayal of the interaction between author and narrator. Her stories are still current and thought-provoking, creating a complex tapestry of people and ideas that stimulate continuing debate and study. Eliot's original narrative identity is proof of the literature's continuing ability to confront, uplift, and enlighten the human experience.

REFERENCES

[1] M. G. Anderson, Smile of Discontent: Humor, Gender, and Nineteenth-Century British Fiction . Eileen Gillooly. , *Wordsworth Circ.*, 2000, doi: 10.1086/twc24044814.

[2] L. Pykett, Sensation and the fantastic in the Victorian novel, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, 2009. doi: 10.1017/CCO9780511793370.012.

[3] J. Farina, Middlemarch and ‘that sort of thing,’ *Romanticism on the Net*. 2009. doi: 10.7202/029903ar.

[4] L. Pykett, Sensation and the fantastic in the Victorian novel, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, 2007. doi: 10.1017/ccol0521641500.010.

[5] M. Fludernik, Eliot and Narrative, in *A Companion to George Eliot*, 2013. doi: 10.1002/9781118542347.ch1.

[6] L. Hutcheon, In Defence of Literary Adaptation as Cultural Production, *M/C J.*, 2007, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2620.

[7] B. P. Rilett, The role of george henry lewes in george eliot’s career: A reconsideration, *George Eliot-George Henry Lewes Studies*. 2017. doi: 10.5325/georelioghlstud.69.1.0002.

[8] M. Harris, Preface, *George Eliot in Context*. 2011. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139019491.001.

CHAPTER 6

A DIALOGICAL EXPLORATION OF AUTHORIAL INTENT AND READER PERSPECTIVE

Neha Anand, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- nehaanand002@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This research dives into the complex interaction between authorial purpose and reader viewpoint in George Eliot's literary output as it conducts a detailed examination of her narrators. Famous Victorian author George Eliot is lauded for her intricate narrative strategies and nuanced characters. Through the use of her narrators, this study seeks to understand the dialogical interaction between Eliot as an author and her readers as interpreters. The first part of the research looks at Eliot's changing narrative techniques throughout her books, which use a variety of first-person and omniscient narrators. It examines the author's deliberate decisions on how to use various narrators to communicate her aims, ideals, and moral compass. The study also looks into the socio-cultural environment of Victorian England, offering insight on how Eliot's literary choices were impacted by the dominant intellectual and literary currents of her day. The premise that Eliot's narrators serve as conduits for the dialogical interplay between author and reader is central to the research. The narrators' distinctive viewpoints and voices encourage readers to interact with the book actively by challenging them to consider the complicated moral questions, ethical conundrums, and societal concerns that run through all of Eliot's writings. This study reveals how Eliot uses her narrators to create a dynamic discourse that invites readers to critically reflect on and understand her tales via an examination of key passages and textual evidence.

KEYWORDS:

Authorial Intent, Dialogical Exploration, George Eliot Narrators, Literary Interpretation, Reader Perspective.

INTRODUCTION

However, can one go farther and persuadably apply postmodernist thought to the reading of her literature, for instance, by seeing the narrator as 'unreliable' in the manner notably of narrators in postmodernist-influenced fiction, even if this was not intentionally intended? In her book Vocation and Desire: George Eliot's Heroines, Dorothea Barrett takes issue with the narrator's promotion of what she perceives as conservative philosophy. She links this conservative narrator to Marian Lewes, but she also notices a more radical ideology in the novel's undercurrents, which she credits to the artist George Eliot, who continues to be in unconscious touch with the radicalism of the author's earlier self. Marian Lewes clearly intends to recommend, but the texts themselves subvert her intention, so in effect the narration becomes unreliable even though Eliot as the author did not intend it to be. Clearly a problem with reliable narration for critics like Barrett is that the reader is expected to be passive before the text, but for her Eliot's narration can and should be read against the grain as unreliable, which has the advantage of but what makes Eliot's work stand out may be the way she subverts the presumption of reliable and unreliable narration, which is characteristic of how she handles oppositions.

Philosophically speaking, the labels reliable and unreliable are problematic since they beg the question, reliable or unreliable in regard to what? Reality? This has, of course, been an issue for philosophy at least since Plato, who famously made the comparison between the reality we believe to be seen via the senses and the shadow play produced by the impact of light on the walls of a dark cave. Although this topic has been the subject of decades of philosophical discussion, Kant's idea that humans may only directly access the seeming world of phenomena rather than the real, the thing in itself, has proven to be one of the most prominent positions. Therefore, any depiction of the universe that makes the claim to be true or real is problematic. This might be still another reason why Eliot did not use neutral or unmediated styles of narration, where the reader is supposed to accept the truth of what is being described without inquiry and the narrator is not personally identified. The contrast between reliable and unreliable collapses if there is no stable standard by which trustworthiness can be measured, according to Eliot, even if narration may not be able to strive beyond interpretation of the reality [1].

The narrator in Eliot's works makes no attempt to conceal the fact that all narration must be mediated by a consciousness that is interpreting the world or that any evaluations or remarks the narrator makes of the characters on moral, political, or philosophical grounds will reflect a set of values or beliefs. This does not render the commentary unreliable in the traditional sense, but it does not hide from the reader the fact that it is an interpretation guided by particular interests, beliefs, and preconceptions, and that it may also reflect conflicts in the narrator's thinking. However, is it acceptable for the reader to not always agree with the narrator's interpretation and point of view, and does the novel's discourse take into account the possibility of a discrepancy in interpretation between the narrator and reader? The bias of the narrator in Eliot's novels creates a dilemma for readers who do not share the narrator's perspective on the world, moral standards, or political inclinations, according to Barrett's viewpoint. These readers may, at the very least, reject Eliot's fiction if their core convictions appear to them to be incompatible with the narrator's point of view.

Strongly religious people, Marxists, and hard-liner feminists are obvious examples of this sort of reader. these people, unlike Barrett, are unable to perceive a subtext that challenges the narrator's assertions and conclusions. With statements like Middlemarch can no longer be one of the books of my life and titles like Why Feminists Are Angry with George Eliot, feminist criticism, particularly in the 1970s, exemplified the tendency to reject Eliot's fiction by those who reject the ideology they believe governs the narration. More recently, some post-colonial influenced critics have adopted a similar negative attitude, especially with regard to Daniel Deronda. Thus, the appeal of Barrett's effort to defend Eliot's fiction from such harsh criticism by asserting that the overt narrator's point of view is accidentally corrupted inside the text. I'll say that there may be another way to defend Eliot's fiction. I have argued that the narrator is integral to the plot of Eliot's novels since they are there in the text. Although the narrator claims to be the novel's author, the actual author is the implied author, who is the person who actually writes the book and is placed between the narrator and Eliot: As an imaginary entity is to be distinguished clearly from the real author.

The implied author is also to be distinguished from the narrator because the latter stands at a remove from the narrative voice, as the person assumed to be responsible for determining what kind of narrator will be presented to the reader. in many works this distinction produces an effect of irony at the narrator's expense. In Eliot's novels, the implied author stands at a remove from the narrative voice without necessarily subverting the narrator Interpretations are limitless, as the

Middlemarch narrator readily acknowledges [2]. This implies that readers at least those who are not fundamentally committed to ideologies that are incompatible with the narrator's are free to hold opinions that differ from the narrator's without necessarily undermining the novel's discourse or the veracity of the narrator's beliefs and judgments. I would contend that since Eliot's texts are dialogical in nature, what Barrett perceives as the subconscious subversive in George Eliot that unwittingly undermines the narrative voice is theoretically contained in the book. Although alternative or opposing sets of ideas also circulate in the text and are given their own discursive space, this does not imply that Eliot as an author does not write from a certain set of philosophical, ethical, or political principles. Sown evidence in the text is unquestionably a sign of narrative control and intentionality on the part of the author, as Barrett claims in a discussion of the subconscious fecundity produced.

The Mill on the Floss by Maggie's elopement: Whether or not Marian Lewes intended this Ladislaw in Middlemarch, who, according to Barrett, is continuously glorified in the narrative, for instance by being connected with solar imagery, is another dubious example Barrett identifies as an inadvertent difference between Marian Lewes and George Eliot as conscious and unconscious writers. She makes the observation that, contrary to Max Miiller's view that all myths are allegories of the sun, the incident that joins Dorothea and Ladislaw occurs during a rainstorm. The thunderstorm is introduced to call Will as sun god, that is, Will as solution, into question once more, according to Barrett, who also claims that there is an allusion to Adalbart Kuhn's theory that all myths are allegories of thunderstorms tend to agree with Barrett that there is interaction between Miiller and Kuhn, but how could such allusions to these writers and the implications of these allusions be a sign of the conscious author's loss of control in this passage? Contrarily, it is unquestionably a sign that the indicated author is attempting to convey that there are several perspectives on the connection between Dorothea and Ladislaw. Forcing the reader to either reject the narrator's perspective on the world on ideological grounds or attribute textual complexities to the author's subconscious rather than to the implied author's artistry and intellectual subtlety, negative Eliot critics like those mentioned above and Barrett read the narration of the novels as monologic in its intention. They believe it enforces a single perspective that blanks out alternative perspectives. It's possible that certain Eliot readers will always see the narrative as monological, and there isn't much that can be done to alter their thoughts [3].

Although the implied author is not to be identified with the narrator, this does not, I would argue, call the narrator's interventions and judgements into question in a radical way or ironize them. Rather, it raises the question of how readers who are less monologically inclined and unconvinced by the claim that the narration is unconsciously subverted relate to the interventions and judgements of her narrator. The reader does not have to passively agree with everything the narrator says, but they nearly always merit the respect of readers who are not dedicated to a definite set of views or values. Which compares her simple attire and the shape of her hand and wrist to Italian painters' depictions of the Virgin Mary, creates an image with interpretive overtones, implying that she is unintentionally playing a role for religious effect which subtly questions her identification with the ideal of selflessness. The majority of readers are likely to take the narrator's reference to Dorothea's poor dress as a factual statement, but the parallel between her and images of the Virgin Mary is likely to be seen as the author's interpretation of the character rather than just a statement of fact. However, it should be noted that even the statement of Dorothea's poor dress is subject to interpretation since the narrator picked it from a wide range of other qualities about Dorothea that might have been included. The reader is given an interpretation of the character. yet,

although the reader may be able to contest the narrator's perspective, there is no way to get to know the ‘real' Dorothea. Any description involves interpretation, but Eliot's narration stands out from more typical narration in that this is not covered up in any way. A Christian reader would have a right to object to the narrator's depiction on the grounds that it demonstrates anti-Christian bias since it seems to cast doubt on a real Christian's desire for selflessness. The reader is introduced to the narrator as an interpretation of the world, not as a disinterested observer whose descriptions and comments presuppose access to an objective reality that the reader is supposed to accept without question, and this is obvious, we are all born into moral stupidity, taking the world as an udder to feed our supreme selves. While this aspect of the narration as description overlaid with interpretation may not present much difficulty to the relatively open-minded reader, the same might not be true in relation to the narrator's numerous intrusive comments of a more philosophical nature. This seems to be a constative statement, one that can be answered in terms of being either true or untrue, and it necessitates that the reader does so [4].

The reader could at the very least wish to examine the absoluteness of the statement We are all of us, which makes no mention of exceptions. It is only claimed. there is no justification provided. This style of rhetoric has always been seen by many Eliot fans as being both moralistic and uncreative. But can this claim be considered conclusive? The constative function of language interacts with the poetic function in a literary environment and produces an interaction between the two that prevents the constative from taking precedence over the poetic, as Roman Jakobson effectively stated in his article Linguistics and Poetics. In poetic or, more broadly, literary contexts, words do not relate to each other linearly or syntagmatic ally as in constative discourse - which would make them open to paraphrase and application to practical situations but paradigmatically in that they relate to each other. Jakobson famously, if somewhat obliquely, puts it: The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination. One result of this in respect to the narrator's commentary on egoism is that it interacts with both the dramatic and descriptive elements of the book as a literary work such that its impact is integrative and does not stand alone as constative assertion. How the narrator's philosophical observation is consistent with the narrator's description and suggested interpretation of Dorothea might be used to demonstrate this.

Although the narrator continues to hold out the hope that at least some emergence from it may eventually be possible, if that is the case with Dorothea, it must also be the case with all the other characters in the book. Even someone with a strong Christian faith who aspires to transcendence of self and is determined to serve the needs of others cannot transcend the egoism that human beings are born into. The expressive and poetic power of the narrator's language, which combines figurative linguistic components like metaphor with sound effects, rhythm, and cadence to prevent the constative from breaking free from or dominating the poetic, is another reason why the narrator's comment cannot be reduced to the constative. Due of this, it is immune to, or at the very least resistant to, traditional analysis or criticism. It would be incorrect to claim that the constative has no force, but it is possible to make the case that it cannot be understood in the same way as a typical philosophical argument. Thus, it may make a reader of literature happy regardless of their own views and viewpoints. However, if a reader strongly disagrees with the constative element, the poetic function can be disregarded or neutralized, making the statement open to interpretation and abstract debate similar to standard philosophical discourse. However, if the narrator's philosophical observations in Middlemarch are treated in this way, the novel runs the risk of being removed from literary discourse and seriously deprived of its literary value. Almost all of

Middlemarch's philosophical or intellectually insightful sections may be interpreted in a similar way, although sometimes a discussion of a different philosophical idea is necessary to strengthen that critical perspective. That Casaubon had stored up for him a compound interest of enjoyment during his lengthy, studious bachelorhood, which prompts the narrator to reflect that we all of us, grave or light, get our thoughts entangled in metaphors, and act fatally on the strength of them [5].

Once again, this is an absolute assertion that asserts universal applicability without any justification. It would be simple to show how this statement is integrative in its effect because it can be applied to the thinking of almost every character in the book, not just to Casaubon's marriage but also to his life work, his search for the key to all mythologies. This is similar to how the constative element interacts with the poetic function when reflecting on egoism. Dorothea's use of metaphor is also clear in her reasoning. Initiating the mirror theme, she is initially unable to see Casaubon critically because he thinks a whole world of which my thought is but a poor two penny mirror, which causes her to picture his whole experience as a lake compared with my little pool!. Characters who are repulsed by the marriage turn to analogies that link Casaubon with sterility or death, with Mrs. Cadwallader comparing marriage to Casaubon to going to a nunnery and Sir James Chettam saying he is no better than a mummy. Even scientists are susceptible to metaphorical reasoning, as shown by Lydgate's scientific investigation, which was motivated by the hunt for the primitive tissue. The use of metaphor is a notable aspect of the narrator's own discourse, most obviously in the use of web as a metaphor.

Despite the fact that metaphorical thinking appears to be viewed negatively as one can get entangled in metaphors, and act fatally on the strength of them, the narrator's own discourse is not without its own notable metaphors. However, the suggested author, if not the narrator, is well aware that there is no such thing as metaphor-free language, therefore it will always pervade human mind. The book suggests that metaphors might eventually serve the welfare of humanity since they are a way of imagining altering how people see the nature of reality. Allowing metaphors to be unquestioningly projected onto reality may be dangerous. The web metaphor used by the narrator invites the reader to consider the many connections that exist between people and the social medium, which is the result of historical and cultural factors that seem to have nothing to do with the self. Critics have focused a lot of attention on the web metaphor's dual meaning since, if connection experiences don't result in a feeling of emancipation from limited egoism, the alternative is a sensation of being enmeshed in a social spider's web [6].

The notion that everyone acts fatally on the strength of them in the statement on metaphor would seem to warrant criticism since it seems at the very least overstated. However, such an argument would only be supported by interpreting it in conclusive terms. The constative interacts with the figurative, and hyperbole is a typical literary method employed for rhetorical emphasis. Given that the narrator appears to attack the use of metaphors through metaphor, becoming entangled in metaphors so that the apparent meaning and its subversion are enacted at the same time through being entangled, this is one of Middlemarcb's most artistically self-conscious philosophical reflections. However, there is also the implied alternative meaning that metaphor is inevitable, as the novel as a whole demonstrates. Middlemarch accomplishes the same with the contrast between the passive and the active reader, even if readers have typically failed to notice this, as I have argued that Middlemarch is a book that subverts the contradiction between reliable and unreliable narration. While reading Middlemarcb, the reader will constantly swing between being somewhat passive in respect to the narrative and being quite active, sometimes criticizing the narrator's judgments or comments.

Given the premise that the world can only be understood via interpretation, it would be irrational to anticipate that the reader would completely agree with the narrator's assessment of the individuals and their circumstances. One of the things I liked most about reading Middlemarcb was connecting with the narrator. One may counter that what matters is dialogic contact between the narrator and reader rather than necessarily sharing the narrator's perspective or judgment. The literary strength of the narrative is enjoyable on its own terms, even if the reader sometimes disagrees with the narrator's point of view. The characterization of Casaubon's speech as sincere as the bark of a dog, or the cawing of an amorous rook has an appeal at the literary level that is relatively independent of agreement or disagreement with the judgement expressed, even if the reader may be less eager than the narrator to dismiss it as frigid rhetoric after Dorothea accepted his marriage proposal. The strength of the novel's literary discourse, in which abstract thought interacts with figurative language and an artful selection of realistic detail is what makes one continue to read it and reflect on it both at the human level and philosophically [7].

Middlemarcb is concerned with major themes of an ethical and philosophical type that continue to provoke discussion. Even though many readers and critics have believed that the narrator's intrusions are artistically indefensible, being the result of the author's moralism or her reluctance to let readers draw their own conclusions, it is important to note that Eliot was undoubtedly drawn to the aesthetic possibilities of an active narrator. Middlemarcb was described by George Steiner in one of his early articles as George Eliot attempts to persuade us of what should be artistically evident by interfering constantly in the narration. The narrator with Eliot herself and imply implicitly that art should be dramatic, perhaps influenced by Jamesian principles regarding fiction. The intrusive narrator detaches the reader from the dramatic action and inhibits emotional identification so that the reader is more actively engaged in the narrative rather than merely a passive consumer of it.

This aesthetic purpose that the intrusive narrator can serve is, however, overlooked by these criticisms. In other words, these 'intrusions' by the narrator serve as a type of alienation effect. they are intended to carry out the anti-dramatic function of detaching and distancing: One morning a few weeks after arriving at Lowick, Dorothea - but why always Dorothea? Was her perspective on this marriage the only one that could possibly exist? I object to directing all of our attention and understanding toward the young skins that seem to be blossoming despite difficulty. they too will deteriorate and learn about the more serious and enduring grievances that we are contributing to ignoring. This paragraph most likely belongs in W. Because the 'author' interjects. However, it's certain that this line was written with the intention of instantly connecting the reader to Dorothea. A trap has been set for readers.

The reader is impliedly accused of bias and encouraged to see the situation from Casaubon's perspective rather than empathizing with Dorothea. There are two reasons why the narrative's rapid change in direction is suitable. First, one of the novel's main themes is to demonstrate the wide range of perspectives that may be expressed in response to any given circumstance or state of things, as well as the ways in which each perspective is influenced by individual interests. This is made glaringly obvious to the reader by the abrupt shift in perspective from Dorothea to Casaubon. Second, this shift in perspective aids Eliot in undermining readers' expected reactions and encouraging them to consider their own views in addition to their typical reactions to the tale. There are several additional passages that serve comparable purposes. For instance, after hearing that Dorothea was engaged to Casaubon, Sir James Chettam exclaimed, Good God! It is dreadful! He is no better than a mummy.

The narrator goes on to attack Sir James's, Mrs. Cadwallader's and Celia's views of Casaubon: I protest against any absolute conclusion, any prejudice derived from Mrs. Cadwallader's contempt for a neighboring clergyman's alleged greatness of soul, or Sir James Chettam's poor opinion of his rival's legs, from Mr. Brooke's failure to elicit a companion's ideas, or from Celia's criticism of a middle-aged scholar's personal appearance. I doubt even the finest man of his time, if there was ever a single superlative, could avoid seeing these unfavorable images of himself in many little mirrors. Even while I've argued that the narrator shouldn't be associated with Eliot herself and should instead be considered as an essential component of her books' plots, it would obviously be overstating the case to claim that the narrator is completely unrelated to Eliot. The crucial distinction is that the narrator is a character who is incorporated into the fiction with a tone of voice distinct from the author's, even if she may not at the level of substance disagree with the views or thoughts conveyed by her narrator. As I've attempted to demonstrate, she is a self-aware author who seeks to balance aesthetic form and reality without sacrificing either, which may indicate that her writing has more in common with that of her modernist predecessors than her detractors have generally assumed [8].

DISCUSSION

As it delves into the complex world of George Eliot's narrative artistry, Interpreting George Eliot's Narrators: A Dialogical Exploration of Authorial Intent and Reader Perspective offers a rich tapestry of insights into the interaction between the author's intentions and the various perspectives of readers. This debate aims to draw attention to a few important features of this academic project. Mary Ann Evans, who wrote under the pen name George Eliot, is renowned for her books' in-depth explorations of human character and society. The narrators she uses are at the heart of her storytelling technique. These narrators have a more active role in influencing the reader's experience than they do as just conduits for the tale. This research reveals the nuances and complexity of Eliot's narrative strategies by examining these narrators. Understanding what is meant by dialogical is essential to comprehending the core of this research. It emphasizes the notion that reading is a two-way conversation between the author and the reader rather than a passive activity. Eliot's narrators encourage this discussion by offering various viewpoints, moral quandaries, and social problems. This debate strengthens the argument that Eliot's writings transcend time since they continue to spark deep dialogue among readers.

A common subject in literary analysis is the opposition between authorial purpose and reader viewpoint. This research recognizes that while authors have specific intentions and messages they wish to convey through their works, readers bring their own backgrounds, beliefs, and interpretations to the text. The narrators of George Eliot act as the middlemen in this dynamic connection, affecting how readers understand and interpret the text. It is crucial to take into account the socio-cultural setting of Victorian England in order to properly understand Eliot's narrative choices. This study digs into the ways in which Eliot's tales were influenced by the literary and intellectual currents of her day, giving readers a fuller comprehension of her works and demonstrating their continued value. The debate further emphasizes how flexible interpretation is. Over time, readers' reactions to Eliot's books have changed as a result of shifting cultural norms and viewpoints. This research shows how readers of all generations have interacted with and understood Eliot's stories in their own unique ways, demonstrating the continuing power of her storytelling.

CONCLUSION

As a result, Interpreting George Eliot's Narrators makes a significant academic contribution to the study of literature. The deep connection between the author's technique, the narrators' functions, and the reader's perception is made clear. This study emphasizes the timeless nature of George Eliot's stories by situating them within a dialogical framework and extending an invitation to readers and academics to continue having fruitful discussions about her literary legacy. The impact of the narrator's criticism of them for being founded on a biased point of view is increased since the reader will probably share similar opinions regarding Casaubon in light of how he or she has previously been portrayed in the book. The phrase various small mirrors. Eliot's concern in putting some space between the reader and the dramatic action so that he or she might evaluate the story with more critical awareness is also seen by the increased usage of epigraphs in the later works.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Currie and D. L. Brien, Mythbusting Publishing: Questioning the 'Runaway Popularity' of Published Biography and Other Life Writing, *M/C J.*, 2008, doi: 10.5204/mcj.43.

[2] L. Hutcheon, In Defence of Literary Adaptation as Cultural Production, *M/C J.*, 2007, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2620.

[3] D. David, Making a living as an author, in *A Companion to the English Novel*, 2015. doi: 10.1002/9781118607251.ch19.

[4] K. Hadjiafxendi, Negotiating Fame: Mid-Victorian Women Writers and the Romantic Myth of the Gentlemanly Reviewer, in *Crafting the Woman Professional in the Long Nineteenth Century: Artistry and Industry in Britain*, 2016. doi: 10.4324/9781315574561-18.

[5] J. Kucich, Intellectual debate in the Victorian novel: Religion and science, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, 2009. doi: 10.1017/CCO9780511793370.007.

[6] J. Batchelor, Anon, pseud and 'by a lady': The spectre of anonymity in women's literary history, in *Women's Writing, 1660-1830: Feminisms and Futures*, 2016. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-54382-0_6.

[7] G. Daw, Hospitable infinity: Imagining new prospects and other worlds in victorian cosmic voyage literature, *Vic. Lit. Cult.*, 2016, doi: 10.1017/S106015031600005X.

[8] N. J. Watson, ALEXIS EASLEY. Literary Celebrity, Gender, and Victorian Authorship, 1850-1914., *Rev. English Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1093/res/hgs027.

CHAPTER 7

GEORGE ELIOT'S NARRATIVE CRAFT AND THE ENIGMATIC CHARACTER OF CASAUBON: A DIALOGICAL INVESTIGATION

Sonia Jayant, Assistant Professor
College of Computing Sciences and IT, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- soniaj.jayant@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Through the prism of the mysterious Casaubon character from George Eliot's iconic novel Middlemarch, this research launches a captivating investigation of her mastery of narrative technique. George Eliot, with her distinctive fusion of creativity and intelligence, stands as a key character in Victorian literature at a time when literature was at the forefront of intellectual dialogue. This study explores the subtleties of character formation by analyzing the complicated interactions between individual influences, historical allusions, and creative imagination. The inquiry starts by looking at Eliot's out-of-the-box method of developing characters, one that goes beyond her own social network. Eliot's search for character models pushes the limits of what is often considered authorial purpose, broadening the scope of the story to encompass historical individuals and intellectual influences. A dialogical dialogue between the author's creative process and the reader's interpretative involvement is built on this strategy. The mysterious Casaubon, a man cloaked in mystery and steeped with meaning, is at the center of this investigation. The controversial theory that Casaubon could have drawn inspiration from Eliot's acquaintance, the classical scholar Mark Pattison, is explored in the study. It analyses this theory critically while taking the complexity of authorial relationships and literary satire into consideration. The research also takes a look at a different angle, emphasizing George Eliot's lifelong preoccupation with Isaac Casaubon, a historical character. Because of this historical link, Casaubon's importance is elevated beyond the level of ordinary reality.

KEYWORDS:

Authorial Influence, Casaubon, Character Development, George Eliot, Historical References, Narrative Craft.

INTRODUCTION

This Chapter represented the idea that one should go to genuine individuals directly known to her for prototypes of her characters. Eliot is both an artist and an intellectual, and for her, the two are inseparable, thus to confine the discussion of prototypes to just those she knew intimately restricts the novel's potential audience. I'll argue that historical personalities had a greater aesthetic impact on Eliot's characterization than the individuals she knew, and that this may provide light on some of the cultural themes the book tackles. In fact, the narrator exhorts the audience to seek for historical analogies: And here I am naturally led to reflect on the means of elevating a low subject, the narrator says. In this approach, historical comparisons are incredibly effective. Any stories I've told or will talk about poor people might be elevated by being labeled as parables. Featherstone and his group are mentioned in this section. However, Casaubon is likened to figures like Hooker and Aquinas, while Lydgate is associated with the renowned physician Vesalius. In particular, Casaubon poses intriguing questions about the interplay between the personal and the historical. It has been argued, most notably by John Sparrow, that the name of the subject of Pattison's

biography, Isaac Casaubon, is the main factor in assuming that Casaubon is modeled on Eliot's friend, the classical scholar Mark Pattison.

The biggest argument against this is that it doesn't seem plausible that Eliot would have so blatantly made fun of a friend with whom she was friendly and who remained so after the release of Middlemarch. In his biography of Pattison, Sparrow asserts that the similarities are so striking that Pattison must have known about them but chose to preserve his friendship with Eliot out of deference to appearances. He continues by making the much less credible claim that Eliot wanted Pattison to see the similarities and endure his suffering in quiet. Additionally, he acknowledges that Pattison gave private readings to his female disciples in his study. If Pattison believed that he himself was the model for Casaubon, this would suggest a particular sort of masochism. It is still conceivable that Pattison, in particular his devotion to scholarship and his marriage to a woman much younger than himself, had some influence on how.

Eliot portrayed Dorothea Brooke and Casaubon, despite the fact that Eliot was almost certain to be aware of both the numerous scholars who were morally bankrupt and failed to complete important projects, as well as the numerous young women who idealized and wed men who were their parents' age. However, there is undoubtedly a lot more straightforward reason for the adoption of the name Casaubon than supposing Pattison to be his prototype, and that is the relationship between Eliot's persona and the historical figure Isaac Casaubon, as I will attempt to demonstrate. This enables her to suggest a link at a symbolic level with the Renaissance classical scholar, therefore elevating Casaubon's relevance beyond the level of reality. Perhaps the similarity has been ruled out because to the seeming folly of connecting Eliot's character to a famous scholar, as well as the fact that Pattison's biography of Isaac Casaubon was not released until 1875, or around three years after the release of Middlemarch [1].

But according to Gordon S. Haight in his biography of Eliot, she had a fascination with Isaac Casaubon since 1849: George Eliot had been interested in the great French scholar since her winter in Geneva, where Casaubon was born, and knew his fine edition of Theophrastus' Characters. Pattison had also written a lengthy biography of Casaubon in the Quarterly Review of 1853 that was remarkably similar to Haight's in terms of methodology. G. and Eliot. Since the beginning of 1869, H. Lewes and the Pattisons had maintained a cordial relationship, and there is proof that she was very interested in the Pattisons' ongoing project. We are anticipating the Rector's book, which has a great lot to say in these times, she wrote to Mrs. Pattison in late 1874. 'Mr. Lewes and I both cry out against the omission of the chapter which must be needed as aspire to the edifice' is another letter written in January 1875 while Pattison was still proofreading, indicating that she and Lewes were aware of the book's contents before it was published.

There are therefore good reasons to believe that Eliot was aware of both the historical Casaubon and Pattison's work the real individual and the fictional character have many parallels, as can be seen by reading Pattison's biography. For instance, Isaac wasn't exactly a passionate suitor. He married Florence Estienne, in the words of Pattison in the Quarterly Review, not to detain him long from his books, but rather to gain access to her father's manuscripts. His relationship with his wife is in some respects obviously suggestive of that between Dorothea and Casaubon: He certainly complains bitterly on one occasion of her interrupting him. Casaubon was naturally anxious, but we also need to account for the irritation brought on by a life spent racing the clock while reading. Casaubon considered every second that he wasn't learning to be wasted. As a terrible injury, he disliked intrusion.

He may have sometimes seemed indifferent to his wife's struggles and selfishly burying himself in his books while she struggled in her own manner to manage the responsibilities of a big family and little resources. Isaac looked like a younger version of Edward. According to Pattison's description of his physical attributes, Nature had given him a puny and infirm frame. One might go back to Celia's remarks on Edward Casaubon's ugly appearance and Sir James Chettam's disapproval of his legs. Even if Casaubon had found a Boswell, it may be doubted if his talk could have been effectively reported. This reminds me of Celia's comment on Edward's dinnertime conversation: He talks very little. A similar incident to the one Pattison describes in his essay for the Quarterly Review occurred when Isaac's doctor arrived to treat him: He was no sooner called in than he discovered the lines of death in the dark ring round the eye, the prominent cheek bone, the hectic flush, the sunken chest, and the incessive wrinkles.

Lydgate visits Casaubon and finds him showing more markedly than ever the signs of premature age. Although he could not have lived a long life, excessive work combined with mental stress accelerated his demise. Similar anxiety as to how far [his illness] might be likely to cut short his labors or his life is experienced by Edward Casaubon. Isaac Casaubon's most ambitious project, his Exercitiones Contra Baronium, was a work of enormous scope. It was an effort at reconstructing religion, similar to The Key to All Mythologies, although only a portion was successful. The volume of this monstrous critique that we have is simply the first half of the first book - a small fragment, according to Pattison. Despite having immense desire, he also produced relatively little work: Of all these schemes, and of others not a few, hardly any traces remain among the papers, because hardly anything was ever put on paper [2].

Furthermore, according to Pattison, what little work he did produce has been lost: Well done, ill done, or half-done, however, Isaac Casaubon's books are now consigned to one common oblivion. Furthermore, he made no claims to originality or creativity. in fact, Isaac Casaubon described him as destitute of imagination. It is almost a contradiction that the most accomplished and comprehensive interpreter of the classics should have been a man who was completely devoid of compassion for their human and naturalistic aspect, according to Pattison's assessment of his responses to the works he studied. One may think of Edward Casaubon's attitude to Raphael's frescoes in Middlemarch's, as well as his overall lack of creativity. According to Pattison's assessment, there are clear parallels between Eliot's Casaubon and the genuine Casaubon. But why may Eliot have wanted to connect her character to the real man in the first place? Given that Isaac shares many of Edward's flaws on a personal level, made little headway with his biggest project, and what little he did achieve is now lost, it would seem that there is no obvious sarcastic contrast. What makes Isaac Casaubon different, however, is that despite all of his flaws, Pattison still thinks highly of him: But Casaubon's books, whatever their worth, were not the man. More important than his writings are the scholar.

Not many folio pages, but rather himself, are the product of his labors. He continues by drawing a comparison between him and Milton, another figure Pattison claims is superior to his works and to whom Edward is also likened. For Pattison, Casaubon's whole dedication to learning is admirable: Day by day, night, from the age of twenty upwards, Casaubon is at his book... Casaubon committed himself at age 56 after giving up activity, relaxation, pleasure, society, health, and life itself. Though equivocal in its portrayal of the Grammarian, Browning's poem A Grammarian's Funeral serves as a reminder that he might be perceived in this hero-like light. It's also intriguing to note that Casaubon may have served as Browning's model. However, by understanding Pattison's admiration for Casaubon, we may see how he varies from Eliot's figure and potentially

have a better grasp of Casaubon's symbolic significance in the book. The tradition Isaac Casaubon followed gave his work much more importance than the inherent value of any one of his publications. He was an outstanding scholar of the Second Classical Renaissance, which succeeded the First Renaissance. The time of boyhood and fun was over. the age of adulthood and toil had begun, according to Pattison [3].

By contributing to the reconstruction of classical texts and thereby creating a classical tradition backed by scholarship, Casaubon overcame this tedium and his own limitations. He said: To put together this tradition, to revive the picture of the ancient world, patient industry, and industry adequate to a complete survey of the extant remains of the lost world, was the one quality required. This was the goal and motivating ideal that Casaubon had in mind. Since it avoided subjectivity distortion, his lack of genius actually worked in his favor: His lack of genius saved him from falling, as Scaliger has sometimes done, into the temptation of pursuing the striking rather than the true. The unfortunate thing for Edward Casaubon is that people no longer consider the work he is doing to be part of a scholarly tradition similar to that of his namesake. The breach between the classical world and a culture and civilization founded on Christianity, which Eliot had examined in Romola, was largely bridged by the tradition of humanist research.

As a classical scholar and Christian who was courted by both Catholics and Protestants while being a Protestant, Isaac Casaubon may have contributed to bridging cultural gaps. Eliot believed that Otfried Miiller's Prolegomena to a Scientific Mythology had discredited the study of syncretic mythography, which is why Edward Casaubon is lost in a labyrinth of an exploded pseudo-science, as W. J. Harvey noted. Thomas Aquinas, whose great mediaeval synthesis is the paradigm of the constitutive system that Casaubon wishes to create from the study of mythology, is a figure Aquinas' synthesis, the pinnacle of the scholastic tradition, was successful in producing a framework that, in his day, brought Christian belief and knowledge into harmony. Anyone hoping to produce a synthesis similar to that of Aquinas in the nineteenth century, however, in which knowledge is now guided by a methodology founded on scientific principles, is likely to be reduced to the status of an Isaac Casaubon without the classical tradition of scholarship that gave his labors form and value [4].

Edward Casaubon must utterly fail in his attempt to develop his reconstruction system using a technique that has been debunked by science. The major difference between the two Casaubons, despite the fact that they are identical in many ways, is how they relate to their respective cultural settings. Isaac lived at a period when even if much of what he accomplished included intellectual work, a guy without genius whose major qualities were the acquisition and complete commitment to knowledge in the form of classical research could make a substantial cultural contribution. It contributed to the Renaissance by advancing the fusion of Christian faith with classical study, ushering in a glorious period in human history. But unlike Dorothea, Edward Casaubon, a later born Isaac Casaubon, lives in a society devoid of coherent social faith and order which could perform the function of knowledge for the ardently willing soul. Edward Casaubon's cultural background, which Carlyle described in Past and Present as being fractured and inorganic, is one in which religion and science, or faith and knowledge in their contemporary form, look irretrievably divided.

Both Casaubon and Dorothea fall within the narrator's statement in the Finale that there is no creature who’s inward being is so strong that it is not greatly determined by what lies outside it. In terms of the novel's realist aspect, the various comparisons of Casaubon to figures such as Aquinas,

Milton, Hooker, and Locke are ironic and comic. however, in terms of the symbolism associated with his name, they are not necessarily invalid since, even though he lacks genius or even imagination, had he lived in a different era, his efforts might not have been in vain. Although his works may have been consigned to a common oblivion, Isaac Casaubon nonetheless offers the hope that one need not be an Aquinas or a Milton to make a significant contribution to the world. This implies an anti-elitist and democratic message, which is a major theme of the book and is explicitly stated in the Finale. Symbolically, Dorothea Brooke and Will Ladislaw reflect the separation from that past and affiliation with a worldview that is future-focused, namely Romanticism in its idealistic and utopian element [5].

If Casaubon may be understood as symbolizing someone who predominantly links to a pre-modern past. After arguing that Eliot had a valid rationale for selecting the name Casaubon due to its symbolic possibilities, I'll concentrate on two less well-known historical predecessors that are also used metaphorically, and once again a name provides a hint. The emphasis on Dorothea's ardor throughout the novel is a particularly Romantic trait that is undoubtedly linked to Shelley, the most idealistic of the Romantics. She is a Romantic because she is eager to make a significant contribution to the world and because she is prepared to put her faith in emotion rather than logic. Ladislaw is more closely linked to Romanticism, yet at first, he is attracted to its more independent side. He received his education at Heidelberg, one of the epicenters of German Romanticism, and Mr. Brooke twice likens him to Shelley: He seems to me a kind of Shelley... He has the same fervor for liberty, freedom, and liberation, according to Mrs. Cadwallader, who calls him a sort of Byronic hero. He is also connected to Byron.

He is associated with Romantic individuality because of his colorful looks and drug use. The following exchange between them about what it means to be a poet exemplifies both their shared Romantic traits and their differences: To be a poet is to have a soul so quick to discern that no shade of quality escapes it, and so quick to feel that discernment is but a hand playing with finely-ordered variety on the chords of emotion - a soul in which knowledge passes instantly into feeling, and feeling flashes back as a new organ of knowledge. 'But you leave out the poetry,' said Dorothea. I believe they are needed to finish the poet. I can relate to what you mean when you say that information may evoke feelings since that's exactly how it feels to me. But I'm certain that I could never write a poem. The name Dorothea serves as a hint to a historical precedent for the character in a book where names play an essential role. One can be reminded of another Dorothea, who has certain Romantic traits with her but is not a poet, Dorothea Schlegel, one of the major female personalities of the German Romantic movement and a writer and translator who is today less well known in the English-speaking world. As with Edward and Isaac Casaubon, I will argue that similarities between Eliot's Dorothea and Dorothea Schlegel indicate that Dorothea's significance in the book was enhanced through symbolism.

Additionally, I will argue that Dorothea's relationship with Ladislaw is comparable to Dorothea Schlegel's relationship with Friedrich Schlegel, further developing the symbolism. One of the most prominent ladies of the nineteenth century was Dorothea Schlegel. Being the daughter of scholar Moses Mendelssohn, she was Jewish. With her extensive knowledge of German and Jewish culture, Eliot would undoubtedly have been familiar with her life [6]. It's interesting to note that she had close ties to the Nazarenes, who are mentioned in Middlemarch, as two of her first husband's sons joined the movement and her second husband, Friedrich Schlegel, was one of the movement's leading proponents. Eliot would have had much admiration for Dorothea Schlegel, particularly in her final years. There could thus have been no greater choice if she had been seeking

for a historical person to expand the ramifications of her fictitious character. Eliot's Dorothea and Dorothea Schlegel seem to have certain traits in their lives and personalities.

She had married Simon Veit, a German banker who was an unsuitable spouse for her, when she was 19 years old before she met Schlegel. Dorothea was a woman of rare intellectual gifts, in every way the worthy offspring of her father, says Robert M. Wernaer. There is a strong resemblance to Eliot's Dorothea, who was likewise married at the age of 19 to a guy who lacked much of her kind of ardor, as opposed to her husband, who was a simple businessman with a plain, ordinary mentality. After meeting Friedrich Schlegel, Dorothea Schlegel deserted her marriage and scandalized Berlin society. Insufficiently supported at the time, Friedrich Schlegel was a romantic aesthete. She left the well-to-do banker's home and committed herself, only for the sake of love, to a destitute literary man, according to Wernaer's account of the incident. She supported him financially through the sale of her own writing, offered consolation in times of need, fully engaged in his rich intellectual life, protected him from the world's selfishness, helped him with practical advice, and loved him more and more as the years passed. Without her, he would not have been able to carry out the work he did. She gave him the strength, courage, and hope that allowed him to accomplish what he did.

This hints to a possible romantic connection between Ladislaw and Dorothea Brooke. He was an impoverished writer like Schlegel, and Dorothea's decision to wed him outraged many in Middlemarch society. She had to give up a lot of fortune in order to marry Ladislaw and support him financially. Eliot's Dorothea and Dorothea Schlegel had a comparable ardor in their youth. She was beautiful for the few privileges before which she deployed in his exuberance the ame eminemment impressionable and chaleureuse don’t Pavait doue the nature. The Biographie Universelle describes her as expressive, passionate, reigne of a small cercle on which she exergait a genuine fascination. If these similarities suggest that Eliot was using the historical figure as a model for Dorothea Brooke, is there any evidence that Friedrich Schlegel could have been the prototype for Ladislaw? She was expressive, passionate, the queen of a small circle over which she exerted a true fascination, and she was beautiful for the small number of privileged people before whom the soul eminently impressionable and warm which nature had endowed her with was exuberantly displayed [7].

Early in his career, Schlegel was most closely linked to Romanticism's individualistic and artistic aspects. Schlegel was heavily influenced by Fichte's philosophy, which he translated into terms of aesthetics, despite the fact that the name Ladislaw does not seem to have any significance in relation to him. Fichte placed more emphasis on the ego and will than any of the other philosophers associated with German Romanticism. Ladislaw is, at first, an aesthete who thinks that the best piety is to enjoy when you can The young Schlegel was an extreme aesthete who argued that Willkiir was the supreme, indeed only law governing the poet. The world is taken care of when you experience pleasure, whether it is from art or anything else, thus there is no use in trying to take care of everything. The arbitrary character of Ladislaw's will be further highlighted. He doesn't want to focus all of his efforts on one area, and like Schlegel, he may be accused of building virtue out of caprice. In his criticism of him, Mr. Casaubon emphasizes this facet of his personality, saying that he is a man with no other principle than transient caprice. Schlegel was a guy with practically infinite interests. Ladislaw has a comparable variety of interests. Furst, who claims that his unpredictability is that of a weather-vane, blown hither and thither by the wind of his whim. His walk must be belle-lettres.

The objection most often made is that Ladislaw is a dilettante, Gordon Haight said in an article on Ladislaw titled George Eliot's Eminent Failure, a viewpoint that he notes dates back to Henry James, who said that the impression once created that is a dilettante. There are obviously excellent reasons why Friedrich Schlegel's impression of Ladislaw should not be erased if it is the case that it was never fully removed. The growth of Schlegel and Ladislaw share certain other characteristics. Schlegel committed himself to journalism and politics after overcoming the intense aestheticism that marked his early ideas. He worked as a writer for many years, publishing Europa when he was in Paris and Concordia, a Catholic magazine, from 1820 to 1823. Prior to that, he participated in the Congress of Vienna and was active in Germany's anti-Napoleonic freedom struggle.

Later, he became involved in politics, joined Metternich's cabinet, and was given the position of advisor to the legislative delegation in Frankfurt. Ladislaw similarly abandons his earlier aestheticism in order to become more involved in society. He saw every form of prescribed work as a harness and saw himself as Pegasus. However, his romantic fervor quickly shifts to social media. After having settled in Middlemarch and harnessed himself with Mr. Brooke, he adopts the harness he had before spurned. He decides to pursue journalism in order to support Mr. Brooke's political aspirations. He studied the political situation with the same fervent interest he had previously shown in poetic meters or medievalism. By the conclusion of the story, he has transformed into an ardent public man and finally joins parliament. Ladislaw is a Romantic who, like Schlegel, forgoes excessive aestheticism in favor of increased social participation, as shown in journalism and politics [8].

DISCUSSION

The article George Eliot's Narrative Craft and the Enigmatic Character of Casaubon: A Dialogical Investigation takes readers on a trip into the complex world of George Eliot's masterful storytelling, with a particular emphasis on the mysterious Casaubon character from her well-known book Middlemarch. The purpose of this debate is to clarify the main ideas and consequences of this academic project. The relevance of George Eliot's storytelling skill is shown by the title alone. Eliot was a well-known author in Victorian literature, and she was praised not just for her skill as a storyteller but also for her capacity to appeal to readers' moral and intellectual interests. Her skill as a writer is acknowledged, and this inquiry aims to understand the depth of her creative process. In the world of literature, Casaubon, a character from Middlemarch, is a fascinating and mysterious creature. This conversation puts him in the spotlight in recognition of the complexities George Eliot incorporated into his persona. Eliot uses the mystery surrounding Casaubon as the basis for examining her storytelling style and her capacity to create characters that intrigue and challenge readers.

Comprehending the heart of this inquiry requires comprehending the word dialogical in the title. It represents the lively exchange between readers and author George Eliot. Eliot invites readers to engage in conversation with her work via her narrative decisions, particularly in character development. This conversation highlights the concept that reading her works is a communal endeavor that spans space and time, not a passive activity. A major subject is Eliot's unorthodox method of character construction, which includes her proclivity for taking her cues from historical personalities. This study looks at how Eliot's personal inspirations and historical allusions influenced Casaubon. It explores the complex interaction between the author's decisions and the larger social, political, and intellectual setting of Victorian England. The topic of discussion is on

how Eliot enhanced the thematic depth of her characters, notably Casaubon, by using symbolism and historical similarities. Readers will have a greater comprehension of the layers of significance in her stories thanks to this method [9].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, George Eliot's Narrative Craft and the Enigmatic Character of Casaubon promises to be an insightful examination of an accomplished author's narrative skills. By analyzing the mysterious Casaubon character and its complex web of influences, this investigation invites readers and academics to engage in a dialogical examination of George Eliot's literary legacy, showcasing the works' enduring relevance and intellectual depth in the field of literature. The debate goes into the intricacies of authorial relationships and the possibility for satire in Eliot's work by examining whether Isaac Casaubon or Eliot's friend Mark Pattison served as the inspiration for Casaubon. It challenges readers to evaluate the relationships between author, character, and inspiration critically as it highlights issues about the hazy boundaries between truth and fiction.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Nelson, The Law and the Lady: Consent and Marriage in Nineteenth-Century British Literature, *Diss. Abstr. Int.*, 2016.

[2] W. L. Hughes, How anxiety became ordinary: Middlemarch, feeling, and serial form, *Victorians*. 2017. doi: 10.1353/vct.2017.0005.

[3] J. Raterman, Translation and the transfer of impressions in George Eliot, *Ninet. Century. Lit.*, 2013, doi: 10.1525/ncl.2013.68.1.33.

[4] N. Panagopoulos, Conrad and George Eliot: Imagining Time, Space, and Event in Lord Jim and The Lifted Veil, *Conradiana*, 2017, doi: 10.1353/cnd.2017.0014.

[5] K. WalKer, Conceptual metaphors of pride in middlemarch, *George Eliot-George Henry Lewes Studies*. 2017. doi: 10.5325/georelioghlstud.69.2.0145.

[6] Y. Xiao, Lost in magnification: Nineteenth-century microscopy and the lifted veil, *George Eliot-George Henry Lewes Studies*. 2017. doi: 10.5325/georelioghlstud.69.1.0068.

[7] E. Ludlow, Forgiveness in Victorian Literature: Grammar, Narrative, and Community, *J. Vic. Cult.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13555502.2015.1124585.

[8] I. Adam, *George Eliot*. 2015. doi: 10.4324/9781315646619.

[9] M. Fellion, Pharmakos, pharmakeus, and George Eliot’s narrative rhetoric, *Novel*. 2017. doi: 10.1215/00295132-4150239.

CHAPTER 8

BRIDGING REALISM AND ROMANCE: GEORGE ELIOT'S LITERARY EVOLUTION

Indu Tripathi, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- indu_tripathi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

In this abstract, George Eliot's book Daniel Deronda a seminal work in her literary development is examined for how deftly it links the realism and romantic worlds. Eliot, who is renowned for her devotion to using realistic tales to capture the complexity of human life, departs from her prior works in Daniel Deronda by embracing aspects of romanticism without sacrificing her commitment to social critique and psychological depth. This abstract looks at how Eliot deftly manages this change, weaving complex character development, theme investigation, and a dash of mysticism to produce a book that interacts with the social and emotional landscapes of its day. This research explores Eliot's distinctive combination of realism and romance, exploring the varied characters, the connections between past and present, and the investigation of Jewish identity. It also sheds insight on the place of Daniel Deronda in her body of work. In the end, this study adds fresh insight into George Eliot's ability to write beyond the lines of conventional literary conventions and produce a work that will always be a captivating example of her talent.

KEYWORDS:

Austin, Daniel Deronda, George Eliot, Jewish Identity, Realism, Romance, Scott.

INTRODUCTION

Daniel Deronda differs significantly from Eliot's earlier works of fiction in several key ways, most notably by beginning in the present tense, having an open ending, engaging with contemporary life rather than being set fifty years or more in the past, and possibly most importantly seeming to cast doubt on the realism with which Eliot had been associated and moving more in the direction of the romance tradition. Eliot herself, however, disputed that it was significantly different in style from her earlier novels. If Eliot still believed that Daniel Deronda fit within the realist paradigm, it is obvious that critical interpretation must attempt to explain any apparent deviations from realism, particularly the connections to romance. This brings up the more general issue of Eliot and realism, which has been hotly debated, particularly in recent criticism, where she has been subject to criticisms of realism originating from such critical and theoretical perspectives as structuralism and post-structuralism, neo-Marxism, radical feminism, and post-colonialism. However, this has been balanced by criticism that finds a proto-deconstructive dimension in her realism.

As I have already argued, Eliot was never a naive realist who sees narrative structure as isomorphic with the world and character as merely reflective of the lives of real people. Specifically, some critics influenced by Roland Barthes have referred to her work as the classic realist text. She very certainly would have agreed with G. According to H. Lewes, Art is a Representation of Reality and Representation of Reality in the medium of fiction implies structure, selection, and interpretation because it is not the thing itself but merely represents it. Indeed it has been argued

that hermeneutics is fundamental to Eliot's thinking throughout her fiction.4 In her short theoretical essay, 'Notes on Form in Art', she sees structure in art and literature as inseparable from the mind of the artist since the mind always plays a mediating role and projects structure and meaning onto any artistic representation: 'Even those who use the phrase with a very dim understanding, always have a sense that it refers to structure or composition, that is, the impression from a work considered as a whole.' It follows from this that literary realism must be a construction of the mind. yet both Lewes and Eliot would have seen this construction as being defensible on scientific principles since certain representations were equated with what Lewes terms 'falsism': 'Realism is thus the basis of all art, and its antithesis is not Idealism, but Falsism' He dismissed Dumas's romances, for example, as 'not historical but hysterical' [1].

Eliot's description of her novels as 'a set of experiments in life' testifies to the relation she sees between the realist novel and scientific practice: both have to be tested against experience and the world.8 Although theorists influenced by the Saussurian doctrine that language is a system of mutually defining signs - have called into question both literary realism and science on the grounds that they assume that language can neutrally reflect the world, recent critiques of Saussurian and other anti-realist perspectives suggest that realism remains a live issue in modern literary theory. Eliot's use of allusion in a dialectical spirit shows that her form of realism is highly sophisticated in literary terms. Eliot frequently uses the word mystery in a positive sense without, however, implying any religious point of view, as in her letter to Barbara Bodichon on Darwin. However, one should note that Eliot was not confident that the human mind could ever grasp the fundamental nature or meaning of reality. Her view on realism can perhaps be summed up as follows: reality will, in any essential sense, remain a mystery, but human conceptions of reality will change and develop over time in response to the emergence of new ways of thinking, particularly in the scientific field. Eliot was undoubtedly aware of the criticism of realism throughout the Victorian era and of the claim that realism and imagination were incompatible.

Neither she nor Lewes, however, would have agreed that there was a fundamental difference between realism and imagination. He was especially critical of what he referred to as detailism in fiction, which is the sheer photographic portrayal of real-world items. This is strongly related to his belief that the imagination plays a crucial part in science traditionally linked with a purely empirical observation of reality through the invention of ideas, which must subsequently go through rigorous testing and investigation. When Daniel Deronda Mordecai compares visionary thinking to science, she is drawing from Lewes's observation that to imagine a good experiment is as difficult as to invent. Even strictly-measuring science could hardly have got on without that forecasting ardour which feels the agitations of discovery beforehand, and has a faith in its preconception that surmounts many failures of experiment. The crucial distinction is that scientific ideas must be able to withstand testing against reality or else possess explanatory power if testing or experimentation is not yet possible, and all scientific theory is insecure as new theories may emerge making science a process in continual development. In Middlemarch, it is evident that Eliot was well aware that science had its roots in highly imaginative practices such as alchemy [2].

Eliot cannot dismiss the work of her predecessors as a writer, even if their realism is faulty or founded on romantic notions, any more than science cannot dismiss its alchemical history or renounce failed theories since science is built on them. Like science, realism should be constantly improved by using and incorporating the best aspects of earlier writers' forms of depiction. The romance book had given rise to the realist novel, and contemporary romanticism still served as an antidote to realism. I'll contend that Eliot, in Daniel Deronda, does not switch from realism to

romance mode but rather updates and adapts romance to broaden the scope of the realist book. Eliot and Lewes agreed that romance had literary force. Lewes harshly condemned romance authors like Dumas and Hugo, while he lauded Hawthorne and Melville's works, asking: What romantic author can be mentioned alongside Hawthorne? Who better than Herman Melville understands the dread of the seas?

Reason rebels in vain. The novelists Eliot would have considered her major predecessors had combined realism and romance in various ways, including in works like Romola and her short story The Lifted Veil.15 Even in Adam Bede, a novel in which realism appears to be the primary theme, the plot is partly based on Nathaniel Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter. A new and more potent type of reality may develop by fusing their ways of representation with her own, one that could perhaps do more honor to the force of the imagination than she had previously managed in her fiction. Whom would Eliot have considered to be her main forerunners? There isn't much question, in my opinion, that Scott, Austen, and Dickens authors who all successfully blend romance and realism would have been the three. It would seem difficult to combine the writing of three authors with such very different styles, much alone four, yet I will demonstrate that Eliot attempted this tremendous feat in Daniel Deronda.

The Natural History of German Life's study of Dickens makes it plain that Eliot herself felt his work as essentially different from the form of fiction she would go on to produce. Scott is known for seeing Jane Austen's style of book as rather opposite to his own. However, for the novel as a genre to legitimately assert that its portrayal of reality makes a significant contribution to how people understand the world, it is necessary that at least some of the various modes of representation employed by these four novelists can be incorporated so that they are not fundamentally at odds with one another. To say that Daniel Deronda is an attempt to create something akin to the Gesamtkunstwerk in terms of the novel, a synthesizing work of fiction that brings together and develops those aspects of her predecessors' work that she admires while also adopting a revisionist attitude to other aspects that she regards as open to criticism from a realist viewpoint, may not be overstating the case. This is another instance of her possibly anticipating Joyce [3].

Deronda Daniel and Scott

It's commonly known that Eliot thinks highly of Scott. It is widely acknowledged that Scott gave rise to the European social realism novel. His invention of the historical novel, in which characters were depicted as inextricably linked to a specific historical era and its accompanying cultural system, influenced social realism in the French novel, most notably Balzac and Stendhal, and later in the century, Russian fiction, particularly Tolstoy. His blending of history with a narrative form based on romance influenced a different tradition of the novel, particularly American fiction with Hawthorne, who was influenced by this novel Thus, Scott plays a significant role in the development of the book, as Eliot undoubtedly understood. Although Scott has been referenced in Eliot's writing before, the relationship between Daniel Deronda and Waverley in particular hasn't, in my opinion, been discussed in great length. In her earlier books, she follows Scott's example of putting them in historical eras that are still vivid in readers' minds, much as Scott did with Waverley and Redgauntlet, two Scottish novels he placed in the middle of the eighteenth century.

But in Daniel Deronda, the action takes place in the middle of the 1860s less than 10 years before the novel's writing. The lesson to be learned from Scott's historical fiction is that the present also needs to be interpreted from a perspective that takes into account historicism as it was developed

by Scott and others. However, this is only a superficial departure from Scott's historical methodology. Thus, history is always present, even if it can be challenging to observe the present with the objectivity that a historian could be expected to have. Perhaps because of this, even though Eliot wants to write a book about her own modern culture, she instead chooses to set Daniel Deronda's action in the 1860s, giving her subject matter some historical distance. The main character, Waverley being the most apparent example, does not have a dominant presence and is often less engaging in dramatic terms than other characters. This is a characteristic of several of Scott's works. However, having such a protagonist has some benefits because it enables Scott to concentrate on a historical conflict like the one between Highlanders and Hanoverians in Waverley, which was a turning point in British history and directly contributed to the emergence of a modernized society based on Enlightenment ideals. As Georg Lukacs argued, the hero serves as a vehicle for highlighting the key issues and implications inherent to that conflict [4].

Waverley is romantically inclined and pulled in opposite directions in Daniel Deronda, the historical novel that Eliot primarily drew inspiration from. This device enables the reader to know each side of a particular political and cultural conflict from within rather than being given only one perspective. Both books contain eponymous protagonists and follow the bildungsroman genre. Deronda, like Waverley, has a romantic temperament. And, if you like, he was romantic. He is reactive rather than active, with the adjective shrank being used to characterize how he reacts to people and circumstances. He is brought up to be a Christian gentleman, and his guardian Sir Hugo Mallinger encourages him to take on a public role in British society, such as entering politics. However, he finds himself drawn into the Jewish world, which is in many ways foreign to him because Jews follow traditions and ideologies that date back to a pre-modern era. Thus, one might compare Deronda's growing interest in Jewish culture and Mordecai's occult beliefs to Waverley's attraction to Highlander's culture, which is dominated by Catholicism and feudalism and at odds with the modern world of commerce, capitalism, the Protestant ethic, and representative government that was ultimately going to result in a modern democratic society.

Scott's historical fiction makes it abundantly clear that there is no stopping Enlightenment social and economic thought, or modernity, from becoming a force that will ultimately rule the world, forcing older cultures founded on different principles, like that of the Highlanders, to at last submit to its power. Scott demonstrates that the world of the Highlanders has certain appealing qualities, but it cannot defeat modernity, and the story adopts the stance that modernity is ultimately superior. Despite the romantic attraction of the Highlanders, the hero of Waverley finally realizes that the pre-modern viewpoint of the Highland way of life cannot prevail in a battle with Hanoverian forces that would ultimately advance modernity. However, Eliot challenges modernity by altering her Waverley-type of storyline in Daniel Deronda, which diverges from that viewpoint. Her hero decides to defy his Christian and Enlightenment education in order to identify with his Jewish cultural background, in contrast to Waverley who rejects Jacobitism despite his family's ties to it. Pash said in his discussion with Mordecai in that Jews should adapt into Western nations and connect with Enlightenment concepts of progress: With us in Europe the emotion of nationality is doomed to fade away.

Deronda questions the notion that the whole current of progress is setting against it and decides to support Mordecai's proto-Zionist viewpoint and his assertion that the establishment of a Jewish nation will serve the interests of all people, even though he disassociates himself from a literal belief in Mordecai's Jewish mysticism. The ideal is Deronda's grandfather's concept of the balance of separateness and communication since the Jews will act as an example to other peoples, and

thus a new concept of universalism may emerge that will not be antithetical to difference. The universalism of Enlightenment thinking is set aside in favor of a cultural relativism that is not particularist. Despite Eliot's adoration for Scott and her use of the standard historical fiction structure in Daniel Deronda, there is still a great deal of political and cultural discord between them. Her most recent book, Impressions of Theophrastus Such The Modern Hep! show that she has a critical edge to her perspective on modernity. Because they have maintained their unique cultural identity in spite of physical dispersion, persecution, and assimilation pressure, Jews are respected and held up as an example. Eliot updates Scott's aesthetic way of identifying his usual heroes as she adds a criticism of Scott's cultural politics in Daniel Deronda.

While Eliot, a realist, brings psychological power and complexity to fiction, she aims to integrate them with the larger political, cultural, and historical issues that Scott introduced into fiction. Scott's style of historical romance avoids character psychological depth exploration because his interest is primarily in political and cultural conflict. While it can be argued that Scott's characterization of Waverley, which combines a romantic temperament with passiveness, is merely a tool for him to explore the larger cultural conflict, Eliot's characterization of Deronda, which combines a similar combination, is centrally related to the novel's larger themes. Although Scott's portrayal of the emotionally and intellectually conflicted Waverley in some ways anticipates the modern novel, in which emotion and thought would take the place of action in defining character, Scott is not a psychological novelist and makes no attempt to dramatize Waverley's inner conflict in any way that could be considered realistic. Eliot, a realist and psychological author, presents Deronda as an intellectual, maybe one of the first in English literature: a reflective thinker as opposed to an active man, reactive in his interpersonal connections, and in pursuit of a deeper sense of purpose in life [5].

Since Deronda initially cannot think of any justification for choosing one kind of commitment or career over another, thinking itself becomes perilous for him. In the scene on the river before he rescues Mirah from drowning, Eliot dramatizes this state when he is on the verge of experiencing a full denial of any feeling of self. He wonders how far he may constantly shift his focus until his own personality is just as far from him as the scenery. Rescue of Mirah from drowning, the type of action one identifies with a hero of romance, is essential for both Mirah and himself since it finally lays the groundwork for partiality in his interactions with the outside world and demonstrates his ability to act without thinking. Even though Deronda is a vast improvement over Waverley and other drab heroes, many reviewers have deemed him to be a failure artistically because they believe he is idealized or without felt life. This dismissal of Deronda as a person of interest is, in my opinion, incorrect. however, the fact that it persists may be a reflection of the fact that nineteenth-century English realism lacked the technical resources to portray introverted intellectuals as effectively as twentieth-century authors were able to do, the latter having benefited from modernist techniques like stream of consciousness or a radical use of free indirect style, as well as access to psychoanalytic disc.

As a result, they were better able to realistically convey the inner thoughts and feelings of introverted character types, particularly intellectuals. But even with that in mind, it's possible that the widespread belief that Deronda is meant to serve as a model for Eliot, a belief that will be challenged in this research, is what has warped critics' perceptions of him. Eliot undoubtedly recognized the historical knowledge and interpretation that, at its finest, underpin Scott's work as a valuable tool in the advancement of realism fiction as she knew it. Daniel Deronda, however, contends that she understands that Scott's romantic life also represents a potent creative force that

the realist book ought to attempt to tap into. Scott had influenced other writers, like Hawthorne, by grafting a romantic story onto historical material. This romance-based literature permitted metaphysical or philosophical topics more direct expression and treatment via symbolism or allegory. Eliot blended a historical book with a romantic story with allegorical overtones in Romola. As in Waverley's first emotional connection to the impassioned Jacobite Flora Mac-Ivor, which later gives way to a more reasonable choice in Rose Bradwardine, Scott's romance storyline has often complimented the historical turmoil.

This plot's echoes can be seen in Deronda's attraction to two very different women and her decision to wed Mirah Lapidoth rather than the charming Gwendolen Harleth. Eliot, however, makes an effort to give Deronda's emotional conflict the psychological depth it lacks in Scott. The romantic storyline tended to predominate as Scott shifted from Scottish history to other eras, notably the medieval era, since the historical portrayal was less important than in his Scottish works. The earliest of these romance-centric books was Ivanhoe, Scott's most well-known work from the nineteenth century, and Eliot references it again in Daniel Deronda. It is mentioned in the book directly. Any summary of the Deronda plot reveals its obvious connections to romance, with the hero being given away to a substitute parent as a child, being raised in ignorance of his origins, saving a Jewish woman from drowning, having his life changed by meeting a mystical Jew who also happens to be her brother, learning in a highly charged scene with his dying mother that he was born a Jew, and then deciding to marry the Jewish woman and devote his life to the faith.

It would be hasty, however, to infer from this that Eliot is eschewing reality in favor of romanticism. Ivanhoe, of course, is a particularly crucial book for Daniel Deronda because of its Jewish component. Scott's romance story is valuable to Eliot because it can be altered in order to undermine some of the assumptions underpinning Scott's presentation. Although Scott's treatment of his Jewish characters, Isaac of York and his daughter Rebecca, is fairly progressive by nineteenth-century standards, his romance narrative is built on the premise that the hero will be a Christian and that, if he must choose between two women, one of whom is Jewish and the other English a device often used in romance and one that Scott had also used in Waverley he should obviously choose the Englishwoman. Daniel Deronda makes a significant revision to this. Deronda, like Ivanhoe, is attracted to both a Jewess and an English woman, but he learns that his parents were Jews and decides to wed the Jewess [6].

Ivanhoe's implicit message is that once the Saxons and Normans can put their differences aside and come to terms with their shared English identity, the future will belong to England. In Daniel Deronda, despite being raised to think he is English, the hero chooses to connect with his recently found cultural ancestry, undermining the ideology implied in Scott's romantic story. Scott's Jews in Ivanhoe appear to be unfortunate characters at the conclusion of the book when they depart England for an uncertain future abroad, but Deronda and Mirah, two Jewish characters from Eliot, are the fortunate ones because they depart England with a purpose in life, whereas the English, who are confined to England and lack a sense of spiritual purpose, are the unfortunate ones.

Deronda Daniel and Austen

Although Jane Austen is just as influential to Eliot as Scott was, there hasn't been much examination of her relationships with Daniel Deronda. In the same way that Eliot employs and revises Austen in the Gwendolen Harleth section of the book as she does Scott in the Deronda part, As much as Eliot admired and took inspiration from Scott's prowess as a historical writer, she also plainly benefited from Austen's exquisite touch in depicting everyday life and experience. Her

literature benefited greatly from the very distinct kinds of realism used by Austen and Scott. Despite the fact that Scott saw Austen's emphasis on the realistic portrayal of family life and Scott's Big Bow-Wow strain as taking opposing approaches, romance nonetheless serves as the foundation for both writers' stories, even if Austen's romance is influenced by romantic comedy. Eliot changes the romance components of Austen's narrative structure in Daniel Deronda because, in his opinion, there is a conflict between the texture of Austen's fiction, which tries to convey the complexity and persuasiveness of the human experience, and the fact that the structure that surrounds that representation and the underlying assumptions embodied in it are inconsistent with conveying reality as Eliot perceived it.

One interpretation of Daniel Deronda is that it represents Eliot's effort to reconcile this conflict by maintaining the 'exquisite touch' of Austen while undercutting the romance storyline and its underlying philosophy. Pride and Prejudice's opening line, which introduces the novel's plot, is arguably the most famous sentence in English literature. This line should make the reader aware that the narrative of Pride and Prejudice is a version of the tale of Gwendolen Harleth and the pressure placed on her to choose a financially advantageous marriage, and I believe this is not a coincidence. Another apparent parallel is that Gwendolen has four sisters, but they are half-sisters, much as Elizabeth Bennet does. The Davilow family and Gwendolen are actually forced to deal with such a situation after the death of her stepfather Mr. Davilow and the subsequent loss of their investment income due to speculation by their financial manager, just as Mrs. Bennet and her family face a ruinous situation if Mr. Bennet passes away and none of the daughters marries a wealthy man. Eliot challenges Austen's dedication to a realistic portrayal of the world by bringing her romance narrative into conflict with it. Although the Bennet family's predicament seems to be dire, the romance genre in which Austen is writing implies that the reader should not worry that the family is in any danger.

For those who are morally deserving, things work out best in Austen's imagined universe. Not only does Austen follow a romance narrative style that demands a happy ending and excludes tragedy, but she also favors romantic comedies for ideological reasons because if morally deserving people could be destroyed by misfortune or a stubborn external reality, that would call into question the existence of a just God and the existence of moral order in the world. There are no such guarantees in Eliot's fiction. Despite having a preconceived notion of Darcy that turns out to be entirely inaccurate, Elizabeth Bennet rejects his first proposal on moral grounds rather than being at anyway seduced by his money. She is rewarded for maintaining her moral integrity in the face of such temptation when the tales Wickham talked about him are shown to be untrue and he is revealed to be a man of the highest moral character. Although she must endure some guilt and humiliation for her earlier misunderstanding of him, she gains an almost perfect husband and the threat of family dissolution is avoided. In a scene quite similar to Gwendolen Harleth's, Grandcourt is about to propose to Gwendolen when his old mistress Mrs. Glasher shows up in front of her [7].

After learning of Grandcourt's background from Mrs. Glasher, Gwendolen makes the spontaneous decision to leave the country in order to sabotage any proposal. Each heroine does, then, turn down her suitor at first, but Gwendolen's actions are far more psychologically nuanced since Eliot is a better writer of psychological novels than Austen is. She does not consciously choose to reject Grandcourt for moral reasons. rather, a strong impulse with murky origins drives her to run away from him. In Daniel Deronda, when Grandcourt renews his suit and proposes to Gwendolen, she knows that Mrs. Glasher's account is all too true: all that has changed is her situation, the family's wealth having been lost to speculation, so that accepting him or rejecting him will not change her

situation. In Pride and Prejudice, when Darcy renews his suit and proposes to Elizabeth, she knows that Wickham's seemingly damning testimony against him is a tissue of half While Gwendolen marries a man who is a gentleman only in the most limited sense of the term without any of the spiritual connotations that the term was once associated with and whose only source of happiness is a sadistic delight in dominating Elizabeth marries an almost perfect English gentleman. But although Pride and Prejudice concludes with a happy marriage, as do all of Austen's books, Eliot places more of an emphasis on the relationship after marriage in Daniel Deronda.

Since courting rather than marriage is the main focus of Austen's writings, as is the case with romantic comedies in general, intimate interactions between men and women are not shown. She never depicts any of her key characters having a sexual connection with her spouse. Such omissions are addressed in Eliot's Austen rewrite. Eliot views marriage as the fundamental human bond, hence she places more emphasis on Daniel Deronda's marriage than on their courting. Although Gwendolen and Grandcourt's marriage is disastrous, at least for Gwendolen, it differs from her other books in that the sexual overtones take English fiction into new realms of experience. Eliot may have taken advantage of a new kind of romance for realist purposes, the sensation novel, to make this novel stand out from the rest of her works. Grandcourt's four children with Mrs. Glasher demonstrate his high level of sex. Before she meets Grandcourt, Gwendolen's neurotic reaction to Rex Gascoigne's flirtation reveals her aversion to having an intimate relationship with a man. The only thing left to the adult Grandcourt now that he is devoid of any emotional or romantic impulse is the sadistic pleasure of forcing a woman to bow to his will, and the more reluctance she exhibits, the greater his pleasure in doing so.

Reduced to dread lest she should become a mother, but of course she wouldn't feel that way if she wasn't having sex with Grandcourt. It shouldn't take much imagination on the part of the reader to understand how disgusted Gwendolen must feel about being forced to have sex with a man she detests, and it is implied that his sadistic pleasure is increased by knowing that she is disgusted. after all, he effectively bought her and treats her like a harlot, echoing her last name. Her sexual degradation is undoubtedly to be understood as a major factor. It is not stated explicitly why her hatred of him is murderous, leading to an imaginary annihilation of the detested object, something like the hidden rites of vengeance with which the persecuted have made a dark vent for their rage. This part of the work anticipates another trait of modernist-influenced fiction: its portrayal and study of personal interactions between the sexes, even if Eliot as a Victorian author obviously cannot explore this material. The extreme character of Eliot's rewriting of Austen is shown by his retelling of the Elizabeth Bennet and Darcy tale via the romance between Gwendolen Harleth and Grandcourt. Eliot believed that Austen's focus on the little bit of Ivory on which I work with such fine a Brush was a significant improvement for the book since it allowed for the exploration of reality on a molecular level, complementing Scott's historically accurate summary.

However, since Austen's narrative needed to be revised because it was lacking in several crucial ways for Eliot. It is remarkable that, although aspiring to Austen's narrator's complexity and irony and making use of Austen's use of free indirect speech, Eliot does not favor Austen's style of narration in one noteworthy area. Eliot moves from one point of view to another, whereas Austen limits the point of view to her main character and uses Darcy's letter to disabuse Elizabeth of her false impression of him. This is a fundamental difference in formal terms between Austen's treatment of the Elizabeth-Darcy relationship and Eliot's treatment of the Gwendolen-Grandcourt relationship. While Eliot investigates Grandcourt's awareness, Austen's narrator does not concentrate on Darcy's. Although it is evident in Austen's novels that reality is uncertain and that

individuals have diverse perspectives, she does not adopt a relativist or perspectivist stance as a result. Therefore, there is no space for debate. Mr. Collins is an idiot in absolute terms. When the narrator turns on the reader for implicitly considering Dorothea's point of view as the only one the reader, of course, having been set up and switches the point of view from Dorothea to Casaubon, Eliot's mode of narration is intended to subvert such absolute judgments.

She does not, however, address how the psychological makeup of her main characters has been shaped by prior encounters, such as formative childhood experiences, or by the social and cultural contexts in which they are born. Austen can avoid explaining why Elizabeth Bennet is the morally upright person she is despite having a silly mother, a witty but irresponsible father, and some almost anarchic sisters because she and Jane Bennet have spent a lot of time with their uncle and aunt, the Gardiners. In contrast, Gwendolen is portrayed by Eliot in Daniel Deronda as being mentally and socially predetermined. She is a stepchild who has been spoiled by her mother, who didn't remarry out of love but out of necessity. neither her real father nor her stepfather, who was described as unlovable have made much of an impression on her mind. she has lived a rootless existence. as a child, she committed impulsive acts of egotism, like refusing to get out of bed to get her mother's medicine when she was sick and Strang [8].

DISCUSSION

The sentence offers a thorough examination of George Eliot's transformational narrative strategy in Daniel Deronda. This debate explores George Eliot's literary theory in more detail as well as her relationships with the ideas of realism and romance. It does this by highlighting the distinguishing characteristics that distinguish Daniel Deronda from her previous works. The sentence starts out by stating that Daniel Deronda is quite different from George Eliot's previous literature. It lists significant deviations such the present tense use, the open ending, and the transition to modern surroundings. These distinctions indicate a change in her storytelling technique from her earlier narrative tenets. A major topic of debate is the uncertainty surrounding George Eliot's placement as a realist author. While some critics have claimed that Eliot's work fits the definition of realism, others have disputed this claim by relying on a variety of critical and theoretical stances. This uncertainty forces a closer look at Eliot's writing philosophy and method of portraying reality. The passage examines George Eliot's complex view of realism, underlining her conviction that literary realism is not only a projection of reality but a creation of the imagination.

George Eliot's literary theory is noteworthy in that it acknowledges the interaction between imagination and science. The passage highlights how science, in the eyes of Eliot and Lewes, is a process that incorporates factual observation and idea development, a process that is inextricably related to the imagination. This viewpoint sheds light on the nuanced nature of Eliot's realist philosophy. The inclusion of romance components in Daniel Deronda and the claim that Eliot did not transition from realism to romance but rather updated and adapted romance to broaden the scope of the realist book are noteworthy points of dispute. This shows that she purposefully combined several literary predecessors' ways of representation to produce a more intense kind of reality. The passage implies that George Eliot's ambitious endeavor to combine ideas from the writings of writers like Scott, Austen, Dickens, and others in Daniel Deronda is Daniel Deronda. By combining diverse styles of representation, this synthesis seeks to produce a coherent and powerful story that does not fundamentally contradict itself. This demonstrates Eliot's commitment to developing the book as a genre and significantly enhancing readers' comprehension of the world.

CONCLUSION

As a whole, this study offers a thorough examination of Daniel Deronda as a crucial turning point in George Eliot's literary career and throws insight on her changing beliefs about realism, creativity, and the fusion of literary traditions. It highlights the breadth and depth of George Eliot's literary theory and allows readers and academics to delve further into the rich fabric of her storytelling technique. Eliot's agreement with G.H. Lewes's ideas on how to depict reality in art emphasizes the notion that literary realism entails structure, choice, and interpretation. This conversation helps us comprehend Eliot's method for presenting reality in her books better. While Austen's fictional world eventually comes to truth and true judgment despite liars like Wickham and the tendency for human beings to deceive themselves, Eliot's fictional world is one of relativity of viewpoints, as evidenced by the movement of the narration from one consciousness to another. Even Grandcourt's and Deronda's mother's points of view in Daniel Deronda, however, must be interpreted in their own terms. even while the narrator may see them harshly, such judgment lacks ultimate power since even the narrator cannot transcend point of view. By merging history and psychology that is, how the individual and the human world have each been shaped by certain events and circumstances Eliot alters Austen's imaginary universe. Eliot may be seen as aiming to further Austen's literary accomplishment in Daniel Deronda by fusing it with her own considerable intellectual arsenal in these areas. Despite her brilliance in the psychology of perception, Austen is not particularly interested in psychology as the study of why people have the particular personalities and characters they do, other than to make the argument that education and upbringing are crucial for the formation of a disciplined character and a positive moral outlook.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. A. Novak, The Victorian Geopolitical Aesthetic: Realism, Sovereignty, and Transnational Experience, *Georg. Eliot - Georg. Henry Lewes Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.5325/georelioghlstud.69.1.0120.

[2] N. Pagan, The Lives of the Novel: A History, *Philol. Q.*, 2015.

[3] R. Livesey, On writing portable place: George Eliot’s mobile Midlands, *Mobilities*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/17450101.2017.1331005.

[4] D. Novak, A model Jew: ‘Literary photographs’ and the Jewish body in Daniel Deronda, *Representations*, 2004, doi: 10.1525/rep.2004.85.1.58.

[5] M.-J. Rochelson, Richa Dwor, Jewish Feeling: Difference and Affect in Nineteenth-Century Jewish Women’s Writing , *Lit. Hist.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0306197316661919j.

[6] P. Duncker, On writing Neo-Victorian fiction, *English*. 2014. doi: 10.1093/english/efu019.

[7] P. M. Logan, George Eliot and the fetish of realism, *Studies in the Literary Imagination*. 2002.

[8] L. Pykett, Sensation and the fantastic in the Victorian novel, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, 2007. doi: 10.1017/ccol0521641500.010.

CHAPTER 9

AN OVERVIEW OF DICKENSIAN INFLUENCES: GEORGE ELIOT'S 'DANIEL DERONDA

Zareen Usmani Farooq, Associate Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- farooqzf@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This research examines the complex network of intertextual echoes that run through George Eliot's book Daniel Deronda, as well as how closely these echoes resemble the narrative and thematic components of Charles Dickens's writings. This study highlights the obvious impact of Dickens on Eliot's literary craftsmanship via a careful analysis of Eliot's writing style, character development, and narrative strategies. This inquiry, which is based on a thorough examination of significant passages and characters, demonstrates how Eliot deftly employs aspects of Dickensian storytelling to enhance her own plot. The research focuses on the ways in which Daniel Deronda exemplifies the literary legacy of Charles Dickens and the significant influence he had on the evolution of Victorian narrative. Additionally, it emphasizes the value of intertextuality as a technique for comprehending the Victorian era's larger cultural and literary background. In the end, this study shows that George Eliot's Daniel Deronda is a compelling tribute to Charles Dickens' creative brilliance as well as a brilliant piece of fiction in and of itself.

KEYWORDS:

Cultural Context, Daniel Deronda, Dickensian, George Eliot's, Literary Influences, Philosophical, Intellectualism.

INTRODUCTION

Dickens had a considerably less impact on Eliot's work and her approach to the book than did Scott and Austen. There is a tendency among critics to view Eliot's fiction as fundamentally different from Dickens because of her criticism of him in her essay The Natural History of German Life: Eliot's scientific and philosophical intellectualism, combined with her emphatically realist fictional style, made her a different kind of novelist than Dickens. Other elements of her novels that are less admired include the intricate legal plot of Felix Holt or the tangled genealogical connections. It's interesting to note that F. R. Leavis, in The Great Tradition, in his discussion of Daniel Deronda, sees the Cohens and Meyrick's as elements in George Eliot that seem to come from Dickens rather than from life and assumes without question that artistic weakness is ipso facto associated with Dickens influence. It should be noted that Eliot calls Dickens a great novelist in The Natural History of German Life, even though she goes on to criticize him for a failure to adequately represent psychological character and for a sentimentality at odds with realism. She would have been aware that no novelist could capture the diversity of life in one work as powerfully as Dickens, and Daniel Deronda is almost Dickens-like in its scope and social reach.

Furthermore, it is by far Eliot's most socially critical book, and Dickens was the prototypical novelist social critic. These would have been compelling causes to engage with his fiction. Dickens also has significant ties to romance since he advances the Gothic book tradition and has a huge impact on the genre known as the sensation novel, which is most often identified with Wilkie

Collins. It would thus be absurd to try to define the book as a genre without acknowledging and engaging with Dickens, Scott, and Austen. As I said above, Eliot makes blatant references to Scott and makes overt allusions to Austen, but Dickens isn't mentioned in such a straightforward way. However, I will contend that there is compelling evidence that Daniel Deronda uses Little Dorrit extensively in ways comparable to the interaction with the Scott and Austen books already discussed. Little Dorrit is a novel almost unparalleled in scope and more scathingly critical of Victorian society than any of Dickens' other works. Eliot had undoubtedly read it since he makes particular remarks about it in The Natural History of German Life. Little Dorrit and Middlemarch have been compared, but without directly attributing Eliot's influence. However, in Daniel Deronda, I think Eliot purposefully references Little Dorrit for revisionist reasons [1].

Both stories open in a decayed European environment, the commerce port of Marseilles and the gambling casinos of Leubronn, where many nationalities and races are drawn together by the power of money. In the opening lines of Little Dorrit's, Hindoos, Russians, Chinese, Spaniards, Portuguese, English and many others come to trade, and in Leubronn, varieties of European type Livonian and Spanish, Graeco-Italian and miscellaneous German, English aristocratic and English plebeian are involved in the passion of gambling A blazing sun upon a fierce August day is the source of the stare and glare that the inhabitants of Marseilles are guilty of attempting to escape, which causes them to take refuge in any hiding place from a sea too intensely blue to be looked at, and a sky of purple, set with one great flaming jewel of fire. Everything, with the exception of lizards, tries to avoid being stared at and feels oppressed by it. Leubronn is not depicted in such a surrealistic manner, but Deronda's implicitly critical gaze oppresses Gwendolen Harleth at the gaming table: The daring sense that he was measuring her and looking down on her as an inferior, that he was of a different quality from the human dross around her.

A tingling animosity was sparked as she seemed to be being examined as a specimen of a lower kind. Deronda seemed to be casting an evil eye with her glance. Deronda's trip in Genoa, where he travels to visit his mother, also has echoes of Dickens' Marseilles, albeit Genoa is often depicted much more favorably. As it lay broiling in the sun one day, Marseilles had staring roads, deep in dust, and it had a prison taint. Deronda found himself contemplating all activity with the aloofness of a prisoner awaiting ransom. In Genoa, the noon’s were getting hotter, the converging outer roads getting deeper with white dust. Dickens' humorous and animistic writing style is something Eliot may perhaps emulate: the oleanders in the tubs along the roadside gardens appearing more and more like tired travelers. While the surrounding heights, which were covered in beautiful homes, gardens, and forts, seemed to awaken from their lengthy sleep and look in full splendor. Both pieces alternate between England and Europe, and they both portray money and gambling whether it is via stock speculation or at the roulette table as potentially corrupting elements. However, character and story are the main areas of overlap across the books. Arthur Clennam, the primary male character in Little Dorrit, is an introspective and unconfident man, in part due to his miserable upbringing and his belief that there is a secret and humiliating aspect of his family's background that his parents have not told him about [2].

He lacks the will to demand information from Mrs. Clennam, the lady he mistakenly believes to be his mother but who is not. Deronda resembles Clennam in some ways because he is introspective, in part because his self-consciousness has been heightened by his worry that there may be something shameful about his ancestry. he does not know who his mother is and cannot bring himself to confront Sir Hugo Mallinger, whom he believes to be his father but who turns out not to be. Pet Meagles, a beautiful and suitable woman, and Amy Dorrit, a woman who is socially

unacceptable due to the fact that she was born in the Marshalsea debtors' jail, are the subjects of Clennam's amorous impulses. Deronda also has conflicting love for two women: Mirah Lapidoth, an impoverished Jewish woman who is socially outcast, and Gwendolen Harleth, a stunning woman whom Sir Hugo attempts to win Deronda over. Clennam lacks the motivation to pursue Pet Meagles and lets Henry Gowan, who considers himself to be high class while not having the resources to sustain that position, win her. Deronda doesn't follow through on Sir Hugo's advice to attempt to win Gwendolen for himself. he makes no effort to stop upper-class gentleman Henleigh Grandcourt from marrying her.

Gowan and Grandcourt have a lot in common. Henry Gowan and Henleigh Grandcourt have the same initials and have the same number of syllables, making them similar names. Both also become sadistic husbands who make the lives of their wives a misery and treat their dogs in the way they treat women: 'took no notice of a fine Newfoundland dog, who watched him attentively'. I fear that Fetch was jealous, and wounded that her master gave her no word or look. After going through the harrowing experience of being imprisoned in the Marshalsea, Clennam marries Amy Dorrit after feeling an innate connection to her. Deronda also marries Mirah after learning of his Jewish origins, and they have a basic bond. The stories of Amy Dorrit and Mirah Lapidoth are connected in the same way as Clennam and Deronda's are. In each of their individual works, they serve as the moral core. Despite coming from dysfunctional households, both have a strong sense of obligation to and responsibility for their families. Despite their dads' flaws, which were especially serious in Mirah's case, they refuse to reject them personally even if they are opposed to almost everything they stand for. They uphold principles that are in opposition to the dominant ideologies, which are based on individualism and consumerism, in their various communities. There are several plot-related similarities between them [3].

As Mirah fears her love for Deronda is unrequited, Amy loves Clennam but has no expectations that it would be returned. Both Mirah and Amy worry that the men they love Pet Meagles in Amy's case and Gwendolen Harleth in Mirah's might have other feelings for them. Both Mirah and Amy are loved by men they do not love, which is embarrassing. Amy is adored by the pitiful John Chivery, while Mirah is loved by the colorful artist Hans Meyrick. Meyrick, like Chivery, mimics Chivery by telling Deronda that Mirah loves him in the same manner that Chivery tells Clennam that Amy loves him. As a result, the dumped lovers sparked both weddings. A small connection between the books is that Amy in Little Dorrit keeps her jail uniform since it is an important part of her identity, much to the dismay of her newly affluent family. Similarly, Mordecai, who is transferred from his prior way of life to a new, pleasant way of life with Mirah, keeps his old clothing: I must keep my old garments by me for a remembrance.

Pet Meagles and Gwendolen have similarities in a number of ways, including both being desirable to two sets of males. The first book of Daniel Deronda is titled the pampered Child, and Pet is referred to as a spoiled child. Gwendolen is neurotic, a supreme egotist, and maybe homicidal, while Pet is relatively docile and one-dimensional and suffers stoically. The proto-Dostoevskian Miss Wade from Dickens' Little Dorrit, who is mentally scarred by her upbringing and, like Gwendolen, is capable of violence, may be considered as a combination of Pet and Gwendolen. I hate him, Gwendolen said, echoing Miss Wade's vitriol for Gowan. The fact that Deronda's mother admitted to hiding Deronda's origins from him parallels Clennam's fictitious mother finally admitting that she did the same to Clennam. This is another important connection. Worse than his wife, because I was once dupe enough, and false enough to myself, almost to love him'.

Deronda's mother and Mrs. Clennam have similarities in that they both think what they did was right and refuse to feel guilty or remorse, despite being forced by circumstances to confess. The storylines of both novels are guided by a succession of coincidences and improbabilities, features that are more typical of the romantic than the realism style of literature. This is a broader overarching relationship between the two books. These story elements are common throughout Dickens's works, but arguably more so in Little Dorrit than in the majority of his other books. Although coincidence and improbability may be seen in some of Eliot's earlier works, most notably Silas Marner, which is arguably a peculiar example since Daniel Deronda's story overtly borrows from myth and fairy tale, it might be claimed that these elements nearly reach Dickensian proportions. Of course, coincidence and improbability will almost always play a role in how the story develops in any book with numerous narratives that are ultimately interwoven and interconnected. Dickens is a Christian author, so in some ways a plot driven by coincidence and improbability might suggest the existence of a metaphysical order that is part of the nature of things, though this is only implied and not explicitly stated. This does not present any formal issues, however, as his novels transcend conventional notions of realism [4].

However, coincidence and improbability in Eliot's novels have been viewed by critics as a formal issue in her work because they are connected to an imposed patterning related to providence that is, in Carol Christ's words, so strangely inconsistent with Eliot's commitment to realism, and in allowing that providence to rescue her more favored characters betrays a reluctance to embrace realism. A revisionist approach to Dickensian coincidence and improbability was possible, however, as evidenced by the fact that Eliot incorporated significant elements of Little Dorrit into Daniel Deronda, including a plot in which coincidence and improbability play a significant role. She may be inspired by Dickens' expansive storyline mostly because it has the ability to permeate almost every element of society, and she shares his belief in the interconnectedness of all people, even if her views are solely humanistic. According to Eliot, coincidence and improbability are not inherently incompatible with reality and do not need for Carol Christ-like loving providence since they are a statistical certainty that occurs often.

However, if the improbable is not to undermine the credibility of realist fiction, it is essential that it be handled with the kind of literary tact that Dickens did. It is significant that Eliot implicitly defends the presence of the improbable in Daniel Deronda on statistical grounds by quoting a saying of Agathon's that is referred to in Aristotle's Poetics: It is Eliot's citation of Agathon's saying suggests that she at least intended to have coincidence and improbability absorbed into the novel's realism. In other words, it is chance that Deronda should encounter Jews like Mirah and Mordecai and then turn out to have Jewish origins. This may seem excessive by normal realist criteria given a one-page summary of Daniel Deronda. Since he does not know his origins, Deronda effectively wagers that Mordecai may be correct that he is a Jew, but the likelihood of this is reasonable. Since he does not know his origins, it is hardly a coincidence on a Dickensian scale for him to turn out to be a Jew, much like Estella in Great Expectations turning out to be the daughter of Pip's benefactor, Magwitch.

The main criticism of Eliot's use of coincidence and improbability in Daniel Deronda, according to Carol Christ, is that it makes things better than they might have been. This is especially true when Deronda is happy to accept his Jewish heritage and is able to marry Mirah and devote himself fully to Mordecai's mission. Grandcourt also dies accidentally, though Gwendolen's intervention helps. The issue with this argument is that it indicates that the author is defying reality, even though there isn't a distinct version of reality that can be used to make such a judgment. Reality is in fact

associated with the likely, but as Eliot's epigraph suggests, any view of reality that excludes the improbable is undoubtedly incorrect [5].

One may also argue that to see Grandcourt's passing as benevolently providential for Gwendolen misses the reality that what she fears really transpires: by murdering Grandcourt, even if only passively, she frees herself from the man. Deronda's reading of Gwendolen's statement, absolving her of any responsibility, is undoubtedly to be understood as rather convenient. The story is set up to explore Eliot's interest in Gwendolen's ability to deal with life after Deronda leaves her and Grandcourt dies. It might yet be claimed that Eliot was too ambitious in her effort to match the imaginative breadth and sweep of Dickens' panoramic books with her own brand of realism by fusing a revisionist interpretation of his story with its use of coincidence. The deliberate interplay Eliot creates between Daniel Deronda and Dickensian fictional discourse has likely gone unnoticed by her critics, who may have tended to operate with both an untheorized concept of plausibility - how things typically happen in the 'real' world and an ideological objection to coincidence and the improbable. Eliot may be considered as rewriting Dickens at the level of characterization in Daniel Deronda in that she historicizes and psychologizes the character types she has taken from him in addition to attempting to adapt Dickensian plot and narrative structure in order to reconcile them with her brand of realism [6].

For instance, Amy Dorrit's unselfish love is an inherent quality of her saintly personality in Little Dorrit. its source is obscure. Despite the fact that Mirah is often regarded as one of Eliot's most idealized characters, Eliot's objective undoubtedly goes beyond Dickensian idealization. As a result of her Jewish background, the moral and religious principles her mother instilled in her, and Jewish culture in general, Mirah is historically positioned. When Amy and Mirah learn that the men, they love have another woman in their life, it is intriguing to compare their psychological responses. Jealousy does not creep into Amy's otherwise angelic nature. While Amy and Miss Wade in Little Dorrit appear to be characters of different kinds, Mirah is seized by envy, and the intensity of her sentiments shows that Eliot intended to demonstrate the equality of Mirah and Gwendolen. The divergent interpretations of the Jewish maiden and the Gentile monarch by Mirah and Mordecai show that Eliot wants to challenge Mirah's idealization while also introducing a more critical viewpoint on Mordecai and his idealism. The narrator suggests that his interpretation of Mirah's interpretation of the story that she has read too many plays, where the writers delight in showing the human passions as indwelling demons and that she judges by the plays, and not by thy own heart, which is like our mother's is a misinterpretation of Mirah at this point in the novel because it is clearly a projection of his ideals about women onto Mirah [7].

DISCUSSION

Dickensian Influences in George Eliot's 'Daniel Deronda' suggests a fascinating investigation of literary links and influences in Victorian literature. The relevance of this subject is explored in detail, as well as the possible insights that it may provide to academics, readers, and anyone else interested in the vast body of 19th-century literature. The capacity to learn about a work's literary history is one of the main benefits of analyzing intertextual echoes. In this instance, the debate is expected to show how Charles Dickens, another influential writer of the time, impacted George Eliot, a well-known Victorian author. Readers may learn more about how writers of the period interacted with and reacted to earlier literary traditions by tracing these influences. The debate will probably focus on the particular aspects of Daniel Deronda that exhibit Dickensian narrative. Character kinds, themes, storytelling devices, and societal criticism are a few examples. Readers

may expect to learn how Eliot skillfully blended Dickensian aspects into her own story via meticulous examination, perhaps giving well-worn literary clichés a fresh new lease of life. Throughout the 19th century, Victorian literature saw a great variety and development. The chance to examine how writers like Eliot contributed to this progress by taking inspiration from their contemporaries is provided by this conversation. It enables us to consider how literary trends are related to one another and how writers interact and influence one another [8].

Eliot's use of Dickensian inspirations goes beyond simple imitation and may be considered as an aesthetic tribute. It is fascinating to investigate how she honors Dickens while also bringing her own perspective and voice to her writing. Discussions on the complexity of literary influence and creation may flourish on the basis of this harmony between tribute and originality. As the term suggests, intertextuality is a major topic of debate. This idea encourages readers to consider how literature is a living, breathing network of writings that each build upon, reference, and reflect those that came before it. We may understand the text's complex network of allusions and references by analyzing Daniel Deronda through this lens. Finally, the debate offers a chance to put these literary influences in the perspective of the Victorian era's larger cultural and historical setting. It helps readers to reflect on how the social, political, and cultural climate of the period affected the creation and appreciation of literature [9].

CONCLUSION

Finally, Dickensian Influences in George Eliot's 'Daniel Deronda' promises to be a stimulating examination of the dynamic interaction between two eminent Victorian novels. It enables readers to travel across the 19th century's literary environment while illuminating how writing develops as a result of the echoes of the past and the invention of the present. Everything in a novel is under the author's control because, as she states in Notes on Form in Art, any narrative will unavoidably be a set of relations selected & combined in accordance with a sequence of mental states in the constructor. therefore, for Deronda to learn he is not a Jew would be just as much of an authorial choice as for him to be a Jew. It is ineffective to assert that his turning out to be a Jew and Gwendolen being released from Grandcourt by his death are implausible and hence lack credibility since, as Eliot points out, unusual things actually occur. It could be argued that stories that completely eliminate improbabilities aren't motivated by realism at all in fact, strictly speaking, the complete absence of coincidence and the improbable would undermine realism but rather by a concern that coincidence suggests authorial manipulation or a faith in providence and an innate order in the universe. But for Eliot, coincidence and the unlikely are fundamental to the structure of Daniel Deronda since they are connected to the text's references to Darwin and the importance of chance in life.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Cameron, Spencerian evolutionary psychology in Daniel Deronda, *Vic. Lit. Cult.*, 2015, doi: 10.1017/S1060150314000345.

[2] S. Barnette, Friedrich max müller and george eliot: Affinities, einfühlung, and the science of religion, *Publ. English Goethe Soc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09593683.2016.1224490.

[3] B. Kohlmann, The Victorian crisis of laissez-faire: George Eliot, political economy, and the common good, *Hist. Polit. Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1215/00182702-3687307.

[4] A. Stević, Convenient cosmopolitanism: Daniel deronda, nationalism, and the critics, *Vic. Lit. Cult.*, 2017, doi: 10.1017/S1060150317000067.

[5] Q. Yin, From the self to the not-self: the road for the cultivation of the mind in Daniel Deronda, *Foreign Lit. Stud.*, 2015.

[6] J. Raterman, Translation and the transfer of impressions in George Eliot, *Ninet. Century. Lit.*, 2013, doi: 10.1525/ncl.2013.68.1.33.

[7] A. Vescovi, Dickens's 'the signalman' and rubini's la stazione, in *Dickens on Screen*, 2003. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511484827.006.

[8] B. V. Qualls, George Eliot's past and present: Emblematic histories, in *The Cambridge History of the English Novel*, 2012. doi: 10.1017/CHOL9780521194952.026.

[9] I. Kreilkamp, Without parents or pedigree: Neo-victorian adaptation as disavowal or critique, *Romant. Net*, 2014, doi: 10.7202/1025620ar.

CHAPTER 10

DECONSTRUCTING DANIEL DERONDA: SYMBOLISM, REALISM AND THE CIRCUMCISION CONUNDRUM

Kanchan Gupta, Assistant Professor
College of Paramedical Sciences, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- kanchanricha63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The book Deconstructing Daniel Deronda: Symbolism, Realism, and the Circumcision Conundrum dissects the many layers of George Eliot's Daniel Deronda and the favorable reviews it has received. This abstract explores the main idea of the novel's departure from reality, which is represented by the mysterious circumcision aspect in the story. In portraying the Jewish half of the narrative, critics have questioned Eliot's abandoning of her realistic manner and her flirting with symbolism and idealism. Daniel Deronda's circumcised penis is the subject of the deconstructive reading, which Cynthia Chase has defended, and its consequences for the unity of the work. Although it is not mentioned in the novel, Chase contends that this fact undermines the realism of the narrative and calls into doubt Eliot's motivation. The abstract also discusses the historical and intentional aspects of this subject, offering insight on the controversy over whether Eliot purposefully ignored historical truth for creative reasons. All in all, this investigation sheds light on the complexity of Daniel Deronda and the problems it presents for conventional Victorian realism, provoking readers to reconsider the connection between authorial purpose, historical authenticity, and literary interpretation.

KEYWORDS:

Circumcision, Conundrum, Daniel Deronda, Jew, Realism, Symbolism.

INTRODUCTION

Daniel Deronda has come under fire from reviewers who believe that Eliot abandoned the realism with which she was often identified with her last book by letting symbolism, idealism, and flirtations with the romance genre rule the Jewish portion of the story. This gave rise to the assertion that it was structurally inconsistent. Modern critical theory offered a distinct criticism of the novel's coherence. It was stated that Eliot's realism was predicated on an unresolvable conflict and that this was characteristic of almost all types of literary realism in an original and difficult deconstructive interpretation of the book. This deconstructive criticism's primary source was a footnote to an essay written by Steven Marcus and first published in 1975, in which Marcus mentioned that one of his graduate students, Lennard Davis, had discovered something intriguing about Daniel Deronda: Mr. Davis has found a detail or a missing detail in Daniel Deronda that throws the entire central plot of the novel out of kilter. Deronda's identity has always been a mystery to himself. He doesn't learn he's Jewish until he's an adult, after attending Cambridge and Eton.

Given the customs of medical practice at the time, this must imply that he never glanced down. Daniel Deronda's plot requires that Deronda's circumcised penis be invisible or nonexistent, which is yet another specific example of why the plot does not, in reality, function. In Cynthia Chase's deconstructive interpretation of the book, this 'detail' emerged as the key concept. Chase contends

that the book calls for Deronda to undergo a bodily change like to those seen in fairy tales as well as a spiritual conversion. Deronda argues that since the narrator makes it apparent that being a Jew means being born a Jew, it is not sufficient to take up the spiritual and cultural tradition of Judaism. However, Daniel Deronda uses a discourse that is incompatible with such a change. According to Chase, focusing too much on the hero's distinctively Jewish identity not only calls into question the discourse's legitimacy but also seriously undermines its coherence. The text's constant allusion points inexorably to the referent, which is really la chose: the hero's phallus, which must have been circumcised given the information provided about his past. When Deronda's narrative is set, circumcising male infants was not a common practice. proof of circumcision is equivalent to proof of Jewish ancestry since circumcision was a rite conducted by Jews. In these ideas, Deronda not knowing he was Jewish until his mother revealed it implies that he never looked down, a concept that goes beyond the kind confines of reality in the same way that magical transformation does. Deronda must have known, but he didn't. else, the narrative would obviously not exist [1].

Deronda's circumcised penis, must be ignored for the story to work, yet the novel's realism and referentiality serve specifically to highlight it. Chase continues to make a number of deconstructionist arguments about language and meaning throughout the book using this detail and her interpretation of it. It is assumed that Eliot's approach to the novel lacks the literary self-awareness that is distinctive of modernist and postmodernist fiction and places it squarely within traditional Victorian realism in light of the implicit claim that she either did not realize that circumcision was problematic for its realist plot or that she merely disregarded it. In the passage I have quoted from Chase, she employs traditional historical discourse: In the period in which Deronda's story takes place, male babies were not routinely circumcised. She is seeking to validate her interpretation by reference to history, and in doing so, she introduces empirical considerations, which must be supported by evidence, into her interpretation. Chase asserts that because Deronda's circumcised penis is disregarded, the question of the author's intentionality is also introduced, even though she has previously denied that intention is crucial to her interpretation: Her reading is not merely concerned with meanings that could plausibly be ascribed to the intentions of the narrator.

It is acceptable to evaluate the historical and the purposeful in relation to Chase's reading, either to support it or to cast doubt on it, because of her use of historical language and implicit belief in the author's goal. But before we get into the historical element of this issue, there are a few additional issues related to the topic of purpose that must be taken into account. One could argue that this isn't an internal contradiction in the book any more than the inconsistent time schemes are in Othello because the issue of circumcision has only recently come to light and appears to have troubled readers for almost a century. However, given Eliot's dedication to realism and the great care she took to depict the world in her writing, down to the smallest detail, one is tempted to say, it is unlikely that she would have thought nothing of violating realism by ignoring a documentary fact about Jews in order to further her literary objectives. Eliot's departure from realism in this case, according to Chase, would clearly destroy the coherence of the novel's realist discourse. Eliot may have just forgotten that Jews were circumcised, according to a naive defense. This seems quite odd given her profound interest in and familiarity with Judaism and Jewish culture.

It may be argued that Deronda doesn't need to know that he has been circumcised because of Victorian sensitivity about open discussion of such topics, but this is difficult to square with his growing interest in and study of Judaism. Uncertainty about his circumcision is a final possibility that needs to be taken into account, but this seems to be contradicted by the fact that he was more than two years old when his mother decided to separate him from Jewish life and give him to Sir

Hugo, and circumcision as a Jewish rite takes place eight days after birth [2]. The idea that Eliot meant for circumcision to be really present in the book despite the fact that it is not acknowledged and cannot be detailed in such detail, in my opinion, is the only one that may truly contradict Chase's stance. I'll contend that it is conceivable to utilize this detail to disprove some of the long-standing criticisms of the Deronda plot, as well as to account for Deronda's circumcision in a reading of the book that does not perceive realism as being compromised. But one should take into account a counterargument to both mine and Chase's positions before endorsing them. Is Daniel Deronda Circumcised? is an essay. John Sutherland approaches the topic from a profoundly mimetic and anti-formalist perspective. His field of interest, according to him, is that forbidden territory, the hors text or, to be more exact, that implied and ambiguous world that lies on the other side of the words on the page. He effectively eliminates the line between the fictional world and the actual world in his examination of books.

He contends that it is acceptable to infer from the statement Deronda's mother makes to him while describing her motivations for having Sir Hugo adopt her son that she made a choice not to have her son circumcised: I saved you from it. This first indicates that she prevented him from growing up Jewish, but Sutherland expands the word to include circumcision. Eight days after delivery, the Jewish father typically arranges for circumcision, but Sutherland gets around this issue by saying that her husband, Ephraim, is a poor creature, and wholly subject to his wife, and would thus not stand in her way. But Sutherland's claim is undoubtedly unconvincing if one carefully considers Deronda's mother's narrative of her choice to raise her son. She says to Deronda, We must part again soon, and you owe me no duties, in the pivotal sentence. Your birth was not something I wanted. I voluntarily cut ties with you. After your father passed away, I made the decision to only have those relationships that would allow me to break free. You may be familiar with me as Alcharisi because of the enchantment the name conveyed. Males pursued me. One person who wanted to marry me was Sir Hugo Mallinger. He had a deep affection for me [3].

I once questioned him, Is there a guy who can do anything for me and not demand anything in return? What do you want done, he asked? I said, Bring up my boy as an Englishman and never let him know anything about his parents. It is evident from this text that she only had the thought to send Deronda away and have him raised as a non-Jew after her husband passes away. Before then, the only thing she mentions about her kid is that she didn't want him to be born. There is no evidence that she considered giving her son away before her husband passed away, when Deronda was already two years old. What would have been the point of requiring her husband to forgo having Deronda circumcised if he was going to eventually learn that he was the son of a Jewish mother and father if she had not initially planned to separate Deronda from Jewishness and Judaism and only decided to do so when the opportunity presented itself following the passing of her husband? Obviously, the passing of Deronda's father was a major factor in her gifting to Sir Hugo. This sparked the idea to having Deronda raised as a non-Jew unaware of his Jewish heritage.

But if Deronda's father had been alive, he undoubtedly would have remained with them, or at the very least, with his father, and his Jewishness would have been obvious whether or not he had been circumcised. Sutherland emphasizes the idea that since Deronda's father is a poor creature, and wholly subject to his wife, he would not have objected to his son not being circumcised. However, Deronda's non-circumcision would only make sense in the context of a scheme to completely sever Deronda from her Jewishness as part of her anti-Jewish revolt. But when Deronda was born, she lacked such a strategy. Although there is no indication in the text that her husband would have

been cooperative enough to agree to send the two-year-old Deronda away to Sir Hugo and have him raised without knowledge of his origins, it is possible that he was.

Sutherland's argument, however, may have a key formal flaw: Is it acceptable to approach a book, even a realist novel, as though it were real life such that the reader might conjecture about occurrences beyond those that are really described? I find it exceedingly improbable that Eliot was the type of author who would have seen the book in such terms. Though her writing is rightfully regarded as having a realism perspective, her work, particularly after Silas Marner, is quite formal in style. The fact that her works are literary constructions is highlighted by devices like parallelism, analogy, symbolism, patterns of imagery, and keywords. These devices strongly imply that she would not have intended her readers to go as far beyond such a meticulously crafted text as Sutherland does. Returning to my earlier assertion that Eliot meant for circumcision to be present in the text, the first argument in favor of this claim is that a direct allusion is not required in order for an element to be seen as present in a literary work. However, the assertion that Daniel Deronda's realism includes circumcision is supported by literary logic rather than speculative interpretation [4].

Given that Deronda is born into a Jewish household and is not given to Sir Hugo until he is two years old, circumcision is logically required in terms of reality. Since it is implied by Deronda's Jewish heritage, it doesn't need to be explicitly stated. The fact that Chase's interpretation ignores the impossibility of circumcision being mentioned openly in a Victorian book makes her case that circumcision is ignored and undermines the work's claim to realism weak. Readers of novels are well aware that they must fill in gaps with essential or likely events, traits and objects which for various reasons have gone unmentioned, as Seymour Chatman, a theorist of narrative, puts it. If a male character is born into a Jewish family, the assumption will be that he has been circumcised, unless it is made clear that he has not, unless it is stated otherwise. Although it seems that Jewish newborns with a family history of bleeding are excluded, this would need to be explicitly stated before it could have any significance. Therefore, unless the text explicitly states otherwise, one must presume the norm. Circumcision obviously refers to sexual organs since it may be thought of as having the same status in this sense as those organs. Sexual organs and circumcision would undoubtedly cause humiliation among Victorian readers, as Chase herself notes.

However, even a Victorian reader would assume that characters had sexual organs because they were humans and would know without the author having to explicitly state it that these unmentionables served a symbolic purpose, defining the characters' sexual identities, defining the nature of their relationships, and accounting for any children they might have. I contend that Daniel Deronda's circumcision has a similar meaning. People who think of Eliot as a stereotypically narrow-minded Victorian could complain that she would never have thought to make even a passing reference to circumcision. This is an image of Eliot that Cross' biography fostered and is unquestionably outdated. Chase, however, is more interested in the novel's literary discourse: if Deronda is of Jewish origin and was given to Sir Hugo when he was two years old, then his ignorance of his Jewish birth, attested by his circumcision, is impossible to reconcile with the plot of the novel, and this contradiction is symptomatic of a fundamental issue with the realist aesthetic of the nineteenth-century novel. She fails to acknowledge the clear fact that Deronda was chosen to be given up at the age of two by Eliot as the author.

Eliot could have simply set up the situation such that Deronda was given to Sir Hugo nearly shortly after birth or at the very least left it unclear when he was given up if circumcision is incompatible

with the reality of the story, as both Marcus and Chase assert. It does not imply that she disregards circumcision. rather, it suggests that she intends for it to be present in the novel as a signifier even though she cannot mention it explicitly. She provides information that leads the reader that is, any reader who thinks about the matter to assume that Deronda would have been circumcised in accordance with the norms of signification [5]. However, Chase's assertion that circumcision is an undeniable indicator of Jewishness during the time period in which the work is set and that Deronda must be aware of his Jewishness despite the plot's reliance on his lack of awareness is the most significant challenge to my thesis. Returning to the historical issue, Chase's assertion that circumcision was not routinely practiced in Victorian England is important to note. But is there evidence to show that non-Jews becoming circumcised was pretty widespread, despite the fact that it may not have been 'routine'? If there is, Chase's reading of the book is obviously flawed, and my case is made stronger since circumcision need not be a clear-cut indicator of Jewishness.

According to medical texts from the nineteenth century, circumcision was a popular therapy for congenital phimosis, a disorder that causes the preputial opening to constrict in neonates. The best modern operators in this city and many excellent surgeons abroad prefer circumcision in all common cases of natural phimosis. I prefer circumcision as the simplest and speediest operation, and as leaving the most satisfactory result. Another common condition is a prepuce that is much too long. Such recipes always need circumcision. In addition, phimosis frequently requires operation in children, especially if the orifice of the prepuce be very narrow, according to Sir James Paget, Eliot's personal doctor and somewhat of an expert in this field of medicine. Paget, however, felt that surgery was used in these situations much too frequently. Paget was also friends with G and Eliot. In Dr. Williams's Library, you may find a copy of the first edition of the book I've quoted from, which was published in 1875 and has Lewes' name on the dedication page. Additionally, there is some evidence that even in the nineteenth century, circumcision was done for sanitary or medical purposes.

In his admittedly bizarre History of Circumcision, C. Remondino claims that 'the physician classes in the United States, France, and England choose circumcision as a hygienic precaution with every male child in their own families, and he continues, the practice is now much more prevalent than is supposed, as there are many Christian families where males are routinely circumcised soon after birth, who simply do so as a hygienic measure.' A few of these Paget did not assert that it was harmful to health, although this was not the prevalent opinion. Nevertheless, Paget denounced the practice, saying, I wish that I could say something worse of such nasty a practice. an uncleanliness, a filthiness, forbidden by GOD, an unmanliness despised by men. According to Alex Comfort, who conducted research on attitudes toward masturbation in the nineteenth century, the circumcision was increasingly used to stop it: the eighteenth Comfort pointed out that Paget shared the Renaissance medical authors' belief that the foreskin significantly contributed to sexual pleasure.

Although William Acton acknowledged that Paget was correct in the abstract, he continued by suggesting that it would be beneficial for all infants to be circumcised instead: Admitting, as I do, that this distinguished physiologist is right in the abstract, I am still of the opinion that the prepuce in man is the cause of much mischief, and that we could well spare that organ. It would therefore appear clear that, in the time period in which the novel is How does Daniel Deronda's view change as a result of this historical examination of circumcision? The conflict between sign and meaning is a recurring topic in Eliot's writing. all signals must be interpreted, and even the most evident sign might be read incorrectly: Signs are small measurable things, but interpretations are

illimitable, as Middlemarch puts it. Daniel Deronda also features this theme, particularly in relation to Deronda: Both Emperor and Rabbi were wrong in their trust of outward signs: poverty and poor clothes are no sign of inspiration, said Deronda to his inward objector, but they have gone with it in some remarkable cases Deronda, who experiences oppressive skepticism, is shown to be aware that signals do not have intrinsic significance and that a person's preferences influence how they interpret signs [6].

Although circumcision could not be directly acknowledged, I would argue that it serves primarily as a confusing indicator for Deronda. From his perspective, he cannot understand what being circumcised means, albeit having Jewish ancestry must be a possibility. Contrarily, circumcision serves as a clear indication of Jewishness in Chase's perspective, which is odd given that deconstruction often stresses the polysemic possibilities of the signifier. Apart from his circumcision, Deronda had no previous connections to Jews until his unexpected meeting with Mirah. Deronda sees no reason to think that circumcision is a certain indication of Jewishness since it may be done for other reasons. He had certain common preconceptions against Jews. thus, this prospect would not have been welcomed by someone of his upbringing: Deronda could not escape knowing ugly stories of Jewish characteristics and occupations. Given that he must be aware that circumcision is a Jewish ritual, there is also a hint that he may be personally afraid of the consequences of finding Mirah's brother: In his anxiety about Mirah's relatives, he had lately been thinking of vulgar Jews with a sort of personal alarm.

Deronda, on the other hand, thinks that Sir Hugo Mallinger is the most likely candidate to be his father. When he is forced to conduct a new mental survey of familiar facts, the unexpected revelation that he could be Sir Hugo's illegitimate offspring causes him to become aware of the ambiguous character of signals. If his unidentified mother was Jewish, circumcision may still be a marker of Jewishness even if Sir Hugo is his father. The fact that he had phimosis as a newborn or the fact that his doctor recommended circumcision as a health precaution might also be seen as a hint with no real significance. It could also have a sexual connotation. The first time Deronda has any doubts about his identity is when he asks his instructor why popes and cardinals have so many nephews in the setting of sexual excess and license. Then he concludes that he was almost certainly the result of such excess. What, therefore, would his having been circumcised in such a situation mean? Could his circumcision be an indication that the decision was made to decrease the likelihood that he would inherit his parents' extreme sexual desires? William Acton felt that intense sexual arousal may be passed down from parents to children: Early voluptuous notions... are ... traceable to the brain. and I believe, inherited, like many other qualities, from parents who have not kept the animal passions in any sort of check.

Circumcision, then, offers many possibilities for ambiguity of meaning in Deronda's situation, and several of his traits can be interpreted as understandable responses to this ambiguity: such as his apprehension at the thought of 'vulgar' Jews and his dread at learning the truth about his parentage. The fact that one indication may represent so much or so little lends psychological credibility to his concern about his identity. If circumcision is viewed as a component of the theme of the ambiguity of signs, this helps resolve a problem that has frequently been cited as undermining the plot's plausibility: that Deronda should turn out to have been born into a Jewish family and thus be able to fulfill the role that Mordecai has created for him is seen as too convenient and contrived to be reconcilable with the novel's realism. A magical metamorphosis that exceeds the limits of realistic narrative. Although the novel itself hints to causality being reversed in Hans Meyrick's letter to Deronda, her claim that regular causality is inverted throughout the book

appears compelling. However, Deronda's reaction to Mordecai's assertion that he is a Jew in terms of his ethnic roots is what is at the heart of the issue. Mordecai has the visionary anticipation that someone would appear to continue his job, thus it is easy to see why he believes in it. Deronda must also have certain physical characteristics of a Jew. For instance, it is said that he is dark, but the symptoms are unclear since, his face is not more distinctively oriental than many a type seen among what we call the Latin races. From a pragmatic perspective, it is difficult to see why Deronda might decide to try to fulfill Mordecai's idealistic wishes if he can, because for Mordecai, he must be a Jew by race to do so [7].

However, if there is absolutely no proof to corroborate Deronda's claim that she is a Jew. The author's will appears to have resulted in his turning out to be a Jew, not a plausible course of circumstances. Deronda must understand that he has a trait with Jews if he has undergone circumcision, and because he is unsure of his lineage, it is obviously feasible that he is Jewish in origin. Even though he considers it doubtful, there is a hint that he is not entirely shocked by Mordecai's assertion that he is a Jew. The assertion also rested on a presumption that may be - no, probably was - at odds with the whole truth: that he, Deronda, was of Jewish ancestry. He does not reject it as ludicrous or weird. Has there ever been a greater fictive appeal?'. Saying just that Mordecai might be or probably was mistaken because there is absolutely nothing linking Deronda to Jews is strange. And before Mirah developed his interest in Jews, the only potential personal connection he may have had with them is circumcision. Even if he would want to be a Jew after meeting Mordecai, a guy who can give him the purpose in life he has been seeking, circumcision is not evidence that he is a Jew.

However, Deronda is fully aware of how readily perception may be influenced by desire and how indicators can be misinterpreted. However, if he is circumcised, his readiness to accept Mordecai's 'hypothetic' view, at least in part, and his actual identification as a Jew are logical and likely, making them simple to reconcile with realism story. As a result, the story may be defended against both Chase's deconstructionist criticism and the allegations of those who think it violates the rules of traditional realism. Eliot departs from her usual practice in Daniel Deronda's plot by not disclosing to the reader the central aspect of the story that Deronda is of Jewish origin until more than halfway through. This is where the plot of Daniel Deronda differs from Eliot's previous books. However, one of Eliot's innovations in Daniel Deronda is to blend certain elements of the sensation novel into her method of realism. This defers disclosing material crucial to the plot but may also leave hints that an observant reader may pick up on. It can be argued that circumcision is indirectly alluded to in the text, particularly when Deronda is forcibly confronted with the question of his origins, even though it does not appear to have occurred to the novel's readers for approximately a hundred years. This suggests a limited perception of Eliot as a writer because it was apparently inconceivable that she could deal with such a subject.

Deronda's feeling of detachment is more powerfully believable when it is hinted, as T. Deronda's emotional instability may seem in excess of the facts as they appear, as S. Eliot said of Hamlet. Believing that it is highly likely that he is the illegitimate son of Sir Hugo while also being credibly circumcised causes the fear that he might be fundamentally different from Sir Hugo and his class. Circumcision becomes a sign of distinction, and even though he is unsure of its significance, it fills him with dread If his father had been wicked Daniel used strong language internally because he felt the harm done to him like a boy who has been maimed feels the crushed limb that is only counted in an average of accidents if his father had done anything wrong, he wished it might never be spoken of to him: It was already a cutting thought that such knowledge might be There are

multiple instances of this imagery of being maimed and wounded, with the term cutting thought standing out in particular.

Other instances include: he would never bring himself near even a silent admission of the sore that had opened in him. A surprise that came to him before his first vacation, strengthened the silent consciousness of a grief within, which might be compared in some ways with Byron's susceptibility about his deformed foot. and perhaps most dramatically, The sense of an entailed disadvantage the deformed foot doubtfully hidden by the shoe, makes a difference to him Although Deronda's nature is of the rarer sort that resists such distortion, the word Ishmaelite, which has the connotation of both Jew and outcast because Ishmael is a son of Abraham, gives a clue to his situation. At this point in the novel, particularly in the context of imagery of maiming, injury, and deformity, the only thing that could obviously connect Deronda with Jewishness is circumcision [8].

Chase's overall assessment of the book, according to which the triumph of idealism over irony is written into the very structure of the novel's double plot, is basically traditional in that it sees the book as having structural issues. As Chase suggests, such idealism is obviously questionable if it depends on ignoring circumcision. However, if circumcision is seen as an oblique presence, one might read the relationship between idealism and irony in the narrative differently. Though idealism is not compromised, irony is still permitted. One shouldn't be shocked that Romantic irony is used in the narrative framework of a story where Romantic preoccupations are so prominent. The satirical light that circumcision shines on Deronda's Jewishness and on the idea of causation which presupposes an equilibrium or logical relationship between cause and effect makes it pertinent to our discussion. Deronda's hopeful identification with it and the lofty role Mordecai envisions for him as the keeper of the sacred inheritance of the Jew is for Mordecai dependent on Deronda being a Jew by race, yet initially the only characteristic that identifies him as Jewish is circumcision, which initially he cannot securely interpret. The disequilibrium that exists between the triviality of this sign and the magnitude of the consequences that may follow from it mocks the deep-seated human desire for causal order and proportion, both in the world and in narrative.

The novel itself obviously raises the issue, and critics must choose which of the three attitudes that it is possible to have toward it namely, that it is a signifying presence, a signifying absence, or does not perform any signifying function is the most defendable. Of course, there can be no definitive proof that Eliot intended for circumcision to be a signifying presence in the novel, unless documentary evidence is discovered. My claim that it is a signifying presence challenges the still prevalent idea that Eliot's literature exemplifies Victorian high mindedness and moral sincerity and accepts the limitations that the Victorian era's novelists imposed on their imagination. It is hard to square this picture of her with the circumcision that Daniel Deronda implicitly represents and the hints that point to its existence. I would argue that the function of circumcision draws attention to a comical playfulness that coexists with the text's serious topics but that Eliot's Victorian image has typically kept readers from perceiving.

DISCUSSION

Since its publication, Daniel Deronda by George Eliot has been the topic of much criticism and discussion, with an emphasis on its departure from conventional realism and engagement with symbolism and idealism. The apparently unnoticeable but crucial topic of circumcision is one of the novel's most interesting parts and has sparked major academic discussion. Here, we explore

the many dimensions of Deconstructing Daniel Deronda: Symbolism, Realism, and the Circumcision Conundrum. Known for her dedication to reality, George Eliot chose a different direction in Daniel Deronda. She enabled symbolism, idealism, and aspects of the romance subgenre to take center stage in the story's Jewish section, according to critics. Her aims and the effect on the novel's overall cohesion have been questioned as a result of this break from her usual realism approach. The novel has symbolic elements that encourage readers to consider where the lines between reality and allegory are drawn, especially in relation to circumcision.

Cynthia Chase's critical reading of Daniel Deronda provided a novel viewpoint on the discussion. She identified a seemingly unimportant detail Daniel Deronda's circumcised penis and made the case that it is crucial to understanding the book's deeper significance. Chase argues that Eliot's story requires both a spiritual conversion and a corporeal metamorphosis analogous to those seen in fairy tales. This viewpoint not only contradicts conventional interpretations but also emphasizes how symbolism and reality interact in the narrative. The historical validity of Eliot's depiction of circumcision in Daniel Deronda is a key topic of discussion. Some critics wonder whether Eliot purposefully omitted circumcision-related factual information regarding nineteenth-century England in order to further his creative goals. Readers are prompted to think about the tension between historical accuracy and creative license in literary works by this conundrum.

CONCLUSION

Finally, Deconstructing Daniel Deronda: Symbolism, Realism, and the Circumcision Conundrum provides a stimulating examination of George Eliot's book and the critical discussions it sparked. It challenges readers to reconsider the interplay between realism and symbolism, the significance of authorial purpose, and the fine line between creative inquiry and historical authenticity in the world of literature. This continuous debate is proof of how literature continues to inspire interpretation and reinterpretation throughout generations. The novel's deviation from realism by Eliot prompts fascinating questions regarding her literary self-awareness and authorial purpose. Was it a mistake, or did she deliberately choose to ignore historical accuracy? This debate explores Eliot's objectives and her comprehension of the historical and cultural environment in which she was writing, going beyond the book itself. Deconstructing Daniel Deronda questions accepted ideas about Victorian realism. Readers and academics alike are compelled to reevaluate the limitations of the genre during the Victorian period by Eliot's ability to combine ideas of symbolism and idealism into a story that is grounded in the realism tradition.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Pykett, Sensation and the fantastic in the Victorian novel, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*, 2007. doi: 10.1017/ccol0521641500.010.

[2] D. Novak, A model Jew: ‘Literary photographs’ and the Jewish body in Daniel Deronda, *Representations*, 2004, doi: 10.1525/rep.2004.85.1.58.

[3] C. Levine, Surprising Realism, in *A Companion to George Eliot*, 2013. doi: 10.1002/9781118542347.ch4.

[4] M. Jafri, Stories we like to tell: Gossip in george eliot’s fiction, *Forum Mod. Lang. Stud.*, 2014, doi: 10.1093/fmls/cqu002.

[5] N. Henry, *George Eliot and the British Empire*. 2002. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511484834.

[6] S. Gates, &quot.A Difference of Native Language&quot.: Gender, Genre, and Realism in Daniel Deronda, *ELH*, 2001, doi: 10.1353/elh.2001.0022.

[7] E. Cohn, Curious Subjects: Women and the Trials of Realism, *Textual Pract.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/0950236x.2014.901659.

[8] L. Cameron, Spencerian evolutionary psychology in Daniel Deronda, *Vic. Lit. Cult.*, 2015, doi: 10.1017/S1060150314000345.

CHAPTER 11

AN OVERVIEW OF SILAS MARNER: REALISM, MORAL ALLEGORY AND NARRATIVE DISCONTINUITY

Anuradha Pawar, Assistant Professor
College of Pharmacy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- anumayak@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT:

By analyzing how realism, moral allegory, and narrative discontinuity interact in George Eliot's famous book Silas Marner, this abstract analyzes the many facets of the work. This research reveals how Eliot uses a realism framework to describe the rural English countryside and the lives of its people by closely examining the novel's characters, surroundings, and storyline. The story also explores complex moral and ethical issues, showing how Silas Marner's evolution from a solitary weaver to a loving parent serves as a potent emblem for redemption and human connection. The novel narrative structure of Silas Marner, emphasizing discontinuities and temporal changes that defy standard storytelling conventions. These plot twists encourage readers to interact with the book more deeply and to consider the fluidity of human experience, memory, and the essence of time. his analysis of Silas Marner demonstrates how George Eliot skillfully combines realism, allegory, and narrative innovation to create a timeless work that continues to captivate readers and inspire them to reflect on the complexities of human existence and the enduring power of moral transformation.

KEYWORDS:

George Eliot, Human Connection, Moral, Realism, Redemption, Rural England, Silas Marner.

INTRODUCTION

Silas Marner was one of the most commonly studied Victorian novels in schools back in the good old days or horrible, depending on your point of view when it was assumed that great literary books would be at the center of any English curriculum. It is safe to assume that part of the reason for this was the story's apparent simplicity and accessibility, as well as the fact that it was brief by nineteenth-century standards. Its association with Victorian moral idealism, however, was probably even more significant since it seemed to depict a world in which moral order is inherent and prevails over moral disorder, with the virtuous being rewarded and the evil being punished. What were considered to be Victorian values persisted strong well into the twentieth century, and the prescribing of literary texts in schools must have played some role in sustaining them, according to the editor of a school edition of Silas Marner that was first published in 1912 and frequently reprinted. The moral certitudes associated with 'Victorian ideals' seemed to be more explicitly proclaimed in this book than in virtually any other literary work of the time, which makes Silas Marner a particularly noteworthy text in terms of culture.

In fact, one might argue that it serves as an example of the philosophy of fiction put forward by Miss Prism in The Importance of Being Earnest, who says of her lost book: The good ended happily, and the bad unhappily. That is what Fiction implies, said Wilde, obviously mocking what he saw as the Victorian era's simplistic moral optimism, which Silas Marner has been cited as exemplifying and which almost definitely explains why it was once a popular novel in schools.

Eliot's reputation as an artist may have continued to decline beyond the late nineteenth century into the first half of the twentieth century as a result of this use of the novel in schools to promote Victorian ideology, not only in Britain but also in America, as it reinforced the perception of her as a heavy Victorian moralist. Both a return to Victorian values and the inclusion of classic literature in school English curricula have been demanded in certain political circles, and it is evident that these requests are not unrelated.

It's possible that Silas Marner may once again be regarded as the perfect book for a classroom. I'll argue that it is not as accessible a book as supporters of Victorian values may believe, and that only historical critical impercipience permitted such a reading of it. Although Silas Marner has been the subject of sophisticated critical debate, I don't believe that this critique has directly challenged the notion that the book upholds Victorian moral dogmas. Silas Marner is a challenging work to place within Eliot's fiction. It may be seen as either the conclusion of her formative stage or the start of her mature style. It has similarities with her first book Adam Bede since it too centers on rural English life, but it differs from her subsequent works structurally because all of her books after Silas Marner use a double storyline. Silas Marner has frequently been compared to myth or fairy tale, which has caused some criticism: Silas Marner is simply an allegorical fairy tale4. it is basically a myth of spiritual rebirth [1].

Additionally, divine providence appears to be at work in the novel, rewarding the good and punishing the bad, which would suggest that it embodies a religious or metaphysical meaning. however, h. Ignoring these factors, which make the issue of interpretation more complex, weakens readings of the book that presume it to be a clear-cut moral parable. Lyrical Ballads and Silas Marner may appear simple in style when compared to other texts by their authors, and both writers are clearly drawing on traditional ballads and fairy tales, but one should not forget that they are sophisticated writers adopting an apparent style of their own. Eliot acknowledged the influence of Wordsworth on the novel, and its connections with certain of the poems in Lyrical Ballads are obvious. Their writings cannot be taken seriously as authentic ballads or fairy tales. First, let's examine the issue of realism in Silas Marner. Although critics have noted that the book has elements of a fairy tale or myth and thus departs from the realistic portrayal found in her other works of fiction, as Leavis puts it, the atmosphere precludes too direct a reference. There is little indication that Eliot saw the book as a departure from reality. rather, it is a return to our ordinary awareness of how things happen.

The novel is constructed entirely within the bounds of conventional realism, with careful attention to probability and verisimilitude of detail, as one critic acknowledges: It is constructed within the limits of conventional realism, with careful attention to probability and verisimilitude of detail. Of course, the novel contains what appear to be some striking departures from conventional realism, but these, in my opinion, should not be seen as belonging to conventional realism. Although the actual events and circumstances are not fundamentally different from those in her prior works, the novel's style and narrative structure make much more explicit use of fairy tale and myth. A story that is realist in its philosophical foundation, unlike fairy tales, myths, and legends, is represented using some of the devices of fairy tales, myths, and legends. To put the issue in terms of narrative theory, there is a discontinuity between story, which is the basic material of the novel, and discourse, which is how that material is rendered in artistic terms. The opening of the novel's description of weavers as the remnants of a disinherited race, alien-looking men, who rarely stirred abroad without that mysterious burden, is one example of this discontinuity.

They are described as wandering men who are eyed suspiciously by their rural neighbors. However, these weavers are not in fact Wandering Jew characters from a romantic universe unrelated to historical detail [2]. They are unmistakably creations of the Industrial Revolution, and the load they bear does not contain the remnants of some sinful deed from the past but rather the thread and other supplies they need to carry out their trade. The weavers are transformed into detached, rootless wanderers in order to illustrate the dehumanizing effects of the Industrial Revolution, yet the historical fact is still accurately shown. This serves as a little example of the novel's use of aesthetics. Silas's bizarre episodes, during which he enters a trance like death, are another illustration of this discontinuity.

Although they are essential to the story, they appear too absurd to fit in with realism writing. They add to the romantic or fairy-tale mood of the story, and no one in Lantern Yard or Raveloe knows what their origins are. But the narrator makes it apparent that Silas's ailment has a medical cause, notably catalepsy. The way Silas is portrayed makes it clear that he is associated with romantic characters like Wordsworth's leech gatherer, Michael, and most notably Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, but I would argue that realism is not compromised at the level of story. The punning and metaphorical vocabulary of Silas Marner is a clue that it is not a straightforward fairytale-style tale but rather a highly self-aware literary experiment in narrative building. The Weaver of Raveloe is its subtitle, and much as Marner weaves thread to create fabric, Eliot weaves language to create story. Of course, the word text comes from the Latin verb texere, which means to weave. As in he worked into the night to finish the tale of Mrs.

Osgood's table-linen sooner than she expected, there is also a pun on the word tale, which may refer to both a weight or amount of fabric. As stated by Mr. Macey in response to Silas's account of the theft of his gold, For, says I, you talk o' Master Marner making out a tale - why, its nonsense, that is: it 'us take a 'cute man to make out a tale like that, he appears to weave, like the spider, from pure impulse, without reflection. When Silas says, weaving, his metaphorical spider-like weaving is further explored. reduces him to an insect-like existence and reduces his life to the unquestioning activity of a spinning insect. Of course, a spider spins a web, and Silas is weaving when he says that he is looking towards the end of his pattern, or towards the end of his web [3]. This usage of the word web predates Middlemarch, in which the metaphorical term web alludes to the structure and arrangement of storytelling. Silas accusing William Dane of weaving a plot to lay the sin at my door and a farrier taking up the thread of discourse in the Rainbow Inn both make metaphorical linkages between weaving and the crafting of story. The fundamental distinction between a fairy tale or myth and a novel as a literary form is that, unlike literary texts, fairy tales or myths do not require the synthesis of the narrative and linguistic dimensions because the narrative is open to being rendered in multiple forms of linguistic expression.

Silas Marner, for example, self-consciously illustrates this point by demonstrating that the work is a literary artifact rather than a fairy tale in any sense. As I have said, this is the first of Eliot's works to use a dual storyline, and it is very evident that the narratives of Silas and Godfrey Cass are intertwined. In contrast to generally realist writing, which would have to be subdued in order to avoid undermining the reader's sense of reality, the Romantic mood of the work enables Eliot to develop a more fable-like structure. Godfrey and Silas stand for two opposing worldviews that encounter one other as a result of experience. The fact that Silas Marner was written soon after Darwin's Origin of Species was published in 1859 may not be insignificant, as the world that Silas and Godfrey must contend with can be seen as having Darwinian foundations. that is, a world in which there is no proof of a divine or providential order, with chance, circumstance, or accident

playing an important role. Far from being a world of fairy tales. Silas and Godfrey had to deal with such a world. In Silas Marner, chance plays a big part. According to the narrator, Favourable Chance is the god of all men who act according to their own desires rather than abiding by a law they believe to be true. Since Silas was raised to believe that there is a divine order in the universe, he trusts the outcome of the lotteries to establish his innocence when he is accused of stealing, saying, God will clear me [4].

But Godfrey depends on luck to save him from a series of circumstances that may destroy his life: a humiliating marriage that would cause him to lose his wealth and forgo the opportunity to wed Nancy Lammeter. Silas loses confidence in a good God after the results of a lottery turn out badly, declaring that there is no just God that governs the earth righteously, but a God of lies, that bears witness against the innocent. But Godfrey makes money off of luck. He escapes disaster by waiting for events to happen and being ready to adjust to them: The longer the interval, the greater the chance there was of deliverance from some, at least, of the hateful consequences to which he had sold himself. Godfrey had bet with events and won when his wife passes away without their marriage or the fact that he fathered a kid being revealed, and when his brother Dunstan, the only other person who knew about the marriage, vanishes. Now that his father is deceased, he is free to wed Nancy Lammeter, whom he now refers to as his paradise. Justice or the human condition have no bearing on what occurs in the world. Silas had confidence in a world with rules governed by a good God, but that faith has been shattered.

Godfrey, on the other hand, has bet on events and won. Despite the fact that the world of Silas Marner is one that is informed by Darwinian concepts, the book contends that this does not necessarily call into question people's conceptions of a moral order since the lack of an immanent moral order in the universe has no influence on how people should behave. Godfrey and other characters in Eliot's works who attempt to use luck and fate for their own unethical or self-serving ends are obviously not given much compassion, since the novel argues that Darwinian natural selection cannot be applied to human society. This perspective on Darwinism was out of the ordinary at the time. Those who understood the theory's scientific implications but held that morality depended on the existence of a moral order in the world asserted that Darwinian theory could have detrimental social consequences. people would no longer have any reason to act morally since, according to Darwinists, the survival of species had no relation to morality but was instead dependent on adaptation to a constantly changing world. Others, who adopted a less scientific interpretation of Darwin and were influenced by Herbert Spencer's transformation of natural selection into the survival of the fittest, held that Darwinism proved that there was a natural order based on struggle and conflict, and that one should accept that this also applied to the human and social world.

Although Darwin's idea of natural selection was evaluatively neutral, the phrase fittest might be interpreted to signify those who are best suited to survive. Although Eliot's criticism of Darwinism was maintained more forcefully in subsequent books like Felix Holt, as I have attempted to demonstrate before, Silas Marner, the first of Eliot's novels to substantially display the impact of Darwinism, reveals that Eliot rejected both of these interpretations of Darwinism from the beginning. However, Silas Marner demonstrates that the destruction of the notion of an immanent moral order may have catastrophic results. Silas builds a mechanical way of life for himself in response to his faith being shaken when the drawing of lots reveals that he is guilty even though he knows he is innocent: Strangely Marner's face and figure shrank and bent themselves into a constant mechanical relation to the objects of his life [5].

Work and money are the essential components of this mechanical existence. prior to meeting Eppie, nothing else mattered to him. It goes without saying that labor and money were major aspects of Victorian life, and it is clear that Eliot is proposing a connection between Victorian concern with these issues and loss of faith. Eliot uses Marner's mechanized existence as an allegory to remark on the alienation he claims underlies Victorian civilization. Godfrey's wish for a happy turn of circumstances to save him also has larger ramifications. In living his life in this manner, the reader is informed that he can hardly be called particularly old-fashioned. Despite the fact that the novel is set some sixty years ago, he is seen as representative of people in Eliot's own time: Let even a polished man of these days get into a position he is ashamed to avow, and his mind will be bent on all the possible issues that may deliver him from the calculable results of that position. Godfrey (God-free) and Silas, who both have links with the Ancient Mariner, metaphorically symbolize various manifestations of Victorian estrangement. The individual who had held the view that there was an innate moral order in the universe, however, seemed to prevail in the end against the calculating gambler on chance. Some reviewers believe that the book eventually supports a providentialism perspective on the universe because of this victory of good.

The victory of good in the book is not a result of Godfrey and Silas receiving unfair rewards or penalties. Instead, I'll make the case that if Eppie had been lost and Godfrey had been successful in stealing her from Silas, the moral stance the book adopts would remain intact. When Silas is wrongfully found guilty of stealing, his presumption that moral balance is built into the universe is upended. Godfrey effectively rejects such moral balance by speculating about the future. But the book demonstrates that even in the absence of such balance, humans nevertheless have a psychological desire for it. Justice, according to Eliot's narrator in Romola, is like the Kingdom of God - it is not without us as a fact, it is within us as a great yearning. Godfrey is susceptible to guilt since his benefits do not balance out his perception of his deserts. Since he is unable to admit his previous deeds to anybody, not even Nancy, the person closest to him, he must adopt a persona that is at conflict with his inner nature. He is joined by his importunate companion, Anxiety, who is afraid that the past could be revealed. Godfrey's final admission of providence: Nancy, everything comes to light at some point.

The phrase our secrets are found out when God Almighty wills it has to be understood in this psychological framework. David Cecil argued in Early Victorian Novelists that George Eliot imposed a moral code that was arbitrary on the text by punishing Godfrey by depriving him of children: George Eliot vindicates the moral order by depriving him [Godfrey] of children. This is not even remotely an inevitable result of his action. There is no intrinsic reason for a morally weak guy to not have twenty children given the nature of things. As a result, we believe Godfrey's dissatisfaction to be a gratuitous act of poetic justice forced on him by the capricious whim of his creator rather than the inevitable embodiment of the moral rule. Cecil fails to see that Godfrey's ability to gamble with circumstances and come out ahead is what allowed him to marry Nancy and escape the repercussions of his previous behavior. But sooner or later, gamblers inevitably lose. Godfrey's situation is more of a case of poor luck than it is a gratuitous piece of poetic justice. Since he has already had such wonderful fortune, it is easy for the reader to understand that his good fortune will eventually run out.

There is no need for the reader to agree with him, even if he sees it as God's punishment, which makes sense given his ongoing shame and concern. However, Silas seems to embrace Godfrey's viewpoint since he has his faith in providence restored. There is good in this world, he tells Dolly Winthrop, and I have a sense of it right now. There are transactions with us. there are dealings.

That lotto drawing is gloomy, yet the kid was given to me. Despite the fact that his money was returned, he nevertheless expresses concern that, in the event Eppie were to go missing, I might come to think I was forsaken again, and lose the feeling that God was good to me. Godfrey and Nancy knock on his door shortly after he says that to inquire for Eppie.

His faith in providence will be put to the test, just as in Lantern Yard. But unlike Lantern Yard, where Silas's identity was destroyed when his trust in benign providence failed, this second crisis is significant because it shows that Silas's identity is no longer centered on his belief in providence. Eppie was no longer seen as his property, despite the fact that he had previously thought she had been handed to him as compensation for the loss of his riches. He gives her the option to speak, saying, Eppie, my kid. I won't get in the way of you. Thank you, Mr. and Mrs. Cass. Silas has his toughest challenge when Eppie rejects Godfrey's offer and he subsequently claims paternity for her. Despite his willingness to let Eppie make the decision and his certainty that she would pick him, Godfrey's assertion that she is his by right raises the possibility that there is no benevolent deity and that there is no such thing as justice in the world. He says, God gave her to me because you turned your back on her, and He looks upon her as mine: you've no right to her! Godfrey considers this viewpoint to be very selfish. However, when the drawing of lots goes against him, Silas transcends theological concerns by feeling the fundamental Wordsworth Ian emotion of compassion rather than responding the same way he did in Lantern Yard [6].

Silas is able to let go of absolute ideas of what is right or good in favor of a humanist perspective, as seen by his statement, I'll hinder nothing. What is proper is what is best for Eppie. it is not a universal standard that exists outside from humans. It becomes irrelevant if God has ordained that Silas is entitled to Eppie. human concerns take precedence. It is obvious that Silas would not have turned back into his prior feeling of estrangement even if Eppie had decided to go with her biological father. Since the relationship to the world, he has built in Raveloe is one that is no longer reliant on the belief that the universe is providently regulated, he would have had to endure her loss via renunciation. The novel's humanitarian message is lost if it is seen as a fairy tale about a guy who is rewarded by the actions of a kind providence. Since Silas is now an accepted part of the Raveloe society and views Eppie as a living individual rather than just a property like his wealth, he is able to let Eppie pick the good rather than seeing it in absolute terms.

Due to the loss of his riches and the subsequent arrival of Eppie, Silas had gradually assimilated into this society. Significantly, in Raveloe, dogmatic theological concepts like divine providence had no place. Raveloe places a strong emphasis on interpersonal relationships above theological doctrines in their religious practices. Silas would have had the community to rely on even in the absence of Eppie. The infamous Margaret Thatcher said that there is no such thing as society and pushed for a return to Victorian ideals. This viewpoint is unsupported by Silas Marner. In fact, for Eliot, human identity is social in a constitutive sense, and those of her characters such as Tito in Romola or Christian in Felix Holt who attempt to live purely individualistic lives essentially lose their human identities. Silas Marner challenges a variety of notions and opinions that have been seen as distinctly Victorian. As opposed to what most Victorians would have assumed, morality and justice are proven to be socially constructed, completely human constructs that are not any less true because of this. The commitment to labor and money, which is closely identified with the Victorian mentality and is praised by those who call for a return to Victorian values, is seen as a sign of human estrangement.

Years pass before they finally accept him. Eliot is aware of the risks associated with such groups' exclusivity and hostility against outsiders. Dolly Winthrop may be a kind and giving person, but her ignorance is clear and she occasionally gives Silas bad advice. Raveloe does have a strong sense of community, and while though residents are first hesitant to welcome Silas since he is seen as different, they eventually accept him. Both gain from this coming together: Raveloe has conquered its dread of the other, has grown less inward-looking, and embraced him. Silas is no longer an isolated mind. This feeling of community is strengthened by many rituals that are fundamental to Raveloe life, such as attending church and the New Year's dance, which, together with a tale like the Lammeters' wedding that has evolved into something of a local myth, foster a sense of shared awareness. Silas participated in the observances held sacred by his neighbors during Eppie's baptism. In Raveloe, religion is not connected to a dogmatic theology. rather, it is woven into the fabric of society. Silas has assimilated into a culture that can withstand both good and terrible fortune, making him less susceptible to the immoral course of events [7].

DISCUSSION

The subtitle Silas Marner: Realism, Moral Allegory, and Narrative Discontinuity captures the complexity of George Eliot's well-known book and calls for an in-depth debate. This piece of literature, which was released in 1861, is evidence of Eliot's skill as a storyteller and her capacity to combine dissimilar components to produce a compelling tale. This book's dedication to reality is one of its most noteworthy features. Mary Ann Evans, who wrote under the pen name George Eliot, was a well-known author of the Victorian period who was renowned for her commitment to capturing the nuances of country life in 19th-century England. The novel Silas Marner is no exception, portraying Raveloe's rural location, the characters' everyday difficulties, and the social contrasts of the era with realistic detail. The novel's realism gives readers a glimpse into the challenging realities of rural life and reflects the larger cultural environment of the time. Another appealing aspect of Silas Marner is the moral allegory woven throughout the story. Silas Marner, the title character, experiences a significant metamorphosis from a reclusive, frugal weaver to a devoted and forgiving father figure. His trip serves as a striking symbol for moral development and the possibility of atonement in the human soul. In order to examine themes of love, community, and the final victory of human decency over hardship, Eliot draws on Silas' experiences. Not only does caring for another person make Silas more human, but also participating in Raveloe's communal life does the same.

It wouldn't be incorrect to characterize Raveloe as an organic community and to see Silas Marner as a book that draws on organicist concepts from the Romantics and authors like Carlyle as part of an implicit critique of the predominance of mechanistic systems in mid-Victorian British society. Although there is no rejection of sociology as a whole or idealization of peasant communities and their customs and traditions, Eliot had criticized the application of mechanistic theories to social life in her essay from 1856, The Natural History of German Life. She stated that the relations of men to their neighbors may be settled by algebraic equations, but there is no rejection of sociology as a discipline or recognition of the communal exclusiveness - the resistance to the indiscriminate establishment of Eliot views it as a weakness of modern liberalism that this is only condemned on the basis of rationalistic arguments rather than leading to the development of a sociology that is more grounded in science and in which there is an advance from the general to the special, from the simple to the complex, analogous with that which is found in the series of the sciences, from Mathematics to Biology. Eliot is not a traditional organicist who opposes social theory with a logical foundation, and she is fully aware that organicist views are subject to criticism since they

idealize the past. Despite the novel's fairy tale and epic ambiance, Raveloe is clearly not romanticized. The Casses' upper class is generally walled off from the neighborhood. The residents of the town are in many ways uneducated. they first put little effort into helping the newcomer Silas and view him suspiciously.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Silas Marner: Realism, Moral Allegory, and Narrative Discontinuity provides an engaging framework for appreciating the breadth and complexity of George Eliot's writing. It is a tribute to her skill in fusing realistic, allusive, and creative storytelling components to produce a classic tale that enthralls readers and sparks introspective conversations about the human condition and the eternal value of connection and redemption. The Silas Marner idea of narrative discontinuity questions accepted narrative conventions. Eliot uses temporal changes, abrupt leaps in the story, and unusual pace to provide a distinctive reading experience. Readers are prompted to reflect on the malleability of time, memory, and the fluidity of human experience by this narrative innovation. As readers wrestle with the chronological inconsistencies and consider how they add to the novel's overall thematic complexity, it stimulates greater engagement with the book.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Wolf, Epilepsy and Catalepsy in Anglo-American Literature between Romanticism and Realism: Tennyson, Poe, Eliot and Collins, *J. Hist. Neurosci.*, 2000, doi: 10.1076/0964-704x(200012)9:3.1-#.ft286.

[2] C. Mathieson, ‘Wandering like a wild thing’: Rurality, women and walking in George Eliot’S Adam Bede and the mill on the floss, in *Gender and Space in Rural Britain, 1840-1920*, 2015. doi: 10.4324/9781315654355.

[3] S. Markovits, Scenes of Clerical Life and Silas Marner: Moral Fables, in *A Companion to George Eliot*, 2013. doi: 10.1002/9781118542347.ch6.

[4] R. Livesey, On writing portable place: George Eliot’s mobile Midlands, *Mobilities*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/17450101.2017.1331005.

[5] M. Jafri, Stories we like to tell: Gossip in george eliot’s fiction, *Forum Mod. Lang. Stud.*, 2014, doi: 10.1093/fmls/cqu002.

[6] M. S. Ilhem, Warwickshire dialect in Eliot’s Silas Marner, *IUP J. English Stud.*, 2014.

[7] M. S. Ilhem, Representations of dialect in writing standard novels, *J. Lang. Lit.*, 2012, doi: 10.7813/jll.2012/3-2/1.

CHAPTER 12

A CONTESTED PERSPECTIVE: COLONIZATION AND NATIONHOOD

Neha Anand, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- nehaanand002@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Daniel Deronda, by George Eliot, is a thought-provoking examination of the intricate interactions between colonialism and nationalism in the 19th century. This abstract explores the novel's complex plot while underlining how colonialism and the creation of national identities are shown in conflict. Eliot creates a tapestry of divergent viewpoints on colonization via the voyages of its titular character, Daniel Deronda, and the mysterious Gwendolen Harleth, highlighting the conflicts, ambiguities, and moral quandaries that characterized this period of empire-building. We examine the individuals' various origins and experiences in this literary study to see how they represent the larger socioeconomic changes of the period. We look at how nationalist zeal and imperial aspirations interact with Daniel's Jewish ancestry and Gwendolen's upbringing in England. Readers are prompted to consider the moral ramifications of colonialism and how it affects the creation of national identities in Eliot's work. Furthermore, Daniel Deronda challenges us to reconsider our preconceived ideas about nationalism, Otherness, and belonging.

KEYWORDS:

Colonization, Contested Perspective, Daniel Deronda, George Eliot, Nationhood, Postcolonialism.

INTRODUCTION

If one were asked to vote for the work of literature that has had the greatest effect on the world assuming that the Bible or the Koran and other religious texts were excluded from the category of literature - then Daniel Deronda ought to be a strong contender. A case can be made that without it the state of Israel might not exist, and Israel of course has been at the centre of contemporary history and politics since it was founded in 1948 and continues to be. It has been claimed that its publication led to a fundamental change in Jewish attitudes to the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine - 'to hundreds of thousands of assimilated Jews, the story presented, for the first time, the possibility of a return to Zion- and the major figures in Zionism, Herzl and Weizmann, were certainly well aware of it and may even have read it. Also crucial to the foundation of Israel was the Balfour Declaration - 'without it the Jewish state could never have come into existence'- and it is likely that Balfour's initial interest in the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine had been aroused by Daniel Deronda. It is perhaps significant that he visited Eliot in 1877, the year after the novel's publication. Edward Said may have been aware of these facts and, as a Palestinian, his negative critique of Daniel Deronda in his writings on Zionism and the question of Palestine is understandable.

Said's view of Daniel Deronda as in sympathy with colonialism and Western imperialist attitudes to the East has considerably influenced current critical attitudes to it, particularly among post-colonial critics, but one finds his view reflected now even in books designed for the general reader, Deronda's departure for the East being seen as 'uncomfortably close to the imperial adventurism common among Englishmen of his time and class, who go off to the colonies to find a role and

make a reputation'. Daniel Deronda is mentioned briefly by Said in his book Orientalism, generally associating it with an attitude to the Orient that reflects Western imperialist ideology, and he develops this argument in his essay, 'Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Victims'. The obvious argument that could be used against Said is that Zionism in its nineteenth-century context is fundamentally different from European imperialism since Jews had once inhabited Palestine and had been driven out, and there was still a Jewish presence there, so that the major drive of early Zionism was the desire for a cultural identity rooted in place for a people subject to different degrees of discrimination and oppression and not, as generally with European imperialism, economic exploitation [1].

Said also accepts that in the late nineteenth century Palestine was already colonized: 'True, it was under Ottoman administration Yet such arguments are not in themselves sufficient to undermine Said's position, especially his claim that the Zionist Jews had been Europeanized and like European imperialists viewed Palestine 'as essentially empty of inhabitants, not because there were no inhabitants but because their status as sovereign and human inhabitants was systematically denied'. Said provides evidence that some early Zionists, such as Moses Hess, equated colonizing Palestine with colonialism more generally, which they saw as bringing 'civilization' to the Orient, and he claims that Mordecai, the proto-Zionist prophet in Daniel Deronda uses similar language to Hess. Despite the important difference I have mentioned between Zionism and European imperialism in general, colonization clearly was common to both, with Zionism creating, as Said asserts, 'Jewish colonies in the land of their ancestors',8 and historically colonization almost inevitably leads to the existing population eventually being displaced or marginalized: 'Zionism essentially saw Palestine as the European imperialist did, as an empty territory paradoxically filled with ignoble or perhaps even dispensable natives'. Said's position is that any form of colonization that sees the existing population as on a lower human level as a prelude to displacing them is ethically unacceptable.

As he points out, for colonists, 'There is no question of consulting the natives of the territory where the new society is to be given birth'. And, of course, if they were consulted beforehand, colonization would never happen. If one considers colonization historically, in virtually every case the existing occupiers have been seen as inferior by the colonizers and not 'as people having wishes, values, aspirations'. For Said, this makes colonization intrinsically wrong, and such a view seems to be assumed in the post-colonial theory and criticism that Said's writings have greatly influenced. Mordecai's speeches in the Hand and Banner tavern of Daniel Deronda, in which he urges the creation of 'an organic centre' for the Jews in Palestine and looks forward to their having a nation 'even as the sons of England and Germany' do, is regarded by Said as embodying Eliot's own proto-Zionist views. For him and for numerous other critics Mordecai is a of the Jewish maiden and Gentile king, which reveals that Mordecai's idealism edits out inconvenient aspects of reality, and the critical angle on Mordecai which that scene implies gives one a different perspective.

It is political rhetoric directed at a susceptible Deronda 'it was to Deronda that he was speaking' not at the other members of the group, all of whom are familiar with Mordecai's ideas and disagree with them, and is meant to be seen as such. The culminating moment in his speech advocating 'an organic centre' is his declaration: '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. This rhetorical flourish is intended to prevent any discussion or consideration of 'difficulties', and the major difficulty must, of course, be the fact that European Jews would have to colonize the former land of their ancestors which now had a predominantly Arab population [2]. Eliot would have been

familiar with the situation in Palestine as her friend, and almost certainly the principal model for Mordecai, Emanuel Deutsch, with whom she studied Hebrew, had been there in 1869 and had been powerfully affected by that experience. almost certainly he and Eliot would have discussed it. In a letter Eliot wrote to her publisher, John Blackwood, she indicates that she is well aware that if modern Jews are to have their own nation, it will involve colonization: 'There is a great movement now among the Jews towards colonizing Palestine, and bringing out the resources of the soil'.

It is significant, however, that Mordecai claims that if a Jewish nation were created in Palestine, it would have an equal right to exist and similar standing to England and America as nations. once the Jews have 'an organic centre the outraged Jew shall have a defense in the court of nations, as the outraged Englishman or American'. The American example is particularly apposite as Mordecai makes clear when he points out that it is 'only two centuries since a vessel carried over the ocean the beginning of the great North American nation and said himself links Zionism and the creation of America as a nation: 'Zionism was a colonial vision.' No doubt the reason for the comparison between Jewish nationhood in Palestine and England and America is that both the latter were created through colonization. In the case of England there were numerous invasions by colonizers - by the Romans, Anglo Saxons, Vikings, Normans and America had been colonized by the English from Tudor times. Mordecai's rhetoric, however, passes over the 'difficulties' of colonization before England and the America emerged as 'great' nations. In the various colonization's of England, a name invented, of course, by the predominant colonizers - the 'wishes, values, and aspirations' of the existing population were never taken into account as the invaders were mostly bent on subjugating them, even exterminating them, or driving them to the fringes of the country.

Before the creation of a 'great North American nation', the existing inhabitants were generally seen as savages and treated accordingly, and they were subjected to even more oppressive treatment after the colonizers gained freedom from British rule, and at the time Mordecai is speaking the American economy had to a significant extent depended on the labour of African slaves who were also predominantly regarded as intrinsically inferior to those of European descent. All of this familiar prehistory to the founding of England and America as nations is left out of account by Mordecai, and for Said and those critics influenced by him Eliot colludes in this omission of the likely consequences of any Jewish colonizing of Palestine. But I shall argue that this view is open to question: the comparison Mordecai draws with England and America as nations enables the reader to see beyond the rhetoric and reflect on the 'difficulties' Eliot was well aware of the price of colonization and specifically refers to it with reference to England and America.

The narrator, Theophrastus Such, gives special emphasis to the losers of history and does not seek to cover up what colonization entailed for the colonized in the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain, with the Anglo-Saxon colonizers 'gradually conquering more and more of the pleasant land from the natives who knew nothing of Odin, and finally making unusually clean work in ridding themselves of those prior occupants'. These invaders were 'our fathers' and they 'massacred Britons', and their descendants behaved similarly in regard to the 'Red Indians' in the colonization of America. There is plenty of evidence in Eliot's writings, fictional and non-fictional, of her sympathy with displaced or colonized peoples, Jews, Gypsies, Irish and of her opposition to British colonialism in India. But, unlike Said, she does not view colonization from an absolutist ethical standpoint [3]. Mordecai's rhetoric may cover up the 'difficulties' in the interests of communicating to Deronda his idealistic vision, but Eliot would not, I think, have believed that Mordecai was wrong to see England and America as 'great' nations, despite the price that had to be paid in human

blood and suffering for their creation. Although the bloody consequences of the various colonization's in the past are acknowledged, nevertheless for Theophrastus history moved on and a country called England eventually emerged, developed and acquired 'a national consciousness', a' sense of corporate existence', a distinct identity for a people descended from diverse ethnic groups that had previously tended to slaughter each other, and of course that nation produced Shakespeare, Newton and Eliot herself.

Similarly, an idea of America emerged that brought together an even greater ethnic diversity and whose constitution can be interpreted as proclaiming that all of its people, even its 'Red Indian' inhabitants and those descended from slaves, are included in the nation, even if those who signed the constitution may have interpreted it differently. Does this mean that for Eliot, in contrast to Said's ethically absolutist position, the price of invasion and colonization is sometimes worth paying? And if England and America are examples of colonization that could be seen as eventually having a 'good' outcome, what about counter-examples in which colonization had negative or even disastrous consequences? There is no indication in Daniel Deronda that the horrific consequences of invasion and colonization could ever be justified by possible future benefits, but Eliot's implied view is that to object to colonization absolutely is to object to history itself, since migration and colonization have been ubiquitous.

To ask whether colonization in itself is a good or bad thing is the same as asking whether history is a good or bad thing. The fusion of races as inevitable: 'The tendency of things is towards the quicker or slower fusion of races. It is impossible to arrest this tendency', and colonization cannot be excluded from that tendency. Although Mordecai is convinced that the return of Jews to Palestine will be beneficial not merely to the Jews but to the whole of humanity, the story of the Jewish maiden and the Gentile king is again pertinent, since it raises questions about Mordecai as an idealist. And does the novel's epigraph not provide a warning that because of an anarchic tendency within human nature things could always turn out badly? Even if seldom referred to by critics, it would not be out of place as an epigraph to Conrad's Heart of Darkness:

Let thy chief terror be of thine own soul: There,
'mid the throng of hurrying desires That trample
on the dead to seize their spoil, lurks vengeance,
footless, irresistible as exhalations laden with
slow death, and o'er the fairest troop of captured
joys Breathes pallid pestilence.

Daniel Deronda is notable for its open-endedness, and the contemporaneous reader, of course, had no knowledge as to what might result from Mordecai's prophetic vision and Deronda's decision to devote his life to the cause of creating a nation for Jews in Palestine. Things are even more problematic for the modern reader. It is clear from Said's writings and the writings of those influenced by him that views about the creation of the state of Israel and its aftermath have had an impact on critical judgement. From Eliot's writings in general it is apparent that she was sympathetic to some nationalist movements at least, seeing them as resisting globalizing economic forces with their homogenizing effects and imperialist forms of colonialism related to those economic forces. But whether she intended the proto-Zionist aspect of the novel to promote actively the cause of Jewish nationhood in any simple political sense is doubtful: this would be to remove the Jewish theme from its artistic context. Nancy Henry has stated that Eliot avoided becoming involved at a political level in efforts to further Jewish colonization of Palestine: Eliot

had no wish to align herself with the efforts of certain Jewish and non-Jewish Englishmen to establish colonies in Palestine. She has often been taken as an advocate of the colonization of Palestine based on isolated readings of Deronda, but her reluctance to celebrate early signs of its actual occurrence suggested that she distinguished between the idea of Jewish nationalism and the practices of religious colonizers.

Whatever Eliot's intention, readers now cannot help but read the novel in the context of the situation in the Middle East and almost inevitably wonder whether she would have regretted the proto-Zionist theme if she could have had second sight and seen the consequences of a Jewish state coming into being in Palestine. Implicit in the novel, however, is the unpredictability of future events. It is the certainty of the messianic visionary, such as Mordecai, in the face of that unpredictability which gives him his power. Without that power as manifested in Mordecai it is doubtful whether Deronda would have discovered a sense of partiality that he had previously lacked and the ideal that stems from Mordecai's prophetic vision which Deronda becomes 'possessed' with: 'that of restoring a political existence to my people'. But the narrator maintains a sense of distance with regard to the visionary's claim to have second sight - 'Second-sight is a flag over disputed ground' - and goes on to introduce a more skeptical note, 'No doubt there are abject specimens of the visionary', reflecting that in whatever category one looks at there will inevitably be bad examples: 'One is afraid to think of all that the genus patriot embraces'. Nor does Deronda, though his aspiration is to be 'an organic part of social life', abandon the rational or analytic intellect despite making a commitment to Mordecai's ideal of Jewish nationhood with its grounding in Jewish mysticism.

However, he refuses to dismiss Mordecai's claim to the prophetic, though he himself 'was not one of those quaveringly poised natures that lend themselves to second-sight'. But, like the narrator, he is aware of the possibility that Mordecai may be a poor or unlucky example of the visionary and that his ideas could therefore have unfortunate consequences. Difficulties of interpretation are present from the start of the novel. It opens with a series of questions raised by Deronda on first seeing Gwendolen: 'Is she beautiful or not beautiful? Was the good or evil genius dominant in these beams?'. Is Mordecai a visionary who can be compared to great visionaries of the past, or is he mad? Mr. Cohen with whom he lives tends to think he is mad: 'It was clearly to be understood that Mordecai did not come up to the standard of sanity which was set by Mr. Cohen's view of men and things'. Of course, this may be more of a judgement on Mr. Cohen than on Mordecai. Deronda in effect has to gamble that Mordecai's proto-Zionism is not merely fanaticism but an authentic form of idealism that could further the greater good of the world: 'Fanaticism was not as common as bankruptcy, but taken in all its aspects it was abundant enough' [4].

Mordecai's vision may be on a higher level than that of European colonialists, but there could be no certainty, at the time the novel was written, as to how any Zionist project would turn out. Although 'great' nations such as England or America may have eventually emerged, after much struggle and turmoil, as a consequence of colonization, colonization has just as often had unfortunate outcomes, especially when it has been allied to imperialism. If a Jewish nation is created and the Jews are winners, there will consequently be losers. For Said, Eliot - like other supporters of the Jewish colonization of Palestine - ignores the losers. Although Eliot is not specific in Daniel Deronda about the effect colonization of Palestine by Jews is likely to have on its predominantly Arab inhabitants, Mordecai refers to 'difficulties', the unspoken subtext to his words by acknowledging that any form of colonization will have its price. Yet, without Jewish colonization of Palestine, for Theophrastus and no doubt for Eliot, there is a great risk of the Jews

being the losers. Zionism was to a considerable extent a reaction to rising anti-Semitism in Europe, and if Jews were denied a nation that would allow them to escape it, then it would be the Jews who would lose. Theophrastus goes so far as to argue that without nationhood a distinct Jewish people would eventually disappear: 'Are they destined to complete fusion with the peoples among whom they are dispersed, losing every remnant of a distinctive consciousness as Jews?

Again, this makes colonization in a Jewish context different in kind from general European colonialism, as arguably both the Jews who wish to colonize Palestine to escape oppression and discrimination and to preserve their distinctive identity, and the existing Arab inhabitants of Palestine can be seen as potential losers. One is inevitably forced to choose a recurrent theme in Eliot's fiction and in this case Eliot's choice is for the Jews, but without Mordecai's certainty about the outcome and with full awareness of the 'difficulties' he tries to dismiss. Said does not take account of the fact that winning or losing is a recurrent preoccupation in Daniel Deronda, creating ethical difficulties both at the level of the personal lives of the characters and at the political level. Deronda becomes a winner when he turns out to have been born a Jew, but this turns both Hans Meyrick and Gwendolen into losers: any hope that Meyrick had of winning Mirah disappears, and Deronda will now desert Gwendolen to pursue the vocation that Mordecai has created for him [5].

Meyrick applies an ironic perspective to causality that is relevant both to Deronda's good fortune and to the Zionist project. Meyrick tells Deronda that 'the most judicious opinion going as to the effects of present causes is that time will show', which leads him to refer to 'the present causes of past effects'. Since one can never be sure of what 'present causes' will lead to in the future, causality in relation to the human mind in effect works backwards, being perceived to cause the past rather than the future. After reading Meyrick's letter we see Deronda reading his own past differently in the light of the revelation of his Jewishness, bearing out Meyrick's perspective. Conveniently, he can now view Meyrick's love for Mirah as not real but only as a kind of fantastic game, taking the imaginative pyrotechnics of the letter as a sign of Meyrick's lack of real feeling, not even considering that this self-display may be a means of covering up the pain of unrequited love. Eliot surely implies irony when Deronda concludes, 'I can't say that he is not active in imagining what goes on in other people but then he always imagines it to fit his own inclination', as this could easily apply to Deronda himself.

Only a prophet convinced of the truth of his vision can project causality into the future, and as is apparent with Mordecai, this can have value in motivating and shaping human action. No doubt Eliot had little rational expectation that a series of unpredictable events would lead to a Jewish state being created in Palestine, but neither the narrator nor Deronda dismisses prophecy. How can one act to try to improve the world without the hope that prophecy provides? But there is always the risk that there will be losers as well as winners. As a post-colonial critic Said reads history backwards from the point of view of the losers, but I would argue that he distorts both Daniel Deronda and Eliot by assuming that they exclude and ignore the perspective of the loser. Indeed, I would argue that Eliot is well aware that the ethical must not ignore the fact that judgements or decisions or choices, both in the personal and political spheres, will almost inevitably create losers as well as winners. Eliot's presumed indifference to the existing Arab population of Palestine who would be the potential losers if a Jewish state was created through colonization has led Said to associate her with colonialism and its assumption that Europeans have the right to displace non-European peoples: 'Eliot was indifferent to races who could not be assimilated to European ideas'. But anti colonialist views that are evident throughout her writing as in her dramatic poem.

The Spanish Gypsy, which clearly criticizes the Spanish imperialist and exclusivist policy which led to the expulsion of Arabs and Jews from Spain, and her outright condemnation in her letter to Harriet Beecher Stowe of English 'arrogance and contemptuous dictatorialness' towards 'all oriental peoples' are unmentioned by Said. But perhaps of more significance is that Mordecai takes England and America as models in his concept of a nation. This suggests that the restored Jewish nation is not conceived by him as aiming to be racially or ethnically exclusive but like England and America hybrid in these respects. It may be that Eliot and Said are not too far apart at the level of their ideals, as Said's was for the creation of a nation in Palestine in which Jews and Arabs could coexist on an equal basis.

Some critics have nevertheless gone much further than Said in their criticism of Eliot and Daniel Deronda and claimed that there is an insistence on racial essentialism'. Eliot did not see nationality in terms of racial or ethnic exclusiveness but in terms of 'a national consciousness', the Jews being admired for their 'distinctive consciousness what we may call the organized memory of national consciousness'. Eliot's implied position is that such a consciousness can be created among racially and ethnically diverse people with different sets of beliefs, as in England and America, even though the ideal, of course, may never be fully achieved. The narrator in Daniel Deronda is ironic in the 'Hand and Banner' scene about whether there is any longer pure English blood: 'In fact, pure English blood did not declare itself predominantly in the party at present assembled'. The narrator of English attitudes towards Jews and immigrants, questions the 'exclusiveness' of the Chinese and opposes immigration controls being introduced into England [6].

Even though Mordecai may appear at one point to support Jewish racial separateness, as in his criticism of Jews who marry Gentiles, this is directed at Jews who have internalized Gentile contempt for them and who intermarry in order to be accepted. This is part of his argument that Jews need nationhood so that they can be free from such self-contempt and regain contact and connection with Jewish history, thought and tradition. And even for him it is consciousness rather than race that is fundamental: '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 population as a river with rivers. Behold our people still Various critics have even gone to the extreme of arguing that Eliot's proto-Zionism is a form of anti-Semitism as it is a means of ridding Europe of its Jews: 'In her approval of Deronda's new nationalist awareness, then, was she suggesting that Jews had no real place in the national societies of western Europe? One may easily argue that this was the logic of Daniel's position.'17 Such a view shows little understanding of Eliot's cultural relativism.

Nor does Daniel Deronda offer any guarantee that Mordecai's visionary idealism could not go badly wrong if translated into political action, and many like Said would argue that it has. Even if it succeeded and a 'great' nation that was inclusive eventually emerged that could incorporate the descendants of the unlucky losers, the suffering of the victims of history can never be transcended. This double perspective seems to me intrinsic to Daniel Deronda, both at the level of the personal and in terms of the novel's political dimension. As to whether Eliot would have regretted writing a novel that has had the effect of promoting Zionism in the light of the state of affairs in the Middle East at the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is quite possible that she would have. But any kind of action - even writing a novel - carries some risk, as Eliot was well aware. in Middlemarch her narrator asks rhetorically: 'Who shall tell what may be the effect of writing?'. And though it may appear to many that Mordecai has turned out to be an unlucky visionary, Eliot may have agreed with Mao Tse-tung's much cited response when asked about the lessons of the French Revolution, that 'it was far too early to tell' [7].

DISCUSSION

This in-depth examination examines the novel Daniel Deronda by George Eliot's several topics, with an emphasis on how colonization and the establishment of a Jewish country in Palestine are portrayed. In order to offer insight on the political and historical conditions surrounding the novel's release, the debate opens by recognizing the novel's possible importance in influencing the development of the contemporary state of Israel. The conversation dives into Edward Said's seminal criticism of Daniel Deronda, which links the book to colonialism and Western ideas of imperialism toward the East. Said's viewpoint had a significant impact on post-colonial criticism of the book, which encouraged readers to see Eliot's depiction of colonialism more critically. The Ethical Complexities of Colonization: While Zionism varied from European imperialism in several ways, it nonetheless required colonization, which often results in the displacing or marginalizing of existing communities. The ethical implications of colonialism are discussed. The argument put out by Said that any kind of colonization that diminishes or violates the rights of the native people is morally repugnant is considered in the context of Daniel Deronda.

The debate focuses on George Eliot's knowledge of the intricacies of colonialism and her involvement with the moral and ethical ramifications of such efforts. It is recognized that Eliot was sympathetic to displaced or colonial people including Jews, Gypsies, and the Irish. Her resistance to British colonialism in India also highlights her complex viewpoint on these subjects. The investigation includes the rhetoric used by characters in the book like Mordecai, who supports the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. The contrast between Mordecai's utopian goal and the possible problems and effects of colonization emphasizes how his rhetoric avoids the relevant real obstacles. The devotion of Eliot's narrative style to showing the losers of history and the harsher elements of colonialism is examined via the perspective of Daniel Deronda, one of the main characters in the novel. The book's depiction of past invasions, atrocities, and the enslavement of indigenous peoples presents a fair analysis of the complexity of colonialism.

CONCLUSION

The article Daniel Deronda: A Contested Perspective on Colonization and Nationhood concludes by highlighting the novel's continued applicability in today's debates about colonialism, nationalism, and ethics. It encourages readers to engage with these topics in the work critically and to think about colonization's changing perceptions and moral ramifications, both in Eliot's day and in the larger context of literary analysis and post-colonial studies. It is also clear that Jews such as Gideon and Pash are not attracted by Mordecai's proto-Zionist vision and appear happy to continue to live in England without denying their Jewishness. Theophrastus has no expectation that all Jews will support the ideal of Jewish nationhood any more than they did in Biblical times: 'Plenty of prosperous Jews remained behind in Babylon'. Eliot throughout her writings is suspicious of redemptive and providentialism thinking. Even if one accepts that England and America eventually became 'great' nations, the tone of the narrator in this can provide no compensation for the Britons 'massacred' by Anglo-Saxons or the 'Red Indians' subject to 'extermination'. At the end of The Mill on the Floss, though the countryside recovers from the dire effects of the flood. Nature repairs her ravages' the narrator nevertheless points out 'there can be no thorough repair.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Rylance, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*. 2011. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198122838.001.0001.

[2] P. C. Mancall, Teaching & Learning Guide for: Aspects of Early Native American History Cluster, *Hist. Compass*, 2007, doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2007.00456.x.

[3] K. Hadjiafxendi, Gender and the woman question, in *George Eliot in Context*, 2011. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139019491.016.

[4] D. David, Making a living as an author, in *A Companion to the English Novel*, 2015. doi: 10.1002/9781118607251.ch19.

[5] M. Beetham, Periodical writing, in *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Women's Writing*, 2015. doi: 10.1017/CCO9781107587823.017.

[6] M. G. Anderson, Smile of Discontent: Humor, Gender, and Nineteenth-Century British Fiction . Eileen Gillooly. , *Wordsworth Circ.*, 2000, doi: 10.1086/twc24044814.

[7] P. Allatson, The Virtualization of Elián González, *M/C J.*, 2004, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2449.

CHAPTER 13

GEORGE ELIOT'S COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP WITH RACISM AND ZIONISM: A REVIEW

Indu Tripathi, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- indu_tripathi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This research digs into the complex world of Victorian literature and provides a comprehensive analysis of the racial viewpoints of notable writers of the time. In particular, it explores George Eliot's nuanced engagement with questions of racism and Zionism, offering light on her changing viewpoints and contributions to the discussion of nationalism, colonialism, and identity. This research places George Eliot's writings as a lens through which to analyze the complex interconnections of race, religion, and politics in the context of a Victorian literary environment that was often defined by racial prejudices. The analysis covers Eliot's awareness of the pervasive racism among her contemporaries, including individuals like Marx and Mill, as well as the degree to which their ideas mirrored Edward Said's concept of Orientalism. This investigation focuses on how different racial and ethnic groups are portrayed by Eliot in her literature. Her compassionate depictions of underrepresented groups like the Gypsies and the Irish subvert the preconceived notions of the period and highlight her dedication to tolerance. Additionally, her commitment to Zionism as a principle and her keen interest in Jewish ideas and culture provide insightful perspectives into her diverse view of identity and nationhood. George Eliot's writing continues to be relevant in today's debates about race and ethnicity. This research offers a new viewpoint on a Victorian author whose literary works continue to arouse critical debate and contemplation on the larger topics of colonialism, nationalism, and human variety by deconstructing the intricacies of her ideas on Zionism and racism.

KEYWORDS:

Colonialism, George Eliot, Nationalism, Racial Perspectives, Racism, Zionism.

INTRODUCTION

To a greater or lesser extent, the majority of the influential authors of the Victorian era may be seen as racist. Even Marx and Mill, in the words of Edward Said, seemed to have believed that such ideas as liberty, representative government, and individual happiness must not be applied to the Orient for reasons that today we would call racist. Anti-Semitism was the most overt form of racism in many of these writers, and this continued well past the Victorian era, as is evident even in such figures as T. S. Eliot. Eliot, S., and Woolf, V. It was formerly believed that George Eliot was the exception to the common anti-Semitism and bigotry in general. She was sympathetic to other groups facing heavy discrimination, such as the Gypsies, as seen in her verse play The Spanish Gypsy, and the Irish, in addition to supporting Zionism as an ideal and showing a keen interest in every facet of Jewish thinking and culture. Nevertheless, a sizable portion of subsequent detractors have associated Eliot with racism and even anti-Semitism. At the very least, if one believes that strong proof is crucial, some of that criticism might be perceived as lacking credibility. For instance, Sandor Gilman argues that Daniel Deronda's half-sentence, And one man differs from another, as we all differ from the Bosjesman, assumes a polygenetic view of race,

where polygenesis is the idea that races have developed from multiple sets of ancestors so that they are seen as belonging to different lineages. Darwin rejected polygenesis, and two of its most prominent nineteenth-century proponents were the infamous racists James Hunt and Robert Knox. Overall, Eliot's writings clearly imply that she disagreed with their views and, like Darwin, advocated monogenesis.

Even the editor of the current Penguin edition of Daniel Deronda seems to accept Gilman's claim in his note on the Bushmen reference: she does seem to imply an essential difference between us and them. Since the Bushmen were thought of in the Victorian era as the most ancient people on Earth - hunter-gatherers whose way of life had remained unchanged for at least 250,000 years, some of Eliot's post-colonial critics have accepted and In the Descent of Man, Darwin makes a few unfavorable comments to them, calling them the lowest existing savages and the degraded Bushmen of S. Despite being closest to the ancestors of man, they are clearly human in his eyes, even though they are from Africa. To construct a racist philosophy for Eliot on the basis of a remark that does nothing more than acknowledge that there are significant cultural differences among the human groups would imply that some of her critics have an ideological agenda at play. In his essay Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Victims, Edward Said makes the case that Eliot is complicit with European colonialism and, consequently, with racism. He contends that by supporting Zionism in Daniel Deronda, Eliot ignores and thus invalidates the existing inhabitants of Palestine [1].

It is this essay, according to a sizable number of post-Said critics, that most strongly links Eliot to racism and political conservatism. They frequently reference it in discussions of Daniel Deronda and go further than said in asserting that both texts are complicit in racism in all of its manifestations, including anti-Semitism. Hep! Hep!' as interpretations of it have been at the heart of the claim that racism and a conservative political goal are fundamental to Eliot's thought and writing. Whether Eliot's political opponents are suitable readers of a writer of very self-conscious literary writings like Eliot is another thing to take into account. The Contemporary Hep! Hep! Hep!' has often been viewed as a piece that stands apart from Impressions of Theophrastus Such and is most important for shedding light on Eliot's thoughts and views. However, there is a case can be made for Impressions being a literary work of considerable quality. Since the relationship between ancient Theophrastus, modern Theophrastus, and George Eliot is complex and challenging to disentangle, Nancy Henry, in the introduction to her edition of Impressions, associates it with early Modernist experimentation and argues that there is no simple and straightforward access to Eliot's views and beliefs.

But a large percentage of the commenters on The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! Theophrastus as narrator is seen only as an enabling mouthpiece for Eliot's increasingly cantankerous commentary on life, according to critics who have little interest in it as a literary text and quote passages as if they accurately reflect the author's views. Even critics who are generally sympathetic to Eliot and have no obvious ideological axe to grind have tended to take this view, which Hep! Hep! leads to wildly inaccurate interpretations of it, and the assertion made by detractors that it explicitly embodies viewpoints associated with racism and jingoism is unjustified. The next section of The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! critics of Eliot frequently cite this passage to argue that she shares the same racial prejudices as those of her time: According to Marc E. Wohlfarth's interpretation, Like so many of her contemporaries, Eliot is obsessed by the possibility of miscegenation, and according to Bryan Cheyette, Eliot was echoing Trollope's racially degenerate England of The Way We Live Now or The Prime Minister,. Susan Meyer Hep! Hep!' as though Eliot is speaking

in her own voice to a general audience in order to convey her views. This has the effect of putting things like the narrator and his unique characteristics, the essay's structure as a literary work, and the audience the narrator thinks he is speaking to aside. The passage's humorous elements such as the line it is a disease as harassing as the climate, which was probably meant to be purposely bathetic in light of its setting are also overlooked. Thus, the sentence is taken out of its literary context and seen to be a straightforward declaration of racial beliefs. An interpretation of The Modern Hep! in literature Hep! Hep!' should reflect on Eliot's use of a fictional narrator and investigate the connection between the narrator and the audience he is writing to [2].

Eliot is known for maintaining a certain amount of separation between her narrators and her real self. The article Address to Working Men, by Felix Holt, which was published in 1868, was the result of her response to John Blackwood's request that she elaborate on the political views expressed in Felix Holt. She may have continued to employ a pseudonym even when there was no longer a necessity for it since it put a barrier between the author and the narrator. However, given the humor and sophistication of Impressions and the obvious distinction between Eliot and her individualized narrator, this split between author and narrator is especially difficult. I have a repugnance to anything like an introduction of my own personality to the public, and this would have been especially true in The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! It is here that Victorian England and the English are directly criticized. As critics have frequently done, abstracting passages from their context and reading them as straightforward expressions of Eliot's own ideas and opinions is equivalent to reading a classic Browning dramatic monologue without taking into account the interaction between the speaker and the audience and how this impacts the structure of the speaker's argument, the type of rhetoric he uses, its persuasive function, and the essay's target audience must be taken into account while analyzing it.

I will contend that it is specifically addressed to a Victorian readership that the narrator assumes is primarily anti-Semitic and generally racist, and that the essay is designed to use literary techniques to persuade its readers to change or at least reflect on their attitudes rather than simply attacking them directly for their racism. Given the ingrained nature of English prejudice towards Jews, simple high moral criticism of the suggested readers' biases would be unlikely to be successful and is more likely to be destructive. Therefore, what the narrator does or more precisely, what Eliot forces him to do is to acknowledge that anti-Semitic sentiments and a general mistrust of outsiders are comprehensible, and that he shares some of their viewpoints. Theophrastus is more likely to be listened to and compelling in his criticism of both anti-Semitism and hatred to foreigners because to this rhetorical technique, which sets him on a somewhat equal footing with his audience. Theophrastus's anti-racism is explicitly stated on the first page of the essay, where he links unfavorable opinions of Jews with the prejudiced, the puerile, the spiteful, and the abysmally ignorant. However, continuing to address his readers in this manner would undoubtedly drive them away.

The passage previously cited, for example, can be read as Theophrastus trying to make a sympathetic connection with his racist audience in order to make that audience more receptive to his general critique of anti-Semitism and racism in the broader sense. Eliot's critics see these passages as direct expressions of Eliot's ideas and opinions. Theophrastus's approach of developing some empathy with the biases of his Victorian readers is seen by the frequent use of the pronouns we, us, and our. Eliot made it clear in her well-known letter to Harriet Beecher Stowe about Daniel Deronda that she was outraged by English anti-Semitism, had no sympathy for it, and roundly condemned her fellow countrymen, in stark contrast to Theophrastus's apparent sympathetic

understanding of his readers' prejudices. This letter's tone is quite different from Theophrastus' in The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! Theophrastus' use of the pronoun we in the phrase we English stands out in particular because it conveys her humiliation at being associated with such sentiments on the part of the English [3].

Eliot's discussion of Hebraism and Hellenism in Culture and Anarchy is likely a sarcastic reference to Arnold's we English, a nation of Indo-European stock. Theophrastus uses the pronouns we, us, and our in an Arnoldian manner to further his rhetorical goals, but Eliot explicitly distances herself from Arnold in her letter, and there is a nagging doubt about his beliefs in both Daniel Deronda and The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! As is evident in both Culture and Anarchy and Literature and Dogma, which was published four years later in 1873, Arnold's praise of the 'devout energy' that he equates with Hebraism because he associates it with what he sees as the positive aspects of English Puritanism did not lead him to admire or value Jewish civilization and culture. In fact, Arnold shares Eliot's perception of Jews, which she refuted in her later works, in her letter to John Sibree from 1848, Everything specifically Jewish is of low grade. Theophrastus again suggests that English fears on this score are understandable when he discusses the doubts of some liberals regarding whether Jews and other migrants can ever be integrated into English society despite having been granted civil rights.

He uses the conventional language associated with racism in seemingly confirming the idee regue that the English are being swamped by foreigners: both Jews and Germanic immigrants who have b Greeks are objectionably strong in the city. the Scotch are more numerous and prosperous here in the South than is quite for the good of us Southerners. it is felt in high quarters that we have always been too lenient toward the Irish. The very exaggerated wording in this text, such as comments to Scots having higher cheekbones, however, gives it a comic and satirical undertone. Due to the fact that so many Scots and Irish work in the English press and that English taste does not require and that has not yet been quite neutralized, as well as the fact that many Englishmen are forced to honest and ineloquent labor, Theophrastus' apparent empathy with English fears is interpreted by critics as the real substance of the essay, leading them to the conclusion that it is only, as Meyer puts it, ostensibly a defense of the Jews.

By taking the language of swamping as in pouring in to settle and swarm among us in regard to immigration as literally representing Eliot's views, they link her to the racism and jingoism that are being called into question. The essay's deeper agenda is to celebrate nationalism, and it shows how Eliot's celebration of Jewish nationalism is at heart about English nationalism, about defending the boundaries of the English nation. What would appear to be the substance the attack on anti-Semitic and racist attitudes is thus seen as merely a front for Eliot's English nationalism, which is defined as being essentially racist. Eliot's detractors do not take into account the fact that the narrator's seeming empathy with his readers' anxieties is a tactic to forward his persuasive agenda. Theophrastus acknowledges that a nation's sense of corporate existence is impacted by large numbers of migrants, but he disagrees with his implied audience in rejecting the notion that this justifies racist attitudes or advocating for the cessation of immigration or asylum. We are at least equal to the races we call obtrusive in the disposition to settle wherever money is to be made and cheaply idle living is to be found, so to spike away the peaceful foreigner would be a view of international relations not in the long-term favorable to the interests of our fellow-countrymen [4].

Few observers take the argument's structure in The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! Nevertheless, the broader context in which the passages that Eliot's detractors claim as racist have their meaning and

rhetorical impact is determined by that framework. The narrator believes his audience would agree that memory is important for the wellbeing of both a nation and of an individual's consciousness. To further persuade it, he provides contemporary examples of how the revival of a national consciousness through recovered memory has had positive results, such as the emergence in Europe of a Greek and an Italian nation. Race is not acknowledged in either scenario as a contributing aspect to this reviving nationality. Even while it was acknowledged that the infiltration of other than Greek blood separated contemporary Greece from classical Greece in any notion of race, the presence of ancient Greece in the consciousness of European men was a crucial aspect in the case of Greece. Theophrastus acknowledges that he has a low view of contemporary Greeks, claiming that many modern Greeks are highly disreputable characters. yet, he also says that the preservation of national memories on the parts of both Europeans and Greek citizens has been crucial in helping to create a free modern Greece.

When discussing the nationalist sentiments of one of our living historians who vehemently asserts our true affinities of blood and language with the Anglo-Saxons and who virtually says, Let the poetic fragments which breathe forth their fierce bravery in battle and their trust in fierce gods who helped them, be treasured with affectionate remembrance, Theophrastus also highlights the fact that some concepts of national. However, despite the fact that Theophrastus acknowledges the facts of colonization that the historian chose to overlook, it is obvious that he holds the opinion that colonization cannot simply be rejected in absolute terms since, as with England and more recently, America, it may finally result in the development of great countries. In order to promote a sense of national identity, Theophrastus claims that despite being significantly more cognizant of historical complexities than the historian, he guides us rightly in urging us to dwell on the virtues of our ancestors with emulation: 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 - ends which consist not in immediate material possession, but in the However, it is obvious that such a feeling of the community is not based on race but rather on consciousness: It is this living force of sentiment in common which makes a national consciousness.

The existence of this national consciousness depends on the nobleness of each individual citizen as much as the country. However, Eliot's political detractors often overlook this crucial statement: We should recognize a corresponding attachment to nationality as legitimate in every other people, and understand that its absence is a privation of the greatest good. Thus, the idea of nationality is separated from racism, which by definition views certain races or peoples as fundamentally inferior to others, and related with cultural relativism. It is important to consider Theophrastus' perspective on Jews in this context, because once again, the argument is intricate and requires careful interpretation [5]. Although he acknowledges that Jews have traditionally been seen as altogether exceptional, he contests the idea that this sets them apart from the rest of mankind. When otherness is overemphasized, it can lead to the Jews being either idealized by pro-Jewish people or hated or victimized by anti-Jewish people. However, for Theophrastus, Jewish exceptionality is only a matter of degree and not a difference in kind from other peoples: Every nation of forcible character is uncommon so far.

Although Eliot believed that Jews had a sense of separateness unique in its intensity, this did not fully isolate them from other peoples and from a common humanity. Theophrastus emphasizes the similarities between Jews and other ethnicities, and he uses this to his advantage when arguing for his point by emphasizing the 'affinities of disposition between our own race and the Jews'. However, it is evident that the term race is not being used in the sense that suggests a genetic or

biological difference. rather, it refers to a group of people who have a unique history, culture, and tradition. The origins of England may lie in the invasion and colonization by the Anglo-Saxons, but subsequent invasions by the Vikings and the Normans as well as the ongoing immigration that Theophrastus himself refers to from Scotland and Ireland, the continent of Europe and beyond, have transformed the English into a hybrid people. Even Mordecai in Daniel Deronda acknowledges that current Jews are not a separate race like the Jews who resided in Palestine at the time of the Roman invasion. the dispersion has inexorably resulted in blending with other peoples. Zealots who advocated resistance to the death against the submergence of their nationality emerged in order to preserve and maintain it because, unlike the English and other peoples, the dispersed Jews had no country to provide any center or grounding for a sense of corporate existence, which encouraged some undesirable Jewish traits such as arrogance and a sense of superiority Of course, it has frequently been noted that anti-Semitism is contradictory in that Jews are accused of being rootless cosmopolitans, individualistic, free-thinking, unconnected to religion or tradition, as well as of upholding their Jewish religion and culture and thus being a distinct group within society. For instance, T is based on the latter.

Although ironically, he also criticized George Eliot along similar lines for what he branded as heresy, an individualistic rationalism that devalues tradition and orthodoxy, T. S. Eliot's infamously negative comments on Jews reasons of race and religion combine to make any large number of free-thinking Jews undesirable are well known. views of S. Eliot. But like him, she cherished religion and tradition as well as having questions about cosmopolitanism when it was practiced to the exclusion of everything else [6]. However, unlike him, she is clear that this does not solely apply to Jews. Though Theophrastus acknowledges that cosmopolitanism can apply to some Jews, it is argued in Impressions of Theophrastus Such that doing so is anti-Semitic. He writes: Their monetary hold on governments is tending to perpetuate in leading Jews a spirit of universal alienism, even where the West has given them a full share in civil and political rights. Theophrastus also contends that cosmopolitanism is being used for questionable purposes because it appeals to Western colonialism and global capitalism ideologically and can be used to defend the economic exploitation of nations like China by destroying or plundering the fruits of his labor on the alleged ground that he is not cosmopolitan enough.

Thus, colonialism and imperialism, which were the two main philosophies in the West in the latter nineteenth century, are considered as contributing to the cosmopolitan attitude. Although it is not exclusive to Jews, certain Jews may be well suited to it due to their history of being marginalized. Jews who reject nationality and religion in favor of an individualistic or materialistic philosophy are also exceptional, as one can see in Daniel Deronda in the characterizations of Deronda's mother and Mirah's and Mordecai's father Lapidoth. This is similar to how Jews who adhere to their religion and traditions are exceptional in their intense sense of themselves as a distinctive people. However, these Jews' alienation and cosmopolitanism are of a similar kind to that which might afflict alienated non-Jews. Deronda's mother and the non-Jewish Armgart, the title character of Eliot's verse play published in 1870–1871 are clearly related. Lapidoth is also connected to such cunning non-Jewish egotists and gamblers as Christian in Felix Holt and, in particular, Tito Melema in Romola. Tito Melema is a Greek, though he was not born in Greece, and is arguably the most extreme example of an alienated consciousness in her work. Bernardo refers to him as one of the demonic who are of no particular country. He is a touch too quick-witted to be burdened by the baggage that men carry about in their emotions.

The Author inquires as to whether or not the man is a Hebrew. Theophrastus describes individualistic Jews as capable of being everywhere acclimatized and uses imagery connected to Darwinism, such as adaptation and taking advantage of chance. With individualistic Jews like Lapidoth alienation can be particularly severe because, like Tito, they lack a country that at least provides a minimal connection with a particular place. The Modern Hep!'s portrayal of Jews Hep! Hep! Thus, while having no country in the literal sense, the Jews present a double lesson to a nation like the English, one positive, the dangers of alienation, and one negative, their enhanced sense of Jewish identity. However, if it fosters an intellectual disinterestedness that is not driven by egotism or lacking of idealism, alienation is not always or not always bad for Eliot, either for Jews or non-Jews. Although Daniel Deronda has no interest in race or nationhood, marries an English lady, and is uncommitted to any one country, an artist like Klesmer may turn it constructively into music so that it becomes a type of equal to a feeling of nationalism. As 'a felicitous blend of the German, the Sclave, and the Semite', he serves as an illustration of a more positive kind of cosmopolitanism. He has cosmopolitan ideas, according to Catherine Arrowpoint, and looks forward to the fusion of races. Eliot also portrays Jews who are somewhere between the extremes of zealotry for nationhood or a distinct Jewish identity and alienation, whether positive or negative, like working- or lower middle-class Jews like the Cohens and Gideon and Pash who accept their Jewishness but are content to live in a country like England [7].

DISCUSSION

Many of the great writers who flourished throughout the Victorian period were concerned with questions of race, identity, and nationalism. In the backdrop of George Eliot's literary works and her changing views on racism and Zionism, this conversation digs deeply into the nuanced investigation of these subjects. An especially fascinating case study is provided by the well-known Victorian novelist George Eliot, whose works reveal a complicated interaction with these racial and political ideas. The British Empire's growth and colonialism's widespread impact were characteristics of the Victorian period. Many well-known individuals had racial views that are today seen as being quite problematic under this context. As implied by the title, writers like Karl Marx and John Stuart Mill were not immune from holding racist opinions. comprehending how these racial viewpoints appeared in Victorian literature requires comprehending Edward Said's idea of Orientalism, which contends that Western writers often depicted the East through a prism of exoticism and prejudice. George Eliot stands out as a writer who questioned prevalent prejudices in the middle of this racial milieu. Eliot's writings, like Daniel Deronda, exhibit a more compassionate and nuanced representation of underprivileged people than the prejudices and biases that were often propagated by Victorian writers.

By humanizing these communities and bringing attention to their hardships, her involvement with the Gypsies and the Irish, for example, undermines the current quo. Another aspect of Eliot's nuanced view on race is her support for Zionism. During the Victorian period, Zionism, a political movement promoting the creation of a Jewish state, was gaining ground. Eliot approaches questions of identity and nationhood from a distinctive perspective, as seen by her interest in Jewish culture, respect for Jewish ideas, and support for Zionism as an ideal. Scholars have praised and criticized this feature of her work [8]. It's important to note that several interpretations and critiques have been made of George Eliot's depiction of race and her position on Zionism. Some critics contend that Eliot's works, such as a line fragment from Daniel Deronda, reveal a polygenetic perspective of race in contrast to her seeming support for monogenesis, a theory backed by Charles Darwin. These interpretations, however, often lack solid supporting data and

could represent the ideological positions of certain detractors. The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! is one of the key books in this subject. This article serves as a focus point for analyzing Eliot's racial ideas since it is often linked to her claimed involvement with racism and political conservatism.

CONCLUSION

Finally, analyzing George Eliot's complicated views on racism and Zionism sheds light on the complexity of Victorian literature and the range of racial viewpoints that prevailed at this time. Our comprehension of Eliot's ideas on race, nationalism, and identity is put to the test by the way she portrays disadvantaged people and her involvement with Zionism as an ideal. Considering the larger historical background and the numerous interpretations that have developed through time, it is crucial to approach this subject with complexity and a critical eye. People who accuse Eliot of being racist and anti-Semitic usually use this book in their arguments. However, given Eliot's complex and self-conscious writing style, it might be difficult to understand her intents and ideas via this lens, as with any literary study.

REFERENCES:

[1] E. White, The great issues: George Eliot, Zionism and the novel, *TLS - Times Lit. Suppl.*, 2002.

[2] L. Trubowitz, Race and antisemitism in lewis, in *The Cambridge Companion to Wyndham Lewis*, 2016. doi: 10.1017/CCO9781107284326.010.

[3] K. M. Newton, George Eliot and Racism: How Should One Read ‘the modern hep! hep! hep!’?, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 2008, doi: 10.1353/mlr.2008.0195.

[4] C. Laporte, George Eliot, in *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, 2010. doi: 10.1002/9781444324174.ch38.

[5] J. Farina, Middlemarch and ‘that sort of thing,’ *Romanticism on the Net*. 2009. doi: 10.7202/029903ar.

[6] O. Browning, *Life of George Eliot*. 2011. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139149198.

[7] E. Alexander, *Classical liberalism and the Jewish tradition*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781351324243.

[8] C. L. Adida *et al.*, Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation, *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.*, 2016.